UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

EASTERN DISTRICT OF VIRGINIA ALEXANDRIA DIVISION

David Burner, individually and on behalf of all others similarly situated,

Plaintiff,	CA No.: 1:19-cv-00457
v. J.G. Wentworth Home Lending	Collective Action
LLC,	
Defendant.	

PLAINTIFF'S COLLECTIVE ACTION COMPLAINT

David Burner ("Plaintiff") brings this action individually and on behalf of all others similarly situated against Defendant J.G. Wentworth Home Lending LLC ("Defendant") and in support shows the Court the following:

1. Nature of Suit.

- 1.1. This is an opt-in collective action brought pursuant to the Fair Labor Standards Act, 29 U.S.C. § 201 et. seq. ("FLSA").
- 1.2. Defendant employed Plaintiff and other Class Members as "Loan Officers" whose primary job duties involved selling Defendant's loan products to individuals over the telephone from a call center.

- 1.3. Defendant paid Loan Officers an hourly rate and a commission. If the commission for the pay period was greater than the hourly rate pay, Plaintiff and the Loan Officers were not paid the hourly rate. They were solely paid the commission which essentially resulted in Defendant paying them on a commission-only basis ("Commission Basis").
- 1.4. The hours worked by Loan Officers were not accurately tracked or counted towards total hours worked and no overtime was paid for these hours ("Uncounted Hours Policy"). Because Defendant did not accurately track and pay for all hours worked, including overtime hours, Defendant violated the FLSA by failing to pay Plaintiff overtime compensation for all hours worked in excess of 40 per workweek.
- 1.5. Defendant also violated the FLSA by failing to include all required remuneration into the regular rate of pay to calculate overtime for any overtime pay it managed to pay Plaintiff and the Class Members. The payments erroneously excluded from the regular rate of pay include, without limitation, commissions and non-discretionary bonus pay ("Additional Pay"). Defendant's failure to include Additional Pay into Loan Officer's regular rate to calculate and pay overtime ("Overtime Miscalculation Policy") violated the FLSA.

2. Parties.

2.1. Plaintiff worked for Defendant in Virginia in the three years preceding the filing of this case. Defendant specifically employed Plaintiff as a Loan Officer from

- approximately June 2014 to October 2017 in Westbridge, Virginia. Plaintiff's consent to participate in this case is filed as an exhibit to this Complaint.
- 2.2. Plaintiff brings this action individually and on behalf of those similarly situated pursuant to the FLSA ("Class Members"). The Class Members consist of all persons who are or have been employed by Defendant or Weststar in Defendant's call center located in Westbridge, Virginia as "Loan Officers," "Mortgage Loan Officers," "Mortgage Bankers," "Loan Originators," "Mortgage Loan Originators," or any other like mortgage sales employee ("collectively, "Loan Officers") at any time during the three-year period preceding the date of the filing of this Complaint.
- 2.3. Defendant J. G. Wentworth Home Lending LLC is a Virginia limited liability company.

3. Jurisdiction and Venue.

- 3.1. Venue of this action is proper in this district and division because Defendant maintains an office in this District. Venue exists in the judicial district pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1391.
- 3.2. Defendant carries on substantial business in the Eastern District of Virginia and has sufficient minimum contacts with this state to be subject to this Court's jurisdiction.

3.3. This Court has jurisdiction over this case pursuant to the district court's federal question jurisdiction as set forth in 28 U.S.C. § 1331. Specifically, this case is brought pursuant to the FLSA.

4. Coverage.

- 4.1. At all material times, Defendant has acted, directly or indirectly, in the interest of an employer with respect to Plaintiff and the Class Members.
- 4.2. At all times hereinafter mentioned, Defendant has been an employer within the meaning of the Section 3(d) of the FLSA, 29 U.S.C. § 203(d).
- 4.3. At all times hereinafter mentioned, Defendant has been an enterprise with the meaning of Section 3(r) of the FLSA, 29 U.S.C. § 203(r).
- 4.4. At all times hereinafter mentioned, Defendant has been an enterprise engaged in commerce or the production of goods for commerce within the meaning of Section 3(s)(1) of the FLSA, 29 U.S.C. § 203(s)(1), in that Defendant has had employees engaging in commerce or in the production of goods for commerce, or employees handling, selling, or otherwise working on goods or materials that have been moved in or produced for commerce for any person and Defendant has had and has an annual gross volume of sales made or business done of not less than \$500,000 (exclusive of excise taxes at the retail level which are separately stated). Plaintiff and the Class Members specifically handled and used materials that traveled in interstate commerce, including computer and telephone equipment, to sell Defendant's loan products over the telephone and the internet.

- 4.5. At all times hereinafter mentioned, Plaintiff and the Class Members were individual employees engaged in commerce or in the production of goods for commerce as required by 29 U.S.C. § 203(e)(1).
- 4.6. Defendant is a national provider of home loan mortgages. Two or more of Defendant's employees, engage in commerce by using equipment that has traveled in interstate commerce. By way of example and not by limitation, Defendant's employees used/use:
 - 4.6.1. computers and telecommunications equipment that has been manufactured and shipped across state lines;
 - 4.6.2. office equipment, such as copiers, that has been manufactured and shipped across state lines;
 - 4.6.3. the interstate telephone systems, landline and cellular, to recruit and employ individuals for operational positions;
 - 4.6.4. The United States postal system to send mail across state lines; and
 - 4.6.5. the interstate banking systems to pay Defendant's employees.
- 4.7. In part, because Plaintiff and the Loan Officers were paid hourly and on a Commission Basis, none of the "exemptions" to the FLSA apply.

5. Factual Allegations.

5.1. Defendant has had business operations throughout the United States, including in Virginia and this Judicial District, during the three years prior to the filings of this lawsuit.

- 5.2. Plaintiff worked for Defendant as a Loan Officer for Defendant from approximately June 2014 until approximately October 2017.
- 5.3. As a Loan Officer, Plaintiff's primary job duties consisted of selling Defendant's loan products to customers over the telephone and through the internet.
- 5.4. Plaintiff and other Loan Officers did not customarily and regularly make sales at their customer's home or place of business. Instead, Plaintiff and other Loan Officers regularly made sales over the phone or the internet.
- 5.5. Plaintiff worked over 40 hours per week. He was not paid any overtime for the week.
- 5.6. Plaintiff worked the following Monday to Friday schedule: (1) 10:00 a.m. until 8:00 p.m., without a lunch break at Defendant's offices; and (2) additional time at home in the evenings. Plaintiff also frequently worked weekends, working at least 10:00 a.m. to 4:00 p.m. on Saturdays from the call center and additional time on Sundays from home. Based on the above, Plaintiff estimates that during the relevant time period he worked between 50 and 70 hours per week, each week during his employment.
- 5.7. Defendant knew that Plaintiff worked in excess of 40 hours per workweek.
- 5.8. Defendant did not accurately track the hours worked by Plaintiff and the Class Members.
- 5.9. Instead of providing Plaintiff with overtime pay, Defendant paid Plaintiff on a Commission Basis, without overtime pay for his many hours of overtime work.

- 5.10. Plaintiff is entitled to receive overtime pay for all hours he worked in excess of 40 hours per workweek.
- 5.11. Defendant willfully failed to pay overtime to Plaintiff and the Class Members despite having awareness of the FLSA's overtime requirements. Specific facts exposing that Defendant willfully violates/violated the FLSA include the fact that Defendant (1) instituted and enforced the Uncounted Hours Policy; (2) instituted and enforced the Overtime Miscalculation Policy; (3) failed to keep proper employment records for Plaintiff and the Class Members; and (4) failed to keep accurate time records for the hours worked by Plaintiff and the Class Members during their employment. Additionally, Defendant has been sued before over these same allegations yet did not change its policies to make sure it was paying overtime.

6. Collective Action Allegations.

- 6.1. Plaintiff brings his FLSA claims as a collective action pursuant to 29 U.S.C. § 216(b).
- 6.2. The Class Members are similarly situated to Plaintiff in terms of job duties and pay provisions. Plaintiff and the Class Members all sold Defendant's loan products to individuals over the phone. Plaintiff and the Class Members were also subjected to the same illegal pay provisions: the Uncounted Hours and Overtime Miscalculation Policies that failed to pay the Loan Officers (1) overtime for all hours worked in excess of 40 per workweek; and (2) one-and-one-half times their regular rates of pay for all overtime hours worked.

Accordingly, the Class Members are similarly situated to Plaintiff in terms of job duties and pay provisions.

- 6.3. The pay policies for all Loan Officers were the same.
- 6.4. Defendant uniformly applied its pay policies to all Loan Officers.
- 6.5. Defendant's failure to pay overtime compensation at the rates required by the FLSA results from generally applicable policies or practices and do not depend on the personal circumstances of the Class Members. Thus, Plaintiffs' experience is typical of the experience of the Class Members. All Class Members, regardless of their precise job requirements or rates of pay, are entitled to overtime compensation at a rate of one-and-one-half their regular rate for hours worked in excess of 40 per week. Although the issue of damages may be individual in character, there is no detraction from the common nucleus of liability facts. The questions of law and fact are common to Plaintiffs and the Class Members.
- 7. Cause of Action: Failure to Pay Wages in Accordance with the Fair Labor Standards Act.
 - 7.1. Each and every allegation contained in the foregoing paragraphs 1-6, inclusive, is re-alleged as if fully rewritten herein.
 - 7.2. During the relevant time period, Defendants violated and continue to violate the provisions of sections 6 and 7 of the FLSA, 29 U.S.C §§ 206-7, and 215(a)(2), by employing employees in an enterprise engaged in commerce or in the production

of goods for commerce within the meaning of the FLSA for weeks longer than 40 hours without compensating for work in excess of 40 hours per week at rates no less than one-and-a-half times their regular rates of pay. Defendants have acted willfully in failing to pay Plaintiffs and the Class Members in accordance with the law. See e.g. 5.11 supra.

8. Litigation Hold.

8.1. Plaintiff requests that Defendant take action to preserve all potentially relevant documents and ESI and to prevent the deletion or spoliation of any evidence.

9. Relief Sought.

- 9.1. WHEREFORE, PREMISES CONSIDERED, Plaintiff prays that he and all those who consent to be opt-in plaintiffs in this collective action recover from Defendant, the following:
 - 9.1.1. An Order recognizing this proceeding as a collective action pursuant to Section 216(b) of the FLSA and appointing Plaintiff and his counsel to represent the Class Members;
 - 9.1.2. An Order requiring Defendant to provide the names, addresses, email addresses and telephone numbers of all potential Class Members;
 - 9.1.3. An Order approving the form and content of a notice to be sent to all potential Class Members advising them of the pendency of this litigation and of their rights with respect thereto;

9.1.4. Overtime compensation for all unpaid hours worked in excess of forty

hours in any workweek at the rate of one-and-one-half times their regular

rates;

9.1.5. All unpaid wages and overtime compensation;

9.1.6. An award of liquidated damages pursuant to 29 U.S.C § 216 as a result of

the Defendant's failure to pay overtime compensation pursuant to the

FLSA;

9.1.7. Reasonable attorneys' fees, expert fees, costs, and expenses of this action

as provided by the FLSA;

9.1.8. Pre-judgment and post-judgment interest at the highest rates allowed by

law; and

9.1.9. Such other relief as to which Plaintiff may be entitled.

Respectfully submitted,

David Burner

By: /s/ Jacob M. Small

Jacob M. Small Of Counsel

Jacob M. Small VBN: 84460 J. Madison PLC 9302 Lee Highway Suite 1200 McLean, Virginia 22031

Phone: 703 910 5062 Fax: 703.910.5107

jmsmall@jmadisonplc.com

-and-

Chris R. Miltenberger
Texas Bar Number: 14171200
The Law Office of Chris R.
Miltenberger, PLLC
1360 N. White Chapel, Suite 200
Southlake, Texas 76092-4322
817-416-5060 (office)
817-416-5062 (fax)
chris@crmlawpractice.com

Pro Hac Vice Application Forthcoming

JACK SIEGEL
Texas Bar No. 24070621
SIEGEL LAW GROUP PLLC
2820 McKinnon, Suite 5009
Dallas, Texas 75201
P: (214) 790-4454
jack@siegellawgroup.biz

Pro Hac Vice Application Forthcoming

Counsel for Plaintiff

JS 44 (Rev. 08/16)

Case 1:19-cv-00457 Document $\frac{1}{10}$ VEIR $\frac{1}{10}$ Page 1 of 1 PageID# 12

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 purpose of initiating the civil docket sheet.

purpose of initiating the civil d	locket sneet. (SEE INSTRUC	TIONS ON NEXT PAGE OF	FTHISFC	ORM.)					
I. (a) PLAINTIFFS				DEFENDANTS					
(b) County of Residence of First Listed Plaintiff Arlington (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 THE TRACT OF LAND INVOLVED.						
Jacob M. Small, J. Madis McLean, Virginia 22031,		ghway, Suite 1200,							
II. BASIS OF JURISD	ICTION (Place an "X" in C	ne Box Only)		TIZENSHIP OF P	RINCIPA	AL PARTIES	(Place an "X" in and One Box 1		
☐ 1 U.S. Government Plaintiff	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·			PTF DEF zen of This State □ 1 □ 1 Incorporated or Principal Plac of Business In This State				PTF □ 4	DEF
☐ 2 U.S. Government Defendant	☐ 4 Diversity (Indicate Citizensh	Diversity (Indicate Citizenship of Parties in Item III)		itizen of Another State				□ 5	
				en or Subject of a reign Country		Foreign Nation		□ 6	□ 6
IV. NATURE OF SUIT		oly) DRTS	l FO	ORFEITURE/PENALTY		e for: Nature of Sui		ptions. STATUT	'ES
□ 110 Insurance □ 120 Marine □ 130 Miller Act □ 140 Negotiable Instrument □ 150 Recovery of Overpayment & Enforcement of Judgment □ 151 Medicare Act □ 152 Recovery of Defaulted Student Loans (Excludes Veterans) □ 153 Recovery of Overpayment of Veteran's Benefits □ 160 Stockholders' Suits □ 190 Other Contract □ 195 Contract Product Liability □ 196 Franchise □ REAL PROPERTY □ 210 Land Condemnation □ 220 Foreclosure □ 230 Rent Lease & Ejectment □ 240 Torts to Land □ 245 Tort Product Liability □ 290 All Other Real Property	PERSONAL INJURY ☐ 310 Airplane ☐ 315 Airplane Product Liability ☐ 320 Assault, Libel &	PERSONAL INJURY 365 Personal Injury - Product Liability 367 Health Care/ Pharmaceutical Personal Injury Product Liability 368 Asbestos Personal Injury Product Liability PERSONAL PROPER 370 Other Fraud 371 Truth in Lending 380 Other Personal Property Damage Product Liability PRISONER PETITION Habeas Corpus: 463 Alien Detainee 510 Motions to Vacate Sentence 530 General 535 Death Penalty Other: 540 Mandamus & Othe 550 Civil Rights 555 Prison Condition 560 Civil Detainee - Conditions of Confinement	TY 2 71	25 Drug Related Seizure of Property 21 USC 881 00 Other LABOR 10 Fair Labor Standards Act 20 Labor/Management Relations 10 Railway Labor Act 31 Family and Medical Leave Act 20 Other Labor Litigation 21 Employee Retirement Income Security Act 11 Income Security Act 12 Income Security Act 13 Income Security Act 14 Income Security Act 15 Income Security Act 15 Income Security Act 16 Income Security Act 17 Income Security Act 17 Income Security Act 18 Incom	□ 422 App □ 423 With 28 U PROPE □ 820 Copp □ 830 Pate □ 840 Trad □ 861 HIA □ 862 Blac □ 863 DIW □ 864 SSII □ 865 RSI □ 870 Taxe or £ □ 871 IRS- 26 U	eal 28 USC 158 Idrawal USC 157 RTY RIGHTS yrights Int Idemark LSECURITY (1395ff) Is Lung (923) C/DIWW (405(g)) D Title XVI	375 False C 376 Qui Ta 3729(a 400 State R 410 Antitru 430 Banks 450 Comm 460 Deport 470 Racket Corrup 480 Consu 490 Cable/ 850 Securit Excha 890 Other S 891 Agricu 895 Freedo Act 896 Arbitra 899 Admin Act/Re	Claims Act Im (31 USC a)) Reapportion Ist and Bankin Intercent Influence Inf	nment ng nced and tions odities/ actions latters mation rocedure
	emoved from	Appellate Court	Reo	(specify)	r District	☐ 6 Multidistr Litigation Transfer		Multidis Litigatio Direct F	on -
VI. CAUSE OF ACTIO	ON Brief description of ca Overtime litigation	nise.	g (I	Do not cite jurisdictional stat	cs wittess ti				
VII. REQUESTED IN COMPLAINT:				EMAND \$ 300,000.00	CHECK YES only if demanded in complaint: JURY DEMAND: □ Yes 🕱 No				
VIII. RELATED CASI	E(S) (See instructions):	JUDGE			DOCKI	ET NUMBER			
DATE 04/12/2019		signature of att	ORNEY (OF RECORD					
FOR OFFICE USE ONLY									
RECEIPT # Al	MOUNT	APPLYING IFP		JUDGE MAG. JUDGE					

ClassAction.org

This complaint is part of ClassAction.org's searchable class action lawsuit database and can be found in this post: <u>J.G. Wentworth Hit with Former Loan Officer's Wage and Hour Lawsuit [UPDATE]</u>