IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT EASTERN DISTRICT OF ARKANSAS JONESBORO DIVISION

AMES WINGCORMACK, CLERK

PLAINTIFF

JAYLIN BONDS, Individually and on Behalf of All Others Similarly Situated

VS.

No. 3:18-cv-/89-163

LANGSTON COMPANIES, INC.

NC.
This case assigned to District Judge Defendant

ORIGINAL COMPLAINT—CLASS AND COLLECTIVE ACTION

COMES NOW Plaintiff Jaylin Bonds ("Plaintiff"), individually and on behalf of all others similarly situated, by and through his attorneys Daniel Ford, Chris Burks and Josh Sanford of Sanford Law Firm, PLLC, for his First Amended and Substituted Complaint—Class and Collective Action against Defendant Langston Companies, Inc. ("Defendant"), he does hereby state and allege as follows:

I. PRELIMINARY STATEMENTS

- 1. This is a class action and a collective action brought by Plaintiff Jaylin Bonds, individually and on behalf of all other hourly-paid employees employed by Defendant at any time within a three-year period preceding the filing of this Complaint.
- 2. Plaintiff brings this action under the Fair Labor Standards Act, 29 U.S.C. § 201, et seq. ("FLSA") and the Arkansas Minimum Wage Act, Ark. Code Ann. § 11-4-201, et seq. ("AMWA"), for declaratory judgment, monetary damages, liquidated damages, prejudgment interest, and costs, including reasonable attorneys' fees, as a result of Defendant's failure to pay Plaintiff and other hourly-paid employees lawful overtime compensation for hours worked in excess of forty (40) hours per week.

Page 1 of 16
Jaylin Bonds, et al. v. Langston Companies, Inc.
U.S.D.C. (E.D. Ark.) No. 3:18-cv-___
Original Complaint—Class and Collective Action

3. Upon information and belief, for at least three (3) years prior to the filing of

this Complaint, Defendant has willfully and intentionally committed violations of the

FLSA and AMWA as described, infra.

II. JURISDICTION AND VENUE

4. The United States District Court for the Eastern District of Arkansas has

subject matter jurisdiction over this suit under the provisions of 28 U.S.C. § 1331

because this suit raises federal questions under the FLSA.

5. Plaintiff's claims under the AMWA form part of the same case or

controversy and arise out of the same facts as the FLSA claims alleged in this

Complaint.

6. Therefore, this Court has supplemental jurisdiction over Plaintiff's AMWA

claims pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1367(a).

7. The acts complained of herein were committed and had their principal

effect within the Jonesboro Division of the Eastern District of Arkansas; therefore, venue

is proper within this District pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1391.

8. Defendant does business in this District and a substantial part of the

events alleged herein occurred in this District.

9. The witnesses to overtime wage violations alleged in this Complaint reside

in this District.

10. On information and belief, the payroll records and other documents

related to the payroll practices that Plaintiff challenges are located in this District.

Page 2 of 16
Jaylin Bonds, et al. v. Langston Companies, Inc.
U.S.D.C. (E.D. Ark.) No. 3:18-cv-___
Original Complaint—Class and Collective Action

III. THE PARTIES

11. Plaintiff repeats and re-alleges all the preceding paragraphs of this

Complaint as if fully set forth in this section.

12. Plaintiff is a resident and citizen of Crittenden County.

13. Plaintiff was employed by Defendant as an hourly-paid factory employee

within the three years relevant to this lawsuit.

14. At all material times, Plaintiff has been entitled to the rights, protection and

benefits provided under the FLSA and AMWA.

15. Defendant Langston Companies, Inc., is a foreign corporation, who was

registered to do business in the state of Arkansas but whose status in Arkansas is

currently revoked.

16. Defendant Langston Companies, Inc.'s registered agent for service of

process is R E Langston, 1760 South 3rd Street, Memphis, Tennessee 38109-7712.

17. Defendant is an "employer" within the meanings set forth in the FLSA and

AMWA, and was, at all times relevant to the allegations in this Complaint, Plaintiff's

employer, as well as the employer of the members of the class and collective.

18. Defendant is a leading supplier of various types of bags and other

packing-related products and services, including multiwall paper sacks, cotton bale

packaging, flexible intermediate bulk containers, and small woven polypropylene bags.

19. Defendant operates six manufacturing facilities worldwide, including five in

the United States and one facility in West Memphis.

20. Defendant has one corporate headquarters in Memphis that centralizes all

pay, time and human resource policies so that they are the same across its facilities.

Page 3 of 16
Jaylin Bonds, et al. v. Langston Companies, Inc.
U.S.D.C. (E.D. Ark.) No. 3:18-cv-___
Original Complaint—Class and Collective Action

21. During the time period relevant to this case, Plaintiff was employed at

Defendant's manufacturing facility in West Memphis.

22. Defendant has employees engaged in commerce and has employees

handling or otherwise working on goods or materials that have been moved in or

produced for commerce by others, such as raw material used to manufacture the variety

of bags that it produces.

23. Defendant's annual gross volume of sales made or business done is not

less than \$500,000.00 (exclusive of excise taxes at the retail level that are separately

stated) for each of the three years preceding the filing of this Complaint.

24. Defendant has unified control over employees and exercises authority

over Plaintiff and other employees, sets the pay policy applicable to Plaintiff and other

employees and controls the work schedule of Plaintiff and other employees.

IV. FACTUAL ALLEGATIONS

25. Plaintiff repeats and re-alleges all the preceding paragraphs of this

Complaint as if fully set forth in this section.

26. During part of the three (3) years prior to the filing of this lawsuit, Plaintiff

worked for Defendant as an hourly-paid factory employee.

27. Plaintiff and other hourly-paid factory employees regularly worked in

excess of forty (40) hours per week throughout their tenure with Defendant.

28. Plaintiff and other hourly-paid factory employees were classified as hourly

employees and paid an hourly rate.

Page 4 of 16
Jaylin Bonds, et al. v. Langston Companies, Inc.
U.S.D.C. (E.D. Ark.) No. 3:18-cv-___
Original Complaint—Class and Collective Action

Case 3:18-cv-00189-KGB Document 1 Filed 10/05/18 Page 5 of 16

29. Plaintiff and other hourly-paid employees recorded their hours worked via

an electronic time clock, which logged their hours into a payroll system maintained by

Defendant.

30. The payroll system used by Defendant rounded hours worked by Plaintiff

and other hourly-paid factory employees in favor of Defendant.

31. For example, if an hourly-paid employee clocked in at 7:45 am, the payroll

system recorded his or her start time as 8:00 am. Likewise, if an hourly-paid employee

clocked out at 5:15 pm, Defendant's payroll system recorded his or her end time as 5:00

pm.

32. The rounding in Defendant's time keeping system resulted in several

hours of unpaid work each month for Plaintiff and other hourly-paid factory employees.

33. Plaintiff worked for Defendant at Defendant's facility in West Memphis

(hereinafter the "West Memphis facility") and Defendant's pay practices were the same

for all hourly factory employers at the West Memphis facility.

34. The pay practices that violate the FLSA and AMWA alleged herein was a

centralized human resources policy implemented uniformly from Defendant's corporate

headquarters.

35. Defendant knew, or showed reckless disregard for whether, the way they

paid Plaintiff and other hourly-paid factory employees violated the FLSA and AMWA.

36. Defendant's hourly-paid factory employees were classic manual laborers,

working with machinery and equipment to produce Defendant's products in a factory

setting.

Page 5 of 16
Jaylin Bonds, et al. v. Langston Companies, Inc.
U.S.D.C. (E.D. Ark.) No. 3:18-cv-___
Original Complaint—Class and Collective Action

V. REPRESENTATIVE ACTION ALLEGATIONS

A. FLSA § 216(b) Class

37. Plaintiff repeats and re-alleges all the preceding paragraphs of this

Complaint as if fully set forth in this section.

38. Plaintiff brings this claim for relief for violation of the FLSA as a collective

action pursuant to Section 16(b) of the FLSA, 29 U.S.C. § 216(b).

39. Plaintiff brings his FLSA claims on behalf of all hourly-paid factory

employees employed by Defendant at any time within the applicable statute of

limitations period, who were classified by Defendant as non-exempt from the overtime

requirements of the FLSA and who are entitled to payment of the following types of

damages:

A. Payment for all hours worked, including payment of a lawful overtime

premium for all hours worked for Defendant in excess of forty (40) hours in a workweek;

and

B. Liquidated damages; and

C. Attorneys' fees and costs.

40. The relevant time period dates back three years from the date on which

Plaintiff's Original Complaint—Class and Collective Action was filed and continues

forward through the date of judgment pursuant to 29 U.S.C. § 255(a).

41. The members of the proposed FLSA Collective are similarly situated in

that they share these traits:

A. They were classified by Defendant as non-exempt from the overtime

requirements of the FLSA;

Page 6 of 16
Jaylin Bonds, et al. v. Langston Companies, Inc.
U.S.D.C. (E.D. Ark.) No. 3:18-cv-___
Original Complaint—Class and Collective Action

B. They were paid hourly rates;

C. They recorded their time in the same manner; and

D. They were subject to Defendant's common policy of rounding time worked

in Defendant's favor.

42. Plaintiff is unable to state the exact number of the potential members of

the FLSA Collective but believe that the group exceeds 500 persons.

43. Defendant can readily identify the members of the Section 16(b)

Collective. The names, physical addresses, electronic mailing addresses and phone

numbers of the FLSA collective action plaintiffs are available from Defendant, and a

Court-approved Notice should be provided to the FLSA collective action plaintiffs via

first class mail, email and text message to their last known physical and electronic

mailing addresses and cell phone numbers as soon as possible, together with other

documents and information descriptive of Plaintiff's FLSA claim.

B. AMWA Rule 23 Class

44. Plaintiff, individually and on behalf of all others similarly situated who were

employed by Defendant within the State of Arkansas, bring this claim for relief for

violation of the AMWA as a class action pursuant to Rule 23 of the Federal Rules of Civil

Procedure.

45. Plaintiff proposes to represent the class of hourly-paid employees who

are/were employed by Defendant within the relevant time period within the State of

Arkansas.

Page 7 of 16
Jaylin Bonds, et al. v. Langston Companies, Inc.
U.S.D.C. (E.D. Ark.) No. 3:18-cv-___
Original Complaint—Class and Collective Action

Case 3:18-cv-00189-KGB Document 1 Filed 10/05/18 Page 8 of 16

46. Common guestions of law and fact relate to all members of the proposed

class, such as whether as a result Defendant's rounding practices, Defendant paid

members of the proposed class a lawful overtime wage in accordance with the AMWA.

47. Common questions of law and fact predominate over any questions

affecting only the individually-named Plaintiff, and a class action is superior to other

available methods for fairly and efficiently adjudicating the claims of the members of the

proposed AMWA class.

48. The class members have no interest in individually controlling the

prosecution of separate actions because the policy of the AMWA provides a bright-line

rule for protecting all non-exempt employees as a class. To wit: "It is declared to be the

public policy of the State of Arkansas to establish minimum wages for workers in order

to safeguard their health, efficiency, and general well-being and to protect them as well

as their employers from the effects of serious and unfair competition resulting from

wage levels detrimental to their health, efficiency, and well-being." Ark. Code Ann. § 11-

4-202.

49. Plaintiff is unable to state the exact number of the potential members of

the AMWA class but believe that the class is approximately 250 persons. Therefore, the

class is so numerous that joinder of all members is impracticable.

50. At the time of the filing of this Complaint, neither Plaintiff nor Plaintiff's

counsel knows of any litigation already begun by any members of the proposed class

concerning the allegations in this Complaint.

Page 8 of 16
Jaylin Bonds, et al. v. Langston Companies, Inc.
U.S.D.C. (E.D. Ark.) No. 3:18-cv-___
Original Complaint—Class and Collective Action

51. Concentrating the litigation in this forum is highly desirable because

Defendant's West Memphis facility is based in the Eastern District of Arkansas and

because Plaintiff and all proposed class members work or worked in Arkansas.

52. No difficulties are likely to be encountered in the management of this class

action.

53. The claims of Plaintiff are typical of the claims of the proposed class in that

Plaintiff worked as an hourly-paid factory employee for Defendant and experienced the

same violations of the AMWA that all other class members suffered.

54. Plaintiff and his counsel will fairly and adequately protect the interests of

the class.

55. Plaintiff's counsel are competent to litigate Rule 23 class actions and other

complex litigation matters, including wage and hour cases like this one, and to the

extent, if any, that they find that they are not, they are able and willing to associate

additional counsel.

56. Prosecution of separate actions by individual members of the proposed

class would create the risk of inconsistent or varying adjudications with respect to

individual members of the proposed class that would establish incompatible standards

of conduct for Defendant.

VI. FIRST CLAIM FOR RELIEF

(Individual Claim for Violation of FLSA)

56. Plaintiff repeats and re-alleges all the preceding paragraphs of this

Complaint as if fully set forth in this section.

57. 29 U.S.C. §§ 206 and 207 require any enterprise engaged in commerce to

pay all employees a minimum wage for all hours worked up to forty (40) in one week

and to pay time and a half of regular wages for all hours worked over forty (40) hours in

a week, unless an employee meets certain exemption requirements of 29 U.S.C. § 213

and all accompanying Department of Labor regulations.

58. During the period relevant to this lawsuit, Defendant classified Plaintiff as

non-exempt from the overtime requirements of the FLSA.

59. Despite the entitlement of Plaintiff to minimum wage and overtime

payments under the FLSA, Defendant failed to pay Plaintiff an overtime rate of one and

one-half times their regular rate of pay for all hours worked over forty (40) in each one-

week period.

60. Defendant's failure to properly pay overtime wages to Plaintiff stems from

Defendant's acts of illegally rounding hours worked by Plaintiff in Defendant's favor and

not paying Plaintiff for all hours worked.

61. Defendant's conduct and practice, as described above, has been and is

willful, intentional, unreasonable, arbitrary and in bad faith.

62. By reason of the unlawful acts alleged in this Complaint, Defendant is

liable to Plaintiff for, and Plaintiff seeks, unpaid overtime wages, liquidated damages,

and costs, including reasonable attorney's fees as provided by the FLSA.

63. Alternatively, should the Court find that Defendant acted in good faith in

failing to pay Plaintiff as provided by the FLSA, Plaintiff is entitled to an award of

prejudgment interest at the applicable legal rate.

VII. SECOND CLAIM FOR RELIEF

(Collective Action Claim for Violation of FLSA)

64. Plaintiff repeats and re-alleges all the preceding paragraphs of this

Complaint as if fully set forth in this section.

Page 10 of 16

Case 3:18-cv-00189-KGB Document 1 Filed 10/05/18 Page 11 of 16

65. Plaintiff brings this collective action on behalf of all hourly-paid employees

employed by Defendant to recover monetary damages owed by Defendant to Plaintiff

and members of the putative collective for all the overtime compensation for all the

hours he and they worked in excess of forty (40) each week.

66. Plaintiff brings this action on behalf of himself individually and all other

similarly situated employees, former and present, who were and/or are affected by

Defendant's willful and intentional violation of the FLSA.

67. During the period relevant to this lawsuit, Defendant classified Plaintiff and

all similarly situated members of the FLSA collective as non-exempt from the overtime

requirements of the FLSA.

68. Despite the entitlement of Plaintiff and those similarly situated to minimum

wage and overtime payments under the FLSA, Defendant failed to pay Plaintiff and all

those similarly situated an overtime rate of one and one-half times their regular rates of

pay for all hours worked over forty (40) in each one-week period.

69. In the past three years, Defendant has employed hundreds of hourly-paid

factory employees.

70. Like Plaintiff, these hourly-paid factory employees regularly worked more

than forty (40) hours in a week.

71. Defendant failed to pay these workers at the proper overtime rate.

72. Because these employees are similarly situated to Plaintiff, and are owed

overtime for the same reasons, the opt-in class may be properly defined as:

Each hourly-paid factory employee who worked more than

thirty-nine (39) hours in any week within the last three years.

73. Defendant's conduct and practice, as described above, has been and is

willful, intentional, unreasonable, arbitrary and in bad faith.

74. By reason of the unlawful acts alleged in this Complaint, Defendant is

liable to Plaintiff and all those similarly situated for, and Plaintiff and all those similarly

situated seek, unpaid overtime wages, liquidated damages, and costs, including

reasonable attorneys' fees as provided by the FLSA.

75. Alternatively, should the Court find that Defendant acted in good faith in

failing to pay Plaintiff and all those similarly situated as provided by the FLSA, Plaintiff

and all those similarly situated are entitled to an award of prejudgment interest at the

applicable legal rate.

VIII. THIRD CLAIM FOR RELIEF

(Individual Claim for Violation of the AMWA)

76. Plaintiff repeats and re-alleges all previous paragraphs of this Original

Complaint as though fully incorporated in this section.

77. Plaintiff asserts this claim for damages and declaratory relief pursuant to

the AMWA, Arkansas Code Annotated §§ 11-4-201, et seq.

78. At all relevant times, Defendant was Plaintiff's "employer" within the

meaning of the AMWA, Ark. Code Ann. § 11-4-203(4).

79. Arkansas Code Annotated § 11-4-211 requires employers to pay all

employees one and one-half times regular wages for all hours worked over forty (40)

hours in a week, unless an employee meets the exemption requirements of 29 U.S.C. §

213 and accompanying Department of Labor regulations.

80. Defendant failed to pay Plaintiff all overtime wages owed, as required

under the AMWA.

Page 12 of 16 Jaylin Bonds, et al. v. Langston Companies, Inc.

U.S.D.C. (E.D. Ark.) No. 3:18-cv-___

81. Defendant's failure to properly pay overtime wages to Plaintiff stems from

Defendant's acts of illegally rounding hours worked by Plaintiff in Defendant's favor and

not paying Plaintiff for all hours worked.

82. Defendant's conduct and practices, as described above, were willful,

intentional, unreasonable, arbitrary and in bad faith.

83. By reason of the unlawful acts alleged in this Complaint, Defendant is

liable to Plaintiff for monetary damages, liquidated damages, costs, and a reasonable

attorney's fee provided by the AMWA for all violations which occurred beginning at least

three (3) years preceding the filing of Plaintiff's initial complaint, plus periods of

equitable tolling.

Alternatively, should the Court find that Defendant acted in good faith in 84.

failing to pay Plaintiff as provided by the AMWA, Plaintiff is entitled to an award of

prejudgment interest at the applicable legal rate.

FOURTH CLAIM FOR RELIEF IX.

(Class Action Claim for Violation of the AMWA)

85. Plaintiff repeats and re-alleges all previous paragraphs of this Complaint

as though fully incorporated in this section.

86. Plaintiff, individually and on behalf of all others similarly situated who were

employed by Defendant within the State of Arkansas, asserts this claim for damages

and declaratory relief pursuant to the AMWA, Arkansas Code Annotated §§ 11-4-201 et

seq.

87. At all relevant times, Defendant has been, and continues to be, an

"employer" of Plaintiff and the members of the proposed class within the meaning of the

AMWA, Ark. Code Ann. § 11-4-203(4).

Page 13 of 16 Jaylin Bonds, et al. v. Langston Companies, Inc. 88. Arkansas Code Annotated § 11-4-211 requires employers to pay all

employees one and one-half times their regular wages for all hours worked over forty

(40) hours in a week, unless an employee meets the exemption requirements of 29

U.S.C. § 213 and accompanying Department of Labor regulations.

89. Defendant failed to pay Plaintiff and members of the proposed class all

overtime wages owed, as required under the AMWA.

90. Plaintiff proposes to represent a class of individuals who are owed

overtime wages and other damages for the same reasons as Plaintiff, which may be

defined as follows:

Each hourly-paid Arkansas factory employee who worked more than thirty-nine (39) hours in any week within the last

three years.

91. Defendant's conduct and practices, as described above, were willful,

intentional, unreasonable, arbitrary and in bad faith.

92. By reason of the unlawful acts alleged herein, Defendant is liable to

Plaintiff and the proposed class for monetary damages, liquidated damages, costs, and

a reasonable attorneys' fee provided by the AMWA for all violations which occurred

within the three (3) years prior to the filing of this Complaint, plus periods of equitable

tolling.

93. Alternatively, should the Court find that Defendant acted in good faith in

failing to pay Plaintiff and members of the proposed class as provided by the AMWA,

Plaintiff and members of the proposed class are entitled to an award of prejudgment

interest at the applicable legal rate.

Page 14 of 16
Jaylin Bonds, et al. v. Langston Companies, Inc.
U.S.D.C. (E.D. Ark.) No. 3:18-cv-___
Original Complaint—Class and Collective Action

X. PRAYER FOR RELIEF

WHEREFORE, premises considered, Plaintiff Jaylin Bonds respectfully prays that Defendant be summoned to appear and to answer herein as follows:

- (A) That Defendant be required to account to Plaintiff, the class and collective members, and the Court for all of the hours worked by Plaintiff and the class and collective members and all monies paid to them;
- (B) A declaratory judgment that Defendant's practices violate the Fair Labor Standards Act, 29 U.S.C. § 201, et seq., and attendant regulations at 29 C.F.R. § 516 et seq.;
- (C) A declaratory judgment that Defendant's practices violate the Arkansas Minimum Wage Act, Ark. Code Ann. § 11-4-201, et seq. and the related regulations;
- (D) Certification of, and proper notice to, together with an opportunity to participate in the litigation, all qualifying current and former employees;
- (E) Judgment for damages for all unpaid overtime compensation under the Fair Labor Standards Act, 29 U.S.C. § 201, et seq., and attendant regulations at 29 C.F.R. § 516 et seq.;
- (F) Judgment for damages for all unpaid overtime compensation under the Arkansas Minimum Wage Act, Ark. Code Ann. § 11-4-201, et seq. and the related regulations;
- (G) Judgment for liquidated damages pursuant to the Fair Labor Standards Act, 29 US.C. § 201, et seq., and attendant regulations at 29 C.F.R. § 516 et seq., in an amount equal to all unpaid overtime compensation owed to Plaintiff and members of the class and collective during the applicable statutory period;

Page 15 of 16
Jaylin Bonds, et al. v. Langston Companies, Inc.
U.S.D.C. (E.D. Ark.) No. 3:18-cv-___
Original Complaint—Class and Collective Action

(H) Judgment for liquidated damages pursuant to the Arkansas Minimum Wage Act, Ark. Code Ann. § 11-4-201, et seq., and the relating regulations; in an amount equal to all unpaid overtime compensation owed to Plaintiff and members of the class and collective during the applicable statutory period;

(I) An order directing Defendant to pay Plaintiff and members of the class and collective pre-judgment interest, reasonable attorney's fees and all costs connected with this action; and

(J) Such other and further relief as this Court may deem necessary, just and proper.

Respectfully submitted,

PLAINTIFF JAYLIN BONDS, Individually and on Behalf of All Others Similarly Situated

SANFORD LAW FIRM, PLLC One Financial Center 650 South Shackleford, Suite 411 Little Rock, Arkansas 72211 Telephone: (501) 221-0088 Facsimile: (888) 787-2040

Daniel Ford

Ark. Bar No. 2014162

daniel@sanfordlawfirm.com

Chris Burks

Ark. Bar No. 2010207

chris@sanfordlawfirm.com

Josh Sanfor

Ark. Bar No. 2001037

iosh@sanfordlawfirm.com

JS 44 (Rev. 06/17)

CIVIL COVER SHEET

The JS 44 civil cover sheet and the information contained herein neither replace nor supplement the filing and service of pleadings or other papers as required by law, except as provided by local rules of court. This form, approved by the Judicial Conference of the United States in September 1974, is required for the use of the Clerk of Court for the ruprose of initiating the civil docket sheet. (SEE INSTRUCTIONS ON NEXT PAGE OF THIS FORM.)

purpose of inflating the civil d	ocket sheet. ISEE INSTRUC	HONS ON NEXT PAGE C	Jr Inis ro	KM.)	318CV18	9-KGD	
I. (a) PLAINTIFFS				DEFENDANTS	S		
JAYLIN BONDS, Individually and on Behalf of all Others Similarly Situated				LANGSTON COMPANIES, INC.			
(b) County of Residence of First Listed Plaintiff CRITTENDON (EXCEPT IN U.S. PLAINTIFF CASES)				County of Residence of First Listed Defendant (IN U.S. PLAINTIFF CASES ONLY) NOTE IN LAND CONDEMNATION CASES, USE THE LOCATION OF			
(c) Attorneys (Firm Name)	Address, and Telephone Numbe	r)		Attorneys (If Known))		
Josh Sanford, SANFORD South Shackleford, Suite 501-221-0088; josh@san	411, Little Rock, Arka		er, 650				
II. BASIS OF JURISDI	CTION (Place an "X" in O	ne Box Only)		TIZENSHIP OF I (For Diversity Cases Only)	PRINCIPAL PARTIES	(Place an "X" in One Box for Plaintif and One Box for Defendant)	
☐ 1 U.S. Government	★3 Federal Question			,	PTF DEF	PTF DEF	
Plaintiff	(U.S. Government)	Not a Party)	Citize	en of This State	I Incorporated or Pr of Business In 1		
2 U.S. Government	☐ 4 Diversity		Citiza	en of Another State	D 2 D 2 Incorporated and 1	Principal Place D 5 D 5	
Defendant		ip of Parties in Item []])	0.02	in or resource state	of Business In		
			1	en or Subject of a	3 G 3 Foreign Nation	□ 6 □ 6	
IV. NATURE OF SUIT (Place an "X" in One Box Only)				Click here for: Nature of Suit Code Descriptions.			
CONTRACT		RTS		ORFEITURE/PENALTY	BANKRUPTCY	OTHER STATUTES	
☐ 110 Insurance ☐ 120 Marine	PERSONAL INJURY 310 Airplane	PERSONAL INJUR 365 Personal Injury -		5 Drug Related Seizure of Property 21 USC 881	 422 Appeal 28 USC 158 423 Withdrawal 	☐ 375 False Claims Act ☐ 376 Qui Tam (31 USC	
☐ 130 Miller Act	315 Airplane Product	Product Liability		0 Other	28 USC 157	3729(a))	
☐ 140 Negotiable Instrument ☐ 150 Recovery of Overpayment	Liability 320 Assault, Libel &	367 Health Care/ Pharmaceutical	ı		PROPERTY RIGHTS	☐ 400 State Reapportionment ☐ 410 Antitrust	
& Enforcement of Judgment	and the second s	Personal Injury			☐ 820 Copyrights	430 Banks and Banking	
☐ 151 Medicare Act	330 Federal Employers	Product Liability			☐ 830 Patent	☐ 450 Commerce	
☐ 152 Recovery of Defaulted	Liability	☐ 368 Asbestos Persona	1		835 Patent - Abbreviated	460 Deportation	
Student Loans (Excludes Veterans)	☐ 340 Marine ☐ 345 Marine Product	Injury Product Liability			New Drug Application 840 Trademark	☐ 470 Racketeer Influenced and Corrupt Organizations	
153 Recovery of Overpayment	Liability	PERSONAL PROPE	RTY	LABOR	SOCIAL SECURITY	☐ 480 Consumer Credit	
of Veteran's Benefits	☐ 350 Motor Vehicle	370 Other Fraud		0 Fair Labor Standards	□ 861 HIA (1395ff)	☐ 490 Cable/Sat TV	
☐ 160 Stockholders' Suits ☐ 190 Other Contract	355 Motor Vehicle Product Liability	☐ 371 Truth in Lending ☐ 380 Other Personal		Act O Labor/Management	☐ 862 Black Lung (923) ☐ 863 DIWC/DIWW (405(g))	☐ 850 Securities/Commodities/ Exchange	
☐ 195 Contract Product Liability	360 Other Personal	Property Damage		Relations	☐ 864 SSID Title XVI	890 Other Statutory Actions	
196 Franchise	Injury	☐ 385 Property Damage		0 Railway Labor Act	☐ 865 RSI (405(g))	☐ 891 Agricultural Acts	
	362 Personal Injury - Medical Malpractice	Product Liability	D 75	I Family and Medical Leave Act		☐ 893 Environmental Matters ☐ 895 Freedom of Information	
REAL PROPERTY	CIVIL RIGHTS	PRISONER PETITIO	NS 🗆 79	O Other Labor Litigation	FEDERAL TAX SUITS	Act	
210 Land Condemnation	☐ 440 Other Civil Rights	Habeas Corpus:	D 79	1 Employee Retirement	☐ 870 Taxes (U.S. Plaintiff	☐ 896 Arbitration	
220 Foreclosure	441 Voting	1 463 Alien Detainee		Income Security Act	or Defendant)	☐ 899 Administrative Procedure	
230 Rent Lease & Ejectment 240 Torts to Land	☐ 442 Employment ☐ 443 Housing/	510 Motions to Vacate Sentence	e		☐ 871 IRS—Third Party 26 USC 7609	Act/Review or Appeal of Agency Decision	
245 Tort Product Liability	Accommodations	☐ 530 General				☐ 950 Constitutionality of	
290 All Other Real Property	1 445 Amer. w/Disabilities -	535 Death Penalty	1.7 Much	IMMIGRATION	18.	State Statutes	
	Employment 446 Amer w/Disabilities -	Other: 540 Mandamus & Oth		2 Naturalization Application 5 Other Immigration	on I		
	Other	☐ 550 Civil Rights		Actions			
	☐ 448 Education	555 Prison Condition	- 1				
		560 Civil Detainee - Conditions of					
		Confinement					
V. ORIGIN (Place an "X" ii	n One Box Only)						
	moved from 3 3	Remanded from Appellate Court	□ 4 Rein Reop		ferred from		
VI CALIER OF ACTIV	29 U.S.C. 201 et		re filing (I	Do not cite jurisdictional st		Direct in	
VI. CAUSE OF ACTION	Brief description of Ca	ause:					
Unpaid Overtime VII. REQUESTED IN ✓ CHECK IF THIS IS A CLASS ACTION			v n	EMAND S CHECK YES only if demanded in complaint:			
COMPLAINT: UNDER RULE 23, F.R.Cv.P.			JURY DEMAND:				
VIII. RELATED CASI	E(S)						
IF ANY	(See instructions):	JUDGE			DOCKET NUMBER		
DATE		SIGNATURE OF AT	HORDEY	OF RECORD			
October 5 2018		/ X/					
FOR OFFICE USE ONLY		() /					
RECEIPT # AN	MOUNT	APPLYING IFF		JUDGE	MAG. JUI	OGE	

ClassAction.org

This complaint is part of ClassAction.org's searchable class action lawsuit database and can be found in this post: <u>Langston Companies</u>, <u>Inc. Owes Employee Unpaid Wages</u>, <u>Lawsuit Claims</u>