IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLORADO

Civil Action No.

LORI CLARK, LESLIE TAYLOR, SARA CREIGHTON, LAURA LAMADLINE, JACOB REEDER, FERNANDO FUSTERO, and IDA DANDRIDGE

individually and on behalf of all others similarly situated

Plaintiffs,

٧.

DAVITA HEALTHCARE PARTNERS, INC. and TOTAL RENAL CARE INC.

Defendants.

COMPLAINT AND JURY DEMAND

LORI CLARK, LESIE TAYLOR, SARA CREIGHTON, LAURA LAMADLINE,
JACOB REEDER, FERNANDO FUSTERO, and IDA DANDRIDGE, individually and on
behalf of all others similarly situated as part of a collective pursuant to the FLSA, by and
through their counsel, for their Complaint against Defendants DAVITA HEALTHCARE
PARTNERS, INC. and TOTAL RENAL CARE INC. (hereinafter referred to as
"Defendants") hereby state and allege as follows:

PRELIMINARY ALLEGATIONS

- 1. Defendants are a Fortune 500 Company that provides a variety of health care services to patients thought the United States and abroad. Defendants specialize in dialysis services for patients with chronic kidney failure and end stage renal disease.
- 2. Plaintiffs and those similarly situated are non-exempt hourly employees of Defendants. Plaintiffs and those similarly situated are all located within a geographic area designated and defined by Defendants as encompassing the states of North Dakota, South Dakota, Minnesota, Wisconsin, Michigan, and parts of Iowa, Illinois, Nebraska, Indiana, Ohio, Kentucky, and West Virginia, and are collectively referred to by Defendants as "Team Fusion."
- 3. Plaintiffs and those similarly situated in the "Team Fusion" zone are subject to the same illegal policy and practice of failing to pay workers for all time worked and failing to pay overtime wages. That policy and practice is based, in part, on direct patient care hours per treatment and the calculation of direct patient care hours for each facility established by corporate DaVita that reduces Defendants' patient to staff ratios and require Plaintiffs and those similarly situated to work more hours for which they are not properly compensated.
- 4. Plaintiffs and those similarly situated were/are not properly paid for all work performed for the benefit of the employer.
- 5. Plaintiffs and those similarly situated were/are not properly paid for overtime, time and a half, for over forty (40) hours in a workweek.
- 6. Defendants required Plaintiffs and those similarly situated to clock out for their meal breaks. Plaintiffs and those similarly situated were/are required to perform

work-related duties during meal breaks. Plaintiffs and those similarly situated were/are not paid for work-related interruptions that occurred/occur during meal breaks during their shifts wherein they worked more than five consecutive hours. Defendants failed to change Plaintiffs', and those similarly situateds', time records to reflect the additional time worked on behalf of the employer even when Plaintiffs and those similarly situated requested that their time records be corrected by management.

- 7. Plaintiffs and those similarly situated were/are not properly paid for other work-related duties which occurred outside of their scheduled shift hours and/or on weekends. Defendants failed to change Plaintiffs', and those similarly situateds', time records to reflect the additional time worked on behalf of the employer even when Plaintiffs and those similarly situated requested that their time records be corrected by management.
- 8. Defendants failed to properly maintain accurate daily records of all hours worked by Plaintiffs and those similarly situated as required by federal law because Defendants are not properly recording all hours worked, including overtime.

This cause of action is brought as a collective action pursuant to federal law to recover from Defendants unpaid wages, overtime compensation, a declaratory judgment, liquidated damages, compensatory damages, punitive damages, costs and attorneys' fees and pre- and post-judgment interest associated with the bringing of this action, plus any additional relief that is just and proper for Plaintiffs and those similarly situated under federal law.

JURISDICTION AND VENUE

- 9. Plaintiffs and those similarly situated as part of a collective pursuant to the FLSA and as a class pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 23 incorporate herein by this reference the allegations contained in this Complaint as if set forth *verbatim*.
- 10. The FLSA authorizes court actions by private parties to recover damages for violation of the FLSA's wage and hour provisions. Jurisdiction over Plaintiffs', and those similarly situated, FLSA claims are based upon 29 U.S.C. § 216(b) and 28 U.S.C. § 1331.
- 11. Subject Matter jurisdiction is conferred on this Court by Title 28 U.S.C. § 1337 and by Title 29 U.S.C. § 216(b). At all times pertinent to this Complaint, Defendants were/are an enterprise engaged in interstate commerce or in the production of goods for consumers as defined § 3(r) and 3(s) of the FLSA, 29 U.S.C. §§ 203(r) and 203(s). The annual gross sales volume of the Defendant was in excess of \$500,000 per annum.
- 12. Alternatively, Plaintiffs and those similarly situated worked in interstate commerce so as to fall within the protections of the FLSA.
- 13. Venue is proper in the District of Colorado pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1391(a).

COVERAGE PURUSANT TO THE FAIR LABOR STANDARDS ACT

14. Plaintiffs and those similarly situated as part of a collective pursuant to the FLSA incorporate herein by this reference the allegations contained in this Complaint as if set forth *verbatim*.

- 15. At all times material hereto, Plaintiffs and those similarly situated were "employees" of Defendants within the meaning of FLSA because they were individuals employed by an employer.
- 16. At all times material hereto, Plaintiffs LORI CLARK, LESIE TAYLOR, SARA CREIGHTON, LAURA LAMADLINE, JACOB REEDER, FERNANDO FUSTERO, IDA DANDRIDGE, and those similarly situated were hourly employees eligible for overtime pay.
- 17. At all times material hereto, individual Plaintiff LORI CLARK was classified both as a facility administrator (exempt position) as well as a Registered Nurse (non-exempt position). Plaintiff LORI CLARK was not paid any overtime for work performed on behalf of Defendants as a non-exempt hourly Registered Nurse.
- 18. At all times material hereto, individual Plaintiff SARA CREIGHTON was classified both as a facility administrator (exempt position) as well as a part-time social worker (non-exempt position). Plaintiff SARA CREIGHTON was not paid any overtime for work performed on behalf of Defendants as a non-exempt part-time social worker.
- 19. At all times material hereto, individual Plaintiff LAURA LAMADINE was classified both as a home program manager (exempt position) as well as various nursing positions (non-exempt position). Plaintiff LAURA LAMADINE was not paid any overtime for work performed on behalf of Defendants as a non-exempt hourly nurse.
- 20. At all times material hereto, individual Plaintiff JACOB REEDER was classified both as a Facility Administrator (exempt position) as well as a Registered Nurse (non-exempt position). Plaintiff JACOB REEDER was not paid any overtime for work performed on behalf of Defendants as a non-exempt hourly nurse.

- 21. At all times material hereto, Defendants were an "employer" within the meaning of FLSA because Defendants acted directly or indirectly in the interest of the employer in relation to an employee. 29 U.S.C. § 203(d). See Koellhoffer v. Plotke-Giordani, 858 F. Supp. 2d 1181, 1189 (D. Colo. 2012).
- 22. The FLSA "defines the verb 'employ' expansively to mean 'suffer or permit to work." *Nationwide Mut. Ins. Co. v. Darden,* 503 U.S. 318, 326 (1992) (quoting 29 U.S.C. § 203(g)). "An entity 'suffers or permits' an individual to work if, as a matter of 'economic reality', the entity functions as the individual's employer." *Goldberg v. Whitaker House Coop., Inc.,* 366 U.S. 28, 33 (1961).
- 23. At all times material hereto, Defendants were/are an employer because Defendants had the ability to do the following with respect to Plaintiffs and those similarly situated: hire and fire, supervise work schedules and conditions of employment, determined rates and method of payment and were obligated under the law to maintain employment records.
- 24. Also, at all times material hereto, Defendants were/are an employer because Defendants held exclusive operational control over Plaintiffs and those similarly situated, were solely responsible for the day-to-day operations *and* had direct responsibility for the supervision of the Plaintiff and those similarly situated.
- 25. At all times material hereto, Defendants employed two (2) or more employees.
- 26. At all times material hereto, Defendants were, and continue to be an "enterprise engaged in commerce" within the meaning of FLSA.

- 27. The FLSA defines an enterprise engaged in commerce or in the production of goods for commerce as one that "(a)(i) has employees engaged in commerce or in the production of goods for commerce, or that has employees handling, selling, or otherwise working on goods or materials that have been moved in or produced for commerce by any person; *and* (ii) is an enterprise whose annual gross volume of sales made or business done is not less than \$500,000...." 29 U.S.C. § 203(s)(1).
- 28. At all times material hereto, Defendants were, and continue to be, an "enterprise engaged in commerce" within the meaning of FLSA.
- 29. At all times material hereto, Defendants gross annual revenue was in excess of \$500,000 per annum during the relevant time periods.
- 30. At all times material hereto, Plaintiffs and those similarly situated were "engaged in commerce" and subject to individual coverage of the FLSA.
- 31. Likewise, section 13 of the FLSA, 29 U.S.C. § 213, exempts certain categories of employees from overtime pay obligations. Because none of the FLSA exemptions apply to Plaintiffs and those similarly situated, at all times material hereto, Plaintiffs and those similarly situated were/are non-exempt.

PARTIES

- 32. Plaintiffs and those similarly situated as part of a collective pursuant to the FLSA incorporate herein by this reference the allegations contained in this Complaint as if set forth *verbatim*.
- 33. At all times pertinent hereto, individual Plaintiff LORI CLARK resided in the State of Michigan with a residential address in Grand Haven, MI 49417.

- 34. At all times pertinent hereto, individual Plaintiff LESLIE TAYLOR resided in the State of Michigan with a residential address in Canton, MI 48188.
- 35. At all times pertinent hereto, individual Plaintiff SARA CREIGHTON resided in the State of Michigan with a residential address in Grand Rapids, MI 49546.
- 36. At all times pertinent hereto, individual Plaintiff LAURA LAMADLINE resided in the State of Michigan with a residential address in Allendale, MI 49401.
- 37. At all times pertinent hereto, individual Plaintiff JACOB REEDER resided in the State of Michigan with a residential address in Clarksville, MI 48815.
- 38. At all times pertinent hereto, individual Plaintiff FERNANDO FUSTERO resided in the State of Illinois with a residential address in Rockford, IL 61103.
- 39. At all times pertinent hereto, individual Plaintiff IDA DANDRIDGE resided in the State of Illinois with a residential address in Rockford, IL 61101
- 40. At all times material hereto, individual Plaintiff LORI CLARK was classified both as a facility administrator (exempt position) as well as a Registered Nurse (non-exempt position). Plaintiff LORI CLARK was not paid any overtime for work performed on behalf of Defendants as a non-exempt hourly Registered Nurse.
- 41. At all times material hereto, individual Plaintiff LESLIE TAYLOR worked as an hourly employee as both a dietician (non-exempt position) as well as a social worker (non-exempt position).
- 42. At all times material hereto, individual Plaintiff SARA CREIGHTON was classified both as a facility administrator (exempt position) as well as a part-time social worker (non-exempt position). Plaintiff SARA CREIGHTON was not paid any overtime for work performed on behalf of Defendants as a non-exempt part-time social worker.

- 43. At all times material hereto, individual Plaintiff LAURA LAMADINE was classified both as a home program manager (exempt position) as well as various nursing positions (non-exempt position). Plaintiff LAURA LAMADINE was not paid any overtime for work performed on behalf of Defendants as a non-exempt hourly nurse.
- 44. At all times material hereto, individual Plaintiff JACOB REEDER was classified both as a Facility Administrator (exempt position) as well as a Registered Nurse (non-exempt position). Plaintiff JACOB REEDER was not paid any overtime for work performed on behalf of Defendants as a non-exempt hourly nurse.
- 45. At all times material hereto, individual Plaintiff FERNANDO FUSTERO worked as a non-exempt hourly employee for Defendants as a Dialysis Technician.
- 46. At all times material hereto, individual Plaintiff IDA DANDRIDGE worked as a non-exempt hourly employee for Defendants as a Patient Care Technician.
- 47. At all times material hereto, Plaintiff and all similarly-situated employees were performing their duties for the benefit of and on behalf of Defendants.
- 48. Defendants should be in possession of the time entries and wage records for Plaintiffs, individually and collectively, for each and every workweek.
- 49. Upon information and belief, Defendant DAVITA HEALTHCARE PARTNERS is a Colorado incorporated company organized under the laws of Colorado doing business at 2000 16th Street Denver, CO 80202.
- 50. Upon information and belief, Defendants TOTAL RENAL CARE, INC. is a Colorado incorporated company organized under the laws of Colorado doing business at 2000 16th Street Denver, CO 80202.

51. Defendants are/were employers for the purposes of the FLSA, and are the proper Defendants/employers for the Plaintiff and other similarly situated, non-exempt workers of Defendants.

COLLECTIVE ALLEGATIONS

- 52. Plaintiffs and those similarly situated as part of a collective pursuant to the FLSA incorporate herein by this reference the allegations contained in this Complaint as if set forth *verbatim*.
- 53. Plaintiffs bring their First Claim for Relief, the FLSA claim, as an "opt-in" collective action pursuant to 29 U.S.C. § 216(b).
- 54. The FLSA claims may be pursued by those who opt-in to this case, pursuant to 29 U.S.C. § 216(b).
- 55. Plaintiffs individually and on behalf of other similarly-situated employees (hereinafter also referred to as Opt-in Plaintiffs) seek relief on a collective basis challenging, among other FLSA violations, Defendants' practice of failing to accurately record all hours worked and failing to pay for all hours worked, including overtime compensation. Plaintiffs also seek relief on a collective basis for any and all retaliation for asserting their rights. The number and identity of other Opt-in Plaintiffs will be determined from the records of Defendants, and potential members may easily and quickly be notified of the pendency of this action.

FIRST CLAIM FOR RELIEF
Violation of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 and
Failure to Maintain Records
(ALL COLLECTIVE MEMBERS)

- 56. Plaintiffs and those similarly situated as part of a collective pursuant to the FLSA incorporate herein by this reference the allegations contained in this Complaint as if set forth *verbatim*.
- 57. At all times material herein, Opt-in Plaintiffs have been entitled to the rights, protections, and benefits provided under the FLSA, 29 U.S.C. §§ 201 *et seq*.
- 58. The FLSA regulates, among other things, payment of overtime pay by employers such as the Defendants.
- 59. Defendants were, and are, subject to the recordkeeping and overtime pay requirements of the FLSA because they are an enterprise engaged in commerce and its employees are engaged in commerce.
- 60. Defendants violated the FLSA by failing to pay Opt-in Plaintiffs for all of their time worked, including overtime. In the course of perpetrating these unlawful practices, Defendants have also willfully failed to keep accurate records of all hours worked by employees. Defendants have also willfully failed to provide paystubs to their employees and/or documentation of hours worked and monies paid to their employees.
- 61. Section 13 of the FLSA, 29 U.S.C. § 213, exempts certain categories of employees from overtime pay obligations. None of the FLSA exemptions apply to Opt-in Plaintiffs. Accordingly, Opt-in Plaintiffs must be paid overtime pay in accordance with the FLSA.
- 62. Opt-in Plaintiffs were required to clock out by Defendants for their meal breaks, but were/are required to perform work-related duties during meal breaks. Opt-in Plaintiffs were/are not paid for work-related interruptions that occurred/occur during meal breaks during their shifts wherein they worked more than five consecutive hours.

Defendants failed to change Plaintiffs' and those Opt-in Plaintiffs' time records to reflect the additional time worked on behalf of the employer even when Opt-in Plaintiffs and those similarly situated requested that their time records be corrected by management.

- 63. Opt-in Plaintiffs were/are not properly paid for other work-related duties which occurred outside of their scheduled shift hours and/or on weekends. Defendants failed to change Opt-in Plaintiffs' time records to reflect the additional time worked on behalf of the employer even when Opt-in Plaintiffs requested that their time records be corrected by management.
- 64. Defendants failed to properly maintain accurate daily records of all hours worked by Opt-in Plaintiffs as required by federal law because Defendants are not properly recording all hours worked, including overtime.
- 65. Opt-in Plaintiffs are victims of a uniform compensation policy practice. This uniform policy and practice is in violation of the FLSA.
- 66. Opt-in Plaintiffs are entitled to damages equal to the unpaid wages and mandated overtime premium pay within the three years preceding the filing of this Complaint because Defendants acted willfully and knew, or showed reckless disregard of whether, its conduct was prohibited by the FLSA.
- 67. As a result of the aforesaid willful violations of the FLSA overtime provisions, overtime compensation has been unlawfully withheld by Defendants from Opt-in Plaintiffs for which Defendants are liable pursuant to 29 U.S.C. § 216(b), together with an additional equal amount as liquidated damages, pre- and post-judgment interest, reasonable attorneys' fees, and costs of this action.

SECOND CLAIM FOR RELIEF Violation of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 and Failure to Maintain Records (PLAINTIFFS, INDIVIDUALLY)

- 68. Plaintiffs and those similarly situated as part of a collective pursuant to the FLSA incorporate herein by this reference the allegations contained in this Complaint as if set forth *verbatim*.
- 69. At all times material herein, Plaintiffs, individually, are entitled to the rights, protections, and benefits provided under the FLSA, 29 U.S.C. §§ 201 *et seq*.
- 70. The FLSA regulates, among other things, payment of overtime pay by employers such as the Defendants.
- 71. Defendants were, and are, subject to the recordkeeping and overtime pay requirements of the FLSA because they are an enterprise engaged in commerce and its employees are engaged in commerce.
- 72. Defendants violated the FLSA by failing to pay Plaintiffs for all of their time worked, including overtime. In the course of perpetrating these unlawful practices, Defendants have also willfully failed to keep accurate records of all hours worked by employees. Defendants have also willfully failed to provide paystubs to their employees and/or documentation of hours worked and monies paid to their employees.
- 73. Section 13 of the FLSA, 29 U.S.C. § 213, exempts certain categories of employees from overtime pay obligations. None of the FLSA exemptions apply to Opt-in Plaintiffs. Accordingly, Opt-in Plaintiffs must be paid overtime pay in accordance with the FLSA.
- 74. Defendants required Plaintiffs to clock out for meal breaks. Defendants also required Plaintiffs to perform work-related duties during meal breaks. Plaintiffs were

not paid for work-related interruptions that occurred/occur during meal breaks during their shifts wherein they worked more than five consecutive hours. Defendants failed to change Plaintiffs' time records to reflect the additional time worked on behalf of the employer even when Plaintiffs requested that their time records be corrected by management.

- 75. Plaintiffs were not properly paid for other work-related duties which occurred outside of their scheduled shift hours and/or on weekends. Defendants failed to change Plaintiffs' time records to reflect the additional time worked on behalf of the employer.
- 76. Defendants failed to properly maintain accurate daily records of all hours worked by Plaintiffs as required by federal law because Defendants are not properly recording all hours worked, including overtime.
- 77. Plaintiffs are victims of a uniform compensation policy practice. This uniform policy and practice, in violation of the FLSA.
- 78. Plaintiffs are entitled to damages equal to the unpaid wages and mandated overtime premium pay within the three years preceding the filing of this Complaint because Defendants acted willfully and knew, or showed reckless disregard of whether, its conduct was prohibited by the FLSA.
- 79. As a result of the aforesaid willful violations of the FLSA overtime provisions, overtime compensation has been unlawfully withheld by Defendants from Plaintiff for which Defendants are liable pursuant to 29 U.S.C. § 216(b), together with an additional equal amount as liquidated damages, pre- and post-judgment interest, reasonable attorneys' fees, and costs of this action.

WHEREFORE, Plaintiffs and those similarly situated as part of a collective pursuant to the FLSA demand judgment against Defendants, for the payment of compensation for which they have not been properly paid, liquidated damages, reasonable attorney's fees and costs, prejudgment interest, and for all other appropriate relief requested herein and available pursuant to federal law.

JURY DEMAND

Plaintiffs and those similarly situated as part of a collective pursuant to the FLSA request a trial by jury on all issues so triable.

DATED: November 16, 2017

Respectfully submitted,

RAMOS LAW

/s/ Colleen T. Calandra Colleen T. Calandra

/s/ Madison Fiedler Carlson Madison Fiedler Carlson

/s/ Darren Natvig Darren Natvig

3000 Youngfield Street Wheat Ridge, CO 80215 Telephone: (303) 733-6353 Fax Number: (303) 865-5666 Email: colleen@ramoslaw.com madison@ramoslaw.com darren@ramoslaw.com

Wilcox Law Firm, LLC

/s/ Ronald L. Wilcox Ronald L. Wilcox 383 Corona Street, #401 Denver, CO 80218 Telephone: (303) 594-6720

Email: ron@wilcox.legal

ATTORNEYS FOR PLAINTIFFS

JS 44 (Rev. 06/17) District of Colorado Form

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 purpose of initiating the civil docket sheet. (SEE INSTRUCTIONS ON NEXT PAGE OF THIS FORM.)

purpose of initiating the civil d	OCKET SHEET. (SEE HV31KUC.	TIONS ON NEXT FAGE OF	r IIIIs roi	1			
I. (a) PLAINTIFFS LORI CLARK, et al., individually and on behalf of all othe similarly situated				DEFENDANTS DAVITA HEALTHCARE PARTNERS, INC. AND TOTAL RENAL CARE INC.			
(b) County of Residence of First Listed Plaintiff Ottawa Co., MI (EXCEPT IN U.S. PLAINTIFF CASES)				County of Residence of First Listed Defendant			
				County of Residence	(IN U.S. PLAINTIFF CASES (ONLY)	
				NOTE: IN LAND CONDEMNATION CASES, USE THE LOCATION OF THE TRACT OF LAND INVOLVED.			
(c) Attorneys (Firm Name, A	Address, and Telephone Number	•)		Attorneys (If Known)			
Colleen T. Calan	idra, Esq., Ramos Law neat Ridge, CO 80215	LLC, 3000 Youngf	ield				
II. BASIS OF JURISDI	ICTION (Place an "X" in O	ne Box Only)			RINCIPAL PARTIES	(Place an "X" in One Box for Plaintif	
☐ 1 U.S. Government	'X3 Federal Question			(For Diversity Cases Only) P1	rf def	and One Box for Defendant) PTF DEF	
Plaintiff	(U.S. Government)	Not a Party)	Citize	en of This State	1 ' 1 Incorporated or Print of Business In '		
☐ 2 U.S. Government Defendant	' 4 Diversity (Indicate Citizensh	ip of Parties in Item III)	Citizo	en of Another State X	2 ' 2 Incorporated <i>and</i> Prof Business In		
				en or Subject of a 'reign Country	3 ' 3 Foreign Nation	' 6 ' 6	
IV. NATURE OF SUIT						of Suit Code Descriptions.	
CONTRACT 110 Insurance	PERSONAL INJURY	ORTS PERSONAL INJUR		DRFEITURE/PENALTY 25 Drug Related Seizure	, 422 Appeal 28 USC 158	OTHER STATUTES 375 False Claims Act	
☐ 120 Marine	' 310 Airplane	365 Personal Injury -	1 5 02	of Property 21 USC 881	' 423 Withdrawal	' 376 Qui Tam (31 USC	
130 Miller Act140 Negotiable Instrument	' 315 Airplane Product Liability	Product Liability 367 Health Care/	a 69	00 Other	28 USC 157	3729(a)) ☐ 400 State Reapportionment	
☐ 150 Recovery of Overpayment	' 320 Assault, Libel &	Pharmaceutical			PROPERTY RIGHTS	□ 410 Antitrust	
& Enforcement of Judgment	Slander	Personal Injury			□ 820 Copyrights □ 830 Patent	430 Banks and Banking	
151 Medicare Act152 Recovery of Defaulted	' 330 Federal Employers' Liability	Product Liability 368 Asbestos Personal			830 Patent 835 Patent - Abbreviated	☐ 450 Commerce ☐ 460 Deportation	
Student Loans	340 Marine	Injury Product			New Drug Application	☐ 470 Racketeer Influenced and	
(Excludes Veterans) 153 Recovery of Overpayment	' 345 Marine Product Liability	Liability PERSONAL PROPER	TY -	LABOR	□ 840 Trademark SOCIAL SECURITY	Corrupt Organizations 480 Consumer Credit	
of Veteran's Benefits	' 350 Motor Vehicle	370 Other Fraud	5X 71	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 Lending380 Other Personal	n 72	Act 20 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 ' 362 Personal Injury -	 385 Property Damage Product Liability 		40 Railway Labor Act 1 Family and Medical	' 865 RSI (405(g))	891 Agricultural Acts893 Environmental Matters	
	Medical Malpractice	<u>, </u>		Leave Act		☐ 895 Freedom of Information	
REAL PROPERTY 210 Land Condemnation	USA 440 Other Civil Rights	PRISONER PETITION		00 Other Labor Litigation 01 Employee Retirement	FEDERAL TAX SUITS 870 Taxes (U.S. Plaintiff	Act 896 Arbitration	
220 Foreclosure	1 440 Other Civil Rights	Habeas Corpus: ☐ 463 Alien Detainee	U 79	Income Security Act	or Defendant)	899 Administrative Procedure	
230 Rent Lease & Ejectment	☐ 442 Employment	☐ 510 Motions to Vacate		•	□ 871 IRS—Third Party	Act/Review or Appeal of	
240 Torts to Land245 Tort Product Liability	☐ 443 Housing/ Accommodations	Sentence 530 General			26 USC 7609	Agency Decision 950 Constitutionality of	
☐ 290 All Other Real Property	445 Amer. w/Disabilities -	☐ 535 Death Penalty		IMMIGRATION		State Statutes	
	Employment 446 Amer. w/Disabilities -	Other: 540 Mandamus & Other		52 Naturalization Application 55 Other Immigration			
	Other	550 Civil Rights	51 5 40	Actions			
	☐ 448 Education	555 Prison Condition560 Civil Detainee -					
		Conditions of					
V ODICIN		Confinement				<u> </u>	
	emoved from 3	Remanded from Appellate Court	☐ 4 Rein Reo		erred from	n - Litigation -	
		ntute under which you ar		(specify) Oo not cite jurisdictional statu) Transfer	Direct File	
VI. CAUSE OF ACTIO	ON U.S.C. §201 et Brief description of ca	uise. —					
	•	AP Docket	FAI	LURE TO PAY WAG	SES AND OVERTIME		
VII. REQUESTED IN COMPLAINT:	CHECK IF THIS UNDER RULE 2	IS A CLASS ACTION 3, F.R.Cv.P.) D	DEMAND \$	CHECK YES only JURY DEMAND	y if demanded in complaint: Yes 'No	
VIII. RELATED CAST	E(S) (See instructions):	JUDGE Hon.	Marcia	S. Kreiger	DOCKET NUMBER	15cv01964	
DATE		SIGNATURE OF AT	TORNEY (OF RECORD			
11/16/17	s/Colleen T.		·				
FOR OFFICE USE ONLY							
DECEIDT#	MOUNT	ADDI VING IED		HIDGE	MAC III	DGE	

Case 1:17-cv-02748 Document 1-1 Filed 11/16/17 USDC Colorado Page 2 of 3

Print

Save As...

Reset

JS 44 Reverse (Rev. 06/17)

INSTRUCTIONS FOR ATTORNEYS COMPLETING CIVIL COVER SHEET FORM JS 44

Authority For Civil Cover Sheet

The JS 44 civil cover sheet and the information contained herein neither replaces nor supplements the filings and service of pleading 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. Consequently, a civil cover sheet is submitted to the Clerk of Court for each civil complaint filed. The attorney filing a case should complete the form as follows:

- **I.(a) Plaintiffs-Defendants.** Enter names (last, first, middle initial) of plaintiff and defendant. If the plaintiff or defendant is a government agency, use only the full name or standard abbreviations. If the plaintiff or defendant is an official within a government agency, identify first the agency and then the official, giving both name and title.
- (b) County of Residence. For each civil case filed, except U.S. plaintiff cases, enter the name of the county where the first listed plaintiff resides at the time of filing. In U.S. plaintiff cases, enter the name of the county in which the first listed defendant resides at the time of filing. (NOTE: In land condemnation cases, the county of residence of the "defendant" is the location of the tract of land involved.)
- (c) Attorneys. Enter the firm name, address, telephone number, and attorney of record. If there are several attorneys, list them on an attachment, noting in this section "(see attachment)".
- **II. Jurisdiction.** The basis of jurisdiction is set forth under Rule 8(a), F.R.Cv.P., which requires that jurisdictions be shown in pleadings. Place an "X" in one of the boxes. If there is more than one basis of jurisdiction, precedence is given in the order shown below.

United States plaintiff. (1) Jurisdiction based on 28 U.S.C. 1345 and 1348. Suits by agencies and officers of the United States are included here. United States defendant. (2) When the plaintiff is suing the United States, its officers or agencies, place an "X" in this box.

Federal question. (3) This refers to suits under 28 U.S.C. 1331, where jurisdiction arises under the Constitution of the United States, an amendment to the Constitution, an act of Congress or a treaty of the United States. In cases where the U.S. is a party, the U.S. plaintiff or defendant code takes precedence, and box 1 or 2 should be marked.

Diversity of citizenship. (4) This refers to suits under 28 U.S.C. 1332, where parties are citizens of different states. When Box 4 is checked, the citizenship of the different parties must be checked. (See Section III below; **NOTE: federal question actions take precedence over diversity cases.**)

- **III. Residence** (citizenship) of Principal Parties. This section of the JS 44 is to be completed if diversity of citizenship was indicated above. Mark this section for each principal party.
- **IV. Nature of Suit.** Place an "X" in the appropriate box. If there are multiple nature of suit codes associated with the case, pick the nature of suit code that is most applicable. Click here for: Nature of Suit Code Descriptions.
- **V. Origin.** Place an "X" in one of the seven boxes.

Original Proceedings. (1) Cases which originate in the United States district courts.

Removed from State Court. (2) Proceedings initiated in state courts may be removed to the district courts under Title 28 U.S.C., Section 1441. When the petition for removal is granted, check this box.

Remanded from Appellate Court. (3) Check this box for cases remanded to the district court for further action. Use the date of remand as the filing date.

Reinstated or Reopened. (4) Check this box for cases reinstated or reopened in the district court. Use the reopening date as the filing date. Transferred from Another District. (5) For cases transferred under Title 28 U.S.C. Section 1404(a). Do not use this for within district transfers or multidistrict litigation transfers.

Multidistrict Litigation – Transfer. (6) Check this box when a multidistrict case is transferred into the district under authority of Title 28 U.S.C. Section 1407.

Multidistrict Litigation – Direct File. (8) Check this box when a multidistrict case is filed in the same district as the Master MDL docket. **PLEASE NOTE THAT THERE IS NOT AN ORIGIN CODE 7.** Origin Code 7 was used for historical records and is no longer relevant due to changes in statue.

- VI. Cause of Action. Report the civil statute directly related to the cause of action and give a brief description of the cause. Do not cite jurisdictional statutes unless diversity. Example: U.S. Civil Statute: 47 USC 553 Brief Description: Unauthorized reception of cable service
- VII. Requested in Complaint. Class Action. Place an "X" in this box if you are filing a class action under Rule 23, F.R.Cv.P.

 Demand. In this space enter the actual dollar amount being demanded or indicate other demand, such as a preliminary injunction.

 Jury Demand. Check the appropriate box to indicate whether or not a jury is being demanded.
- VIII. Related Cases. This section of the JS 44 is used to reference related pending cases, if any. If there are related pending cases, insert the docket numbers and the corresponding judge names for such cases.

Date and Attorney Signature. Date and sign the civil cover sheet.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

for the

District of Colorado						
LORI CLARK, et al. individually and on behalf of all others similarly situated)))					
Plaintiff(s))					
v.	Civil Action No.					
DAVITA HEALTHCARE PARTNERS, INC. and TOTAL RENAL CARE, INC.)))					
Defendant(s))					
•	NA CIVIL ACTION					
AND TOTAL RENAL CARE INC	E 2090, DENVER, CO 80202					
A lawsuit has been filed against you.						
are the United States or a United States agency, or an office	EET, #200					
If you fail to respond, judgment by default will be You also must file your answer or motion with the court.	e entered against you for the relief demanded in the complaint.					
	CLERK OF COURT					
Datas						
Date:	Signature of Clerk or Deputy Clerk					

AO 440 (Rev. 06/12) Summons in a Civil Action (Page 2)

Civil Action No.

PROOF OF SERVICE

(This section should not be filed with the court unless required by Fed. R. Civ. P. 4 (l))

ceived by me on (date			
☐ I personally serv	yed the summons on the individual at	t (place)	
		on (date)	; or
☐ I left the summo	ns at the individual's residence or us	sual place of abode with (name)	
	, a person	of suitable age and discretion who re	sides there,
on (date)	, and mailed a copy to the	ne individual's last known address; or	
☐ I served the sum	mons on (name of individual)		, who is
designated by law	to accept service of process on behal		
		on (date)	; or
☐ I returned the su	mmons unexecuted because		; or
☐ Other (specify):			
My fees are \$	for travel and \$	for services, for a total of \$	0.00
I declare under pen	alty of perjury that this information i	is true.	
·			
	_		
		Server's signature	
		Printed name and title	

Additional information regarding attempted service, etc:

Print Save As... Reset