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

NOV 1 3 2018 JAMES W. MCCORMACK, CLERK

EASTERN

N DISTRICT ARKANSAS

DEP CIERK

CALEB CAULEY and ASHLYN WAGLEY, Each Individually and on Behalf of All Others Similarly Situated

PLAINTIFFS

VS.

Case No. 4:18-cv-_845 - KGB

UNITED CEREBRAL PALSY OF CENTRAL ARKANSAS, INC., and PAULA RADER

DEFENDANTS

ORIGINAL COLLECTIVE ACTION COMPLAINT AND CLASS ACTION COMPLAINT

COME NOW Plaintiffs Caleb Cauley and Ashlyn Wagley, each individually and on

behalf of all other similarly situated current and former employees of Defendants United

Cerebral Palsy of Central Arkansas, Inc., and Paula Rader (collectively "Defendant"), by

and through their attorneys Steve Rauls and Josh Sanford, and bring this putative

collective action, and in support thereof they do hereby state and allege as follows:

I. OVERVIEW This case assigned to District Judge Baker and to Magistrate Judge Volne 1. Plaintiffs bring claims under the Fair Labor Standards Act ("FLSA"), 29 U.S.C. § 201, *et seq.* to recover unpaid overtime compensation under § 216(b) of the FLSA. They bring these claims as a collective action on behalf of themselves and all current or former home healthcare workers employed by Defendant from November 13, 2015, to the present.

2. Plaintiffs file a *Notice of Related Case* for disposed action <u>Adams, et al., v.</u> United Cerebral Palsy of Central Arkansas, Inc., 4:16-cv-930-JLH. 3. The proposed Rule 23 class will seek recovery of monetary damages for all overtime worked by Plaintiff and the putative class members.

4. Plaintiffs, in addition the federal claims identified above, bring this action under the Arkansas Minimum Wage Act, Ark. Code Ann. § 11-4-201, *et seq.* ("AMWA"), for declaratory judgment, monetary damages, liquidated damages, prejudgment interest, civil penalties and costs, including reasonable attorneys' fees as a result of Defendant's commonly applied policy and practice of failing to pay Plaintiff and all others similarly situated overtime compensation for the hours in excess of forty hours in a single week that they were/are made to work.

II. THE PARTIES

A. <u>Plaintiffs</u>

Plaintiff Caleb Cauley is a citizen of the United States, domiciled in the City of Vilonia, and has been employed by Defendant in Arkansas at times after November 13, 2015, as a home healthcare worker who provided companionship services.

6. Plaintiff Cauley's hours varied from week to week but he regularly worked more than 40 hours a week, including some weeks in which he worked in excess of 60 hours.

7. Despite his overtime work, he was not properly compensated for all overtime hours worked in excess of 40 hours per week. Plaintiff Cauley's consent to sue is attached hereto as Exhibit "A". Plaintiff Ashlyn Wagley is a citizen of the United States, domiciled in the City of Conway, and has been employed by Defendant in Arkansas at times after November 13, 2015, as a home healthcare worker who provided companionship services.

9. Plaintiff Wagley's hours varied from week to week but she regularly worked more than 40 hours a week, including some weeks in which she worked in excess of 60 hours.

10. Despite her overtime work, she was not properly compensated for all overtime hours worked in excess of 40 hours per week. Plaintiff Wagley's consent to sue is attached hereto as Exhibit "A".

11. Plaintiffs bring this action on behalf of themselves and all other similarly situated individuals pursuant to 29 U.S.C. § 216(b). Plaintiffs and the similarly situated individuals were, or are, employed by Defendant as home healthcare workers since November 13, 2015. As this case proceeds, it is likely that more individuals will join this action as opt-in plaintiffs.

12. The precise size of the FLSA Collective and the identity of the putative plaintiffs will be ascertainable from the business records of Defendant and its related and affiliated entities.

B. <u>Defendants</u>

13. Separate Defendant United Cerebral Palsy of Central Arkansas, Inc., d/b/a United Cerebral Palsy of Arkansas, is an Arkansas corporation with its principal place of business located in Little Rock.

14. This Defendant is, and has been, an enterprise engaged in commerce or in the production of goods or services for commerce within the meaning of 29 U.S.C. §

203(s)(1), and, upon information and belief, Defendant has had an annual gross volume of sales made or business done of not less than \$500,000.00 at all relevant times.

15. Paula Rader is a resident of Arkansas, and at times relevant to this Complaint, was an officer and executive of the corporate Defendant.¹

16. At all times relevant hereto, Paula Rader had operational control over the corporate Defendant.

17. At all times relevant hereto, Paula Rader had the power to hire and fire employees of the corporate Defendant, supervised and set wages and wage policies for the employees of the corporate Defendant.

18. Plaintiffs, and all those similarly situated, are "employees" of Defendant engaged in commerce or in the production of goods or services for commerce as defined by 29 U.S.C. § 206(a) and 207(a)(1).

19. At all relevevant times, Defendant is, and has been, an "employer" of Plaintiffs and the similarly situated individuals within the meaning of the FLSA, 29 U.S.C. § 203(d).

20. This claim is brought pursuant to the Fair Labor Standards Act, 29 U.S.C. § 201 *et seq.* and is a collective action pursuant to 29 U.S.C. § 216(b). Plaintiffs' claims arise under § 207(a) of the FLSA.

III.

VENUE

21. Venue is proper in this Court as a substantial part of the events giving rise the claims occurred in the Western Division of this District.

1

http://ucpark.org/about/leadership-staff/ (last viewed November 9, 2018)

IV. COLLECTIVE ACTION DEFINITION

22. The class of similarly situated employees sought to be certified under 29

U.S.C. § 216(b) as a collective action is defined as:

All home healthcare workers employed after November 13, 2015 (the "FLSA Collective").

V. CLASS ACTION ALLEGATIONS

23. Plaintiffs repeat and re-allege all previous paragraphs of this Complaint as though fully incorporated in this section.

24. Plaintiffs, 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.

25. Plaintiffs propose to represent a class of individuals defined as follows:

All Arkansas home healthcare workers employed after since November 13, 2015 (the "AMWA Class").

26. The proposed class encompasses all home healthcare workers for Defendant.

27. Upon information and belief, there are over one hundred (100) persons in the proposed class. Therefore, the proposed class is so numerous that joinder of all members is impracticable.

28. Common questions of law and fact relate to all of the proposed class members, such as these:

- A. Whether Plaintiffs and the class members were properly paid for their work;
- B. Whether Defendant has failed to pay Plaintiffs and members of the Class overtime compensation for all of the hours worked over forty (40) each week; and
- C. Whether Defendant is liable to Plaintiffs and members of the Class for violations of the AMWA.

29. The above common questions of law and fact predominate over any questions affecting only the individual named Plaintiffs, and a class action is superior to other available methods for fairly and efficiently adjudicating the controversy.

30. 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. To that end, all non-exempted employees must be paid for time worked over forty (40) hours per week at a rate of one and one-half times their regular rate. Ark. Code Ann. § 11-4-211.

31. At the time of the filing of this Complaint, neither Plaintiffs nor Plaintiffs' counsel know of ongoing litigation that bears on the claims asserted herein.

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

33. The claims of Plaintiffs are typical of the claims of the proposed class in that Plaintiffs and all others in the proposed class will claim that they were not paid for all hours worked in violation of the AMWA.

34. Plaintiffs and their counsel will fairly and adequately protect the interests of the class.

35. Plaintiffs' counsel are competent to litigate Rule 23 class actions and other complex litigation matters, including wage and hour cases like this one.

VI. FACTS

36. Defendant employed Plaintiffs and the FLSA Collective as home healthcare workers who provided companionship services for the elderly, ill and/or disabled.

37. Plaintiffs' hours varied from week to week, but Defendant suffered and permitted them to regularly work more than 40 hours a week, including some weeks in which they worked up to and including 60 or more hours in a workweek.

38. Upon information and belief, Defendant suffered and permitted the members of the FLSA Collective to work more than 40 hours in a week, and members of the FLSA Collective worked more than 40 hours in certain workweeks.

39. Neither Plaintiffs nor the members of the FLSA Collective were compensated in accordance with the FLSA because they were not paid proper overtime wages for all hours worked in excess of forty hours a week for all weeks worked. Rather than paying them 1.5 times their regular rate of pay for all hours worked over 40 in a workweek, Defendant paid them a day rate without regard to the number of hours.

40. Plaintiffs are aware of other current and former employees of Defendant who were subject to the same payroll practice.

VII. COLLECTIVE ACTION ALLEGATIONS

41. Plaintiffs re-allege and incorporate by reference all allegations in all preceding paragraphs.

42. Plaintiffs file this action on behalf of themselves and all similarly situated individuals. As mentioned above, the proposed FLSA Collective is defined as follows:

All home healthcare workers employed after since November 13, 2015

43. Pursuant to the FLSA, 29 U.S.C. § 207, employers are generally required to pay overtime compensation at an hourly rate of 1.5 times an employee's regular rate of pay for hours worked over 40 in a workweek.

44. The FLSA contains an exemption from overtime for "domestic workers" who provide companionship and other services to individuals who were unable to care for themselves and also contains an exemption for live in domestic service workers. 29 U.S.C. §§ 213(b)(21) and 213(a)(15).

45. In October of 2013, the United States Department of Labor explained that these exemptions do not apply to domestic-service workers employed by third-party agencies or employers.

46. Beginning on January 1, 2015, the regulations provide that domestic workers employed by third-party agencies or employers are not exempt from the FLSA's minimum wage and overtime requirements. 29 C.F.R. § 552.109(a).

47. As of January 1, 2015, all domestic workers employed by third-party agencies or employers are entitled to overtime compensation at an hourly rate of 1.5 times the employee's regular rate of pay for hours worked over 40 in a work week.

48. Since January 1, 2015, Plaintiffs and the FLSA Collective have routinely worked in excess of 40 hours per workweek without receiving proper overtime compensation for their overtime hours worked.

49. Defendant has violated, and is violating, the provisions of the FLSA, 29 U.S.C. §§ 207 and 215(a)(2), by not paying domestic workers, like Plaintiffs and the FLSA Collective, overtime as required by law.

50. Despite the Department of Labor's positon that domestic workers employed by third-party agencies or employers are not exempt from the FLSA's minimum wage and overtime requirements, Defendant maintained its practice of failing to pay the proper overtime compensation to Plaintiffs and the FLSA Collective.

51. Defendant knowingly, willfully, or in reckless disregard of the law, maintained an illegal practice of failing to pay Plaintiffs and the FLSA Collective proper overtime compensation for all hours worked over 40.

VIII. COUNT ONE: FAIR LABOR STANDARDS ACT—OVERTIME WAGES

52. Plaintiffs re-allege and incorporate by reference all allegations in all preceding paragraphs.

53. The FLSA, 29 U.S.C. § 207, requires employers to pay non-exempt employees 1.5 times the regular rate of pay for all hours worked over 40 hours per workweek. 54. Defendant suffered and permitted Plaintiffs and the FLSA Collective to routinely work more than 40 hours in a workweek without proper overtime compensation as required by the FLSA, 29 U.S.C. § 201 *et seq.* and its implementing regulations.

55. The preceding violation harmed each Named Plaintiff individually, and it also harmed the proposed class.

56. Defendant knew, or showed reckless disregard for the fact, that it failed to pay these individuals proper overtime compensation in violation of the FLSA.

57. Defendant's failure to comply with the FLSA overtime protections caused Plaintiffs and the FLSA Collective to suffer loss of wages and interest thereon.

58. Plaintiffs and the FLSA Collective are entitled to unpaid overtime, liquidated damages, and attorney's fees and costs under the FLSA.

IX. COUNT TWO: ARKANSAS MINIMUM WAGE ACT—OVERTIME WAGES

59. Plaintiffs re-allege and incorporate by reference all allegations in all preceding paragraphs.

60. Plaintiffs, individually and on behalf of the members of the proposed class, assert this claim for damages and declaratory relief pursuant to the AMWA, Arkansas Code Annotated §§ 11-4-201 *et seq*.

61. At all relevant times, Defendant has been, and continues to be, an "employer" of Plaintiffs and the members of the proposed class within the meaning of the AMWA, Arkansas Code Annotated § 11-4-203(4).

62. Defendant, at all times relevant hereto, classified Plaintiffs and the members of the proposed class as exempt from the overtime requirements of the AMWA.

63. Defendant required Plaintiffs to work in excess of forty (40) hours each week but failed to pay Plaintiffs overtime compensation for the hours in excess for forty (40) worked each week.

64. Defendant deprived Plaintiffs of overtime compensation for all of the hours over forty (40) per week, in violation of the AMWA.

65. The preceding violation harmed each Named Plaintiff individually, and it also harmed the proposed class.

66. By reason of the unlawful acts alleged herein, Defendant is liable to Plaintiffs and all members of the proposed class for monetary damages, liquidated damages, and costs, including reasonable attorneys' fees, for all violations that occurred within the three (3) years prior to the filing of this Complaint.

Х.

RELIEF SOUGHT

WHEREFORE, premises considered, Plaintiffs Caleb Cauley and Ashlyn Wagley

prays that each Defendant be summoned to appear and answer herein and for judgment

against each Defendant as follows:

- 1. Permitting this case to proceed as a collective action under § 216(b) of the FLSA and ordering notice to the putative plaintiffs at the earliest opportunity to ensure their claims are not lost to the FLSA statute of limitations;
- 2. Judgment that Plaintiffs and those similarly situated are entitled to the overtime protections under the FLSA;
- Judgment against Defendant for violation of the overtime provisions of the FLSA;
- 4. Judgment that Defendants' violations of the FLSA were willful;
- 5. An award to Plaintiffs and those similarly situated in the amount of unpaid overtime wages and liquidated damages;
- 6. An award of prejudgment interest (to the extent liquidated damages are not awarded);
- 7. An award of reasonable attorneys' fees and costs;

- 8. Leave to add additional plaintiffs and/or state law claims by motion, the filing of written consent forms, or any other method approved by the Court;
- Certification of a class of AMWA claimants pursuant to Rule 23 of the FRCP;
- 10. Judgment for unpaid wages, all as set forth above, for damages accrued under the AMWA; and
- 11. For such further relief as may be necessary and appropriate.

Respectfully submitted,

PLAINTIFFS CALEB CAULEY, et al.

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

Steve Rauls ' Ark. Bar No. 2011170 <u>steve@sapfordlawfirm.com</u>

Josh Sanford Ark. Bar No. 2001037 josh@sanfordlawfirm.com

ATTORNEYS FOR PLAINTIFFS and the PUTATIVE CLASSES

Page 12 of 12 Caleb Cauley, et al., v. United Cerebral Palsy of Central Arkansas, Inc., et al. U.S.D.C. (E.D. Ark.) Case No. 4:18-cv-____ Original Collective Action Complaint and Class Action Complaint

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

CALEB CAULEY and ASHLYN WAGLEY, Each Individually and on Behalf of All Others Similarly Situated

PLAINTIFFS

VS.

Case No. 4:18-cv-____

UNITED CEREBRAL PALSY OF CENTRAL ARKANSAS, INC., and PAULA RADER

DEFENDANTS

CONSENT TO JOIN COLLECTIVE ACTION

I was employed as a home healthcare worker and/or Direct Care Worker for Defendants United Cerebral Palsy of Central Arkansas, Inc., d/b/a United Cerebral Palsy of Arkansas, and Paula Rader (collectively "Defendant"), on or after November 13, 2015. I understand this lawsuit is being brought under the Fair Labor Standards Act for unpaid overtime compensation. I consent to becoming a party-plaintiff in this lawsuit, to be represented by Sanford Law Firm, PLLC, and to be bound by any settlement of this action or adjudication by the Court.

I declare under penalty of perjury that the foregoing is true and correct.

13 Cauley

Signature:

CALEB CAULEY

Date: November 13, 2018

<u>/s/ Josh Sanford</u> Josh Sanford, Esq. SANFORD LAW FIRM, PLLC One Financial Center 650 South Shackleford Road, Suite 411 Little Rock, Arkansas 72211 Telephone: (501) 221-0088 Facsimile: (888) 787-2040 josh@sanfordlawfirm.com

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

CALEB CAULEY and ASHLYN WAGLEY, Each Individually and on Behalf of All Others Similarly Situated

PLAINTIFFS

vs.

Case No. 4:18-cv-____

UNITED CEREBRAL PALSY OF CENTRAL ARKANSAS, INC., and PAULA RADER

DEFENDANTS

CONSENT TO JOIN COLLECTIVE ACTION

I was employed as a home healthcare worker and/or Direct Care Worker for Defendants United Cerebral Palsy of Central Arkansas, Inc., d/b/a United Cerebral Palsy of Arkansas, and Paula Rader (collectively "Defendant"), on or after November 13, 2015. I understand this lawsuit is being brought under the Fair Labor Standards Act for unpaid overtime compensation. I consent to becoming a party-plaintiff in this lawsuit, to be represented by Sanford Law Firm, PLLC, and to be bound by any settlement of this action or adjudication by the Court.

I declare under penalty of perjury that the foregoing is true and correct.

Signature:

hlyn Wagery

ASHLYN WAGLEY

Date: November 13, 2018

<u>/s/ Josh Sanford</u> Josh Sanford, Esq. SANFORD LAW FIRM, PLLC One Financial Center 650 South Shackleford Road, Suite 411 Little Rock, Arkansas 72211 Telephone: (501) 221-0088 Facsimile: (888) 787-2040 josh@sanfordlawfirm.com Case 4:18-cv-00845-KGB Document 1-1 Filed 11/13/18 Page 1 of 1

JS 44 (Rev. 06/17) CIVIL COVER SHEET 4:18 - cv - 845 - KGBThe 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. *(SEE INSTRUCTIONS ON NEXT PAGE OF THIS FORM.)*

Individually and on Bahalf of All Others Similarly Situated Individually and on Bahalf of All Others Similarly Situated (b) County of Residence of Fine Listers Primiting Fall LWERE County of Residence of Fine Listers Others (b) County of Residence of Fine Listers Primiting Fall LWERE County of Residence of Fine Listers Others (b) South Shackeford, Suite 411, Little Rock, Afrances 72211 Difference of Fine Listers Others (c) South Shackeford, Suite 411, Little Rock, Afrances 72211 Difference of Fine Listers Others (c) South Shackeford, Suite 411, Little Rock, Afrances 72211 Difference of Fine Listers Others (c) South Shackeford, Suite 411, Little Rock, Afrances 72211 Difference of Fine Listers Others (c) South Shackeford, Suite 411, Little Rock, Afrances 72211 Difference of Fine Listers Others (c) Sources Cancel Note Found Question (c) Sources of Suite Cancel Afrances 7221 (c) Sources Cancel Afrances State Data) Difference of Fine Listers Others (c) Sources of Suite Cancel Afrances Others Difference of Fine Listers Others (c) Sources of Suite Cancel Afrances Others Difference of Fine Listers Others (c) Sources of Suite Cancel Cancel Note State Others Difference of Fine Listers Others (c) Sources of Rote Cancel Note State Others Difference of Fine Listers Others (c) Sources of Rote Cancel Note State Others	I. (a) PLAINTIFFS		DEFENDANTS									
(b) County of Residence of Final Listed Plaintiff FAULENER County of Residence of Final Listed Defendant (NUTPE CASES) (b) County of Residence of Final Listed Defendant (NUTPE CASES) (NUTPE CASES) (b) Second Port NUTPE CASES (NUTPE CASES) (b) Second Port NUTPE CASES (NUTPE CASES) (b) Second Port Suite of Final Case of Nutper Constraints (NUTPE CASES) (c) Second Port Suite of Final Case of Nutper Constraints (NUTPE CASES) (c) Second Port Suite of Final Case of Nutper Constraints (NUTPE CASES) (c) Second Port Suite of Final Case of Nutper Constraints (NUTPE CASES) (c) Second Port Suite of Final Case of Nutper Constraints (NUTPE CASES) (c) Second Port Suite of Final Case of Nutper Constraints (NUTPE CASES) (c) Second Port Suite of Final Case of Nutper Constraints (NUTPE CASES) (c) Second Port Suite of Nutper Case of Nutper Constraints (NUTPE CASES) (c) Second Port Suite of Nutper Case of Nut	CALEB CAULEY and ASHLYN WAGLEY, Each Individually and on Behalf of All Others Similarly Situated				UNITED CEREBRAL PALSY OF CENTRAL							
Joeffs Amfords (SANFORD CAN) Efficiency (Jesuard Control	(b) County of Residence of First Listed Plaintiff FAULKNER				County of Residence of First Listed Defendant							
EGO South Shackeford, Suite 411, Little Rock, Arkansas 72211 D1 20.5.098; issh@sanfordlawfirm.com III. BASIS OF JURISDICTION (//loce art X'' in One Bax Only) D1 U.S. Government X3 Federal Question (C3 Government (C3 Government Not a Parley) D2 U.S. Government -4 Diventity (C3 Government Not a Parley) FT D2 U.S. Government -4 Diventity (C3 Government Not a Parley) FT D1 U.S. Government -4 Diventity (C3 Government Not a Parley) FT (C3 Government Not a Parley) C3 Government Not a Parley (C3 Government Not a Parley) C3 Government Not a Parley) ((EXCEPT IN U.S. PLAINTIFF CASES)				NOTE: IN LAND CONDEMNATION CASES, USE THE LOCATION OF							
II. BASIS OF JURISDICTION (Placear X" in One Rote Only and One Rote for Planning II. U.S. Government X.J. Federal Question (U.S. Government Note a Parry) II. U.S. Government 4. Diversity Diversity<	650 South Shackleford, S	uite 411, Little Rock, /		r,	Attorneys (If Kno Brent Wakefield	^{own)} d, Ba	rber Law	Firm				
I U.S. Government VX Frederic Question PTF DEF			ne Box Only)				RINCIPA	L PARTIES				
Planuff (U.S. Government Not a Party) Citizen of This State 1 0 1 Citizen of This State 1 0 1 Constraints 0	□ 1 U.S. Government	X 3 Federal Ouestion										
Defaulties (Indicase Critemship of Parties in Item III) OfBuilties ID Another Sate V. NATURE OF SUIT (Place on 'X' in One Bas Only) (Intern or Balytes of a long of the parties of an long of the parties of the partis of the parties of the parties of the parties of the par				Citize	Citizen of This State 🛛 1 🗇 1 Incorporated or Principal Place 🗇 4						04	
Torigin Country Torigin Country Country Click here for Suitt Odd Descriptions ONRACT ORE TURKED SUIT (Piece ar 'X'' in One Raw Odd) ONRACT ORE TURKED SUIT (Piece ar 'X'' in One Raw Odd) 1010 human 310 Arphane Particular Supervision 940 Description 940 Description 110 human 310 Arphane Description 940 Description 940 Description 940 Description 110 human 310 Arphane Description 940 Description 940 Description 940 Description 110 human 310 Advance 930 Oder 930 Oder 930 Description 940 Description 110 human 340 Marine 930 Oder 930 Oder 930 Description 940 Description 110 human 340 Marine 930 Oder Frand 930 Oder Frand 940 Description 940 Description 110 Human 340 Marine 930 Oder Frand 930 Oder Frand 940 Description 940 Description 110 Human 340 Marine 930 Description 940 Description 940 Description 940 Descriprion 940 Description	2 U.S. Government Defendant				n of Another State		2 🗖 2			05	05	
CONTRACT TORESTALTURE 10 Ionume PESONAL INVIRY PESONAL INVIRY Contract 0.25 Dug Related Science 0.42 Appendix Struct 0.4			Foreign Country									
0 10 Aurance PERSONAL INURY PERSONAL INURY 0 432 Durg Related Science 0 375 Falles Claims Act 10 Marine 0 10 Arplace 0 450 Freenal lipity 0 423 Windowal 0 375 Falles Claims Act 10 Nacional All 213 Arplane Product 0 375 Falles Claims Act 0 375 Falles Claims Act 10 Nacional All 230 Arasial, Libel & Paramaceutical Personal lipity 0 400 Satis Responsionment 10 Nacional All 300 Federal lipity 330 Federal lipity 330 Federal lipity 340 Banks and Banking 10 Nacional All 330 Federal lipity 330 Federal lipity 345 Mark Nacional 0 430 Anitrati 10 Nacional All 330 Federal lipity 345 Mark Nacional 0 430 Camerec 430 Camerec 10 Nacional All 355 Moor Valicle 70 Other Fraid 70 Other Fraid 70 Claims Nacional				FC	RFEITURE/PENALT	TY						
V. ORIGIN (Place an "X" in One Box Only) V1 Original Proceeding 2 Removed from State Court 3 Remanded from Appellate Court 4 Reinstated or Reopened 5 Transferred from Another District (specify) 6 Multidistrict Litigation - Transfer 8 Multidistrict Litigation - Direct File VI. CAUSE OF ACTION Cite the U.S. Civil Statute under which you are filing (Do not cite jurisdictional statutes unless diversity): 29 U.S.C. 201, et seq. Brief description of cause: FLSA Wage Violation Cite the U.S. Civil Statute under which you are filing (Do not cite jurisdictional statutes unless diversity): 29 U.S.C. 201, et seq. Brief description of cause: FLSA Wage Violation VII. REQUESTED IN COMPLAINT: CHECK IF THIS IS A CLASS ACTION UNDER RULE 23, F.R.Cv.P. DEMAND S JURY DEMAND: CHECK YES only if demanded in complaint: JURY DEMAND: VIII. RELATED CASE(S) IF ANY (See instructions): JUDGE J. Leon Holmes DOCKET NUMBER 4:16-cv-930 (Adams et al) DATE SIGN_TURE OF ATTORNEY OF RECORD 11/13/2018 FOR OFFICE USE ONLY	 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 	PERSONAL INJURY 310 Airplane 315 Airplane Product Liability 320 Assault, Libel & Slander 330 Federal Employers' Liability 340 Marine 345 Marine Product Liability 350 Motor Vehicle 755 Motor Vehicle 976duct Liability 360 Other Personal 1njury 362 Personal Injury - Medical Malpractice CIVIL RIGHTS 440 Other Civil Rights 441 Voting 442 Employment 443 Amer. w/Disabilities - Employment 446 Amer. w/Disabilities - Other	PERSONAL INJUR 365 Personal Injury - Product Liability 367 Health Care/ Pharmaceutical Personal Injury Product Liability 368 Asbestos Persona Injury Product Liability PERSONAL PROPEI 370 Other Fraud 371 Truth in Lending 380 Other Personal Property Damage Product Liability PRISONER PETITIO Habeas Corpus: 463 Alien Detainee 510 Motions to Vacato Sentence 530 General 535 Death Penalty Other: 540 Mandamus & Oth 550 Civil Rights 550 Civil Rights 550 Civil Rights 550 Civil Rights	Y 0 62 0 69 1 XTY X 71 0 72 0 74 0 79 0 79 0 79	5 Drug Related Seizure of Property 21 USC 8 0 Other 0 Fair Labor Standards Act 0 Labor/Management Relations 0 Railway Labor Act 1 Family and Medical Leave Act 0 Other Labor Litigatio 1 Employee Retirement Income Security Act 1 MMIGRATION 2 Naturalization Applic 5 Other Immigration	2 881	□ 422 Appe □ 423 With 28 U ■ 820 Copy □ 830 Paten □ 835 Paten New 840 Trade ■ 861 HIA □ 863 DIW □ 864 SSID □ 865 RSI (al 28 USC 158 drawal SC 157 RTY RIGHTS rights it it - Abbreviated Drug Application emark SECURITY (1395ff) (Lung (923) C/DIWW (405(g)) 7 Title XVI 405(g)) AL TAX SUITS s (U.S. Plaintiff efendant) Third Party	 375 False C 376 Qui Tar 3729(a) 400 State Rd 410 Antitrus 430 Banks a 450 Comme 460 Deporta 470 Rackete Corrupt 480 Consun 490 Cable/S 850 Securiti Exchan 890 Other S 891 Agricul 895 Freedor Act 896 Arbitrat 896 Arbitrat 896 Arditrat 999 Adminin Act/Rec Agency 950 Constit 	laims Act n (31 USC)) apportion it nd Bankin rce tion mer Influen- Organizat mer Credit at TV es/Commo ge tatutory A tural Acts mental Ma n of Inforr tion strative Pr riew Ap Decision attonality of	ment g ced and ions dities/ ctions tters nation ocedure ipeal of	
VI. CAUSE OF ACTION Cite the U.S. Civil Statute under which you are filing (Do not cite jurisdictional statutes unless diversity): 29 U.S.C. 201, et seq. Brief description of cause: FLSA Wage Violation FLSA Wage Violation VII. REQUESTED IN COMPLAINT: CHECK IF THIS IS A CLASS ACTION DEMAND \$ VIII. RELATED CASE(S) CHECK IF THIS IS A CLASS ACTION DEMAND \$ VIII. RELATED CASE(S) If ANY JUDGE J. Leon Holmes DOCKET NUMBER 4:16-cv-930 (Adams et al) DATE SIGNATURE OF ATTORNEY OF RECORD 11/13/2018 FOR OFFICE USE ONLY	X1 Original □ 2 Re	moved from 3	Remanded from		stated or 🗇 5 Tra			Litigation		Litigati	on -	
VII. REQUESTED IN COMPLAINT: CHECK IF THIS IS A CLASS ACTION UNDER RULE 23, F.R.CV.P. DEMAND \$ CHECK YES only if demanded in complaint: JURY DEMAND: J Yes Xo VIII. RELATED CASE(S) IF ANY (See instructions): JUDGE J. Leon Holmes DOCKET NUMBER 4:16-cv-930 (Adams et al) DATE SIGNATURE OF ATTORNEY OF RECORD 11/13/2018 FOR OFFICE USE ONLY JUDGE J. Leon Holmes DOCKET NUMBER 4:16-cv-930 (Adams et al)		DN 29 U.S.C. 201, et Brief description of ca	seq.	re filing (I			utes unless di			Direct F		
IF ANY (See instructions): JUDGE J. Leon Holmes DOCKET NUMBER 4:16-cv-930 (Adams et al) DATE SIGNATURE OF ATTORNEY OF RECORD 11/13/2018 FOR OFFICE USE ONLY	VII. REQUESTED IN COMPLAINT:	CHECK IF THIS	IS A CLASS ACTIO	N D	EMAND \$			•				
11/13/2018 FOR OFFICE USE ONLY			JUDGE J. Leon Ho	olmes			DOCKE	ET NUMBER 4:1	6-cv-930 (A	dams e	et al)	
	DATE 11/13/2018		SIGNATURE OF AT	TORNEY	OF RECORD							
-		MOUNT	APTLYING IFP		JUDO	GE		MAG. JUE	DGE			

ClassAction.org

This complaint is part of ClassAction.org's searchable class action lawsuit database and can be found in this post: <u>United Cerebral Palsy of Central Arkansas Sued Over Allegedly Unpaid OT Wages</u>