UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS HOUSTON DIVISION

TRAVIS EASON, JR., individually and)	
on behalf of similarly situated persons,)	
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·) Case	No
Plaintiff,)	
) <u>JURY</u>	TRIAL DEMANDED
v.)	
)	
HOUSTON PIZZA VENTURE, LP,)	
HPV-C LLC, and HPV Staff, LLC)	
)	
Defendant.)	

COLLECTIVE ACTION COMPLAINT

Plaintiff Travis Eason, Jr., individually and on behalf of all other similarly situated delivery drivers, for his Complaint against Defendants, alleges as follows:

1. During times relevant, Defendants Houston Pizza Venture, LP, HPV-C, LLC, and HPV Staff, LLC have owned and operated as many as approximately 54 Papa John's franchise stores in Texas. Defendants employ delivery drivers who use their own automobiles to deliver pizza and other food items to customers. Instead of reimbursing delivery drivers for the reasonably approximate costs of the business use of their vehicles, Defendants use a flawed method to determine reimbursement rates that provides such an unreasonably low reimbursement rate beneath any reasonable approximation of the expenses they incur that the drivers' unreimbursed expenses

cause their wages to fall below the federal minimum wage during some or all workweeks.

2. Plaintiff Travis Eason, Jr. brings this lawsuit as a collective action under the Fair Labor Standards Act (FLSA), 29 U.S.C. § 201 *et seq.*, to recover unpaid minimum wages owed to himself and similarly situated delivery drivers employed by Defendants at their Papa John's stores.

Jurisdiction and Venue

- 3. The FLSA authorizes court actions by private parties to recover damages for violation of the FLSA's wage and hour provisions. Jurisdiction over Plaintiff's FLSA claim is based on 29 U.S.C. § 216(b) and 28 U.S.C. § 1331.
- 4. Venue in this District is proper under 28 U.S.C. § 1391 because Defendants operate Papa John's franchise stores in this District, Defendants employed Plaintiff in this District, and a substantial part of the events giving rise to the claim herein occurred in this District.

Parties

5. Defendant Houston Pizza Venture, LP is a Texas limited partnership maintaining its principal place of business in this District and operating Papa John's stores in this District.

- 6. Defendant HPV-C, LLC is a Texas limited liability company maintaining its principal place of business within this District and operating Papa John's stores within this District.
- 7. Defendant HPV Staff, LLC is a Texas limited liability company maintaining its principal place of business within this District and operating Papa John's stores within this District.
- 8. Defendant HPV-C, LLC has served as the general partner of Defendant Houston Pizza Ventures, LP, and thus Defendant HPV-C, LLC is liable for the actions and omissions of Defendant Houston Pizza Ventures, LP.
- 9. Defendants comprise a single integrated enterprise and jointly operate a chain of approximately 54 Papa John's restaurants as they maintain interrelated operations, centralized control of labor relations, common management and common ownership and financial control.
- 10. Alternatively, because the work performed by Plaintiff and all other delivery drivers simultaneously benefited all Defendants and directly or indirectly furthered their joint interests, Defendants are collectively the joint employers of Plaintiff and other similarly situated employees under the FLSA's broad definition of "employer."
- 10. Plaintiff Travis Eason Jr. was employed by Defendants from approximately February 2015 to September 2015 as a delivery driver at their Papa John's store at 6455 West 43rd Street, Houston, Texas 77092-4005, which is located within this District.

Plaintiff Eason's Consent to Become a Party Plaintiff under 29 U.S.C. § 216(b) is attached as **Exhibit 1**.

General Allegations

Defendants' Business

- 11. During times relevant, Defendants have owned and operated as many as approximately 54 Papa John's franchise stores in Texas.
- 12. Defendants' Papa John's stores employ delivery drivers who all have the same primary job duty: to deliver pizzas and other food items to customers' homes or workplaces.

Defendants' Flawed Reimbursement Policy

- 13. Defendants require their delivery drivers to maintain and pay for safe, legally-operable, and insured automobiles when delivering pizza and other food items.
- 14. Defendants' delivery drivers incur costs for gasoline, vehicle parts and fluids, repair and maintenance services, insurance, depreciation, and other expenses ("automobile expenses") while delivering pizzas for the primary benefit of Defendants.
- 15. Defendants' delivery driver reimbursement policy reimburses drivers on a perdelivery basis, but given the distance of the average delivery the per-delivery reimbursement equates to a per-mile rate far below the IRS business mileage reimbursement rate or any other reasonable approximation of the cost to own and operate a motor vehicle. This policy applies to all of Defendants' delivery drivers.

16. The result of Defendants' delivery driver reimbursement policy is a reimbursement of much less than a reasonable approximation of their drivers' automobile expenses.

17. During the applicable FLSA limitations period, the IRS business mileage reimbursement rate has ranged between \$.574 and \$.575 per mile between 2014-2017. Likewise, reputable companies that study the cost of owning and operating a motor vehicle and/or reasonable reimbursement rates, including the American Automobile Association ("AAA"), have determined that the average cost of owning and operating a sedan ranged between \$.571 and \$.608 per mile between 2014 and 2016 for drivers who drive a sedan approximately 15,000 miles per year. These figures represent a reasonable approximation of the average cost of owning and operating a vehicle for use in delivering pizzas during the recovery period.

18. The driving conditions associated with the pizza delivery business cause more frequent maintenance costs, higher costs due to repairs associated with driving, and more rapid depreciation from driving as much as, and in the manner of, a delivery driver. Defendants' delivery drivers further experience lower gas mileage and higher repair costs than the average driver used to determine the average cost of owning and operating a vehicle described above due to the nature of the delivery business, including frequent starting and stopping of the engine, frequent braking, short routes as opposed to highway driving, and driving under time pressures.

- 19. Defendants' reimbursement policy does not reimburse delivery drivers for even their ongoing out-of-pocket expenses, much less other costs they incur to own and operate their vehicle, and thus Defendants uniformly fail to reimburse their delivery drivers at any reasonable approximation of the cost of owning and operating their vehicles for Defendants' benefit.
- 20. Defendants' systematic failure to adequately reimburse automobile expenses constitutes a "kickback" to Defendants such that the hourly wages it pays to Plaintiff and Defendants' other delivery drivers are not paid free and clear of all outstanding obligations to Defendants.
- 21. Defendants fail to reasonably approximate the amount of their drivers' automobile expenses to such an extent that their drivers' net wages are diminished beneath the federal minimum wage requirements.
- 22. In sum, Defendants' reimbursement policy and methodology fail to reflect the realities of their delivery drivers' automobile expenses.

Defendants' Failure to Reasonably Reimburse Automobile Expenses Causes Minimum Wage Violations

23. Regardless of the precise amount of the per-delivery reimbursement at any given point in time, Defendants' reimbursement formula has resulted in an unreasonable underestimation of delivery drivers' automobile expenses throughout the recovery period, causing systematic violations of the federal minimum wage.

- 24. Plaintiff Eason was paid \$7.25 per hour during his employment with Defendants, including a tip credit.
 - 25. The federal minimum wage has been \$7.25 per hour since July 24, 2009.
- 26. Defendants' per-delivery reimbursement rate at the store was approximately \$1.25, which was consistent with the reimbursement rates at Defendants' other stores.
- 27. Throughout his employment with Defendants, Plaintiff Eason experienced an average delivery distance of at least 6 miles.
- 28. Thus, during the applicable limitations period, Defendants' average effective reimbursement rate for Plaintiff Eason was approximately \$0.21 per mile (\$1.25 per delivery / 6 miles per delivery) or less.
- 29. During this same time period, the lowest IRS business mileage reimbursement rate was \$.535 per mile, which reasonably approximated the automobile expenses incurred delivering pizzas. http://www.irs.gov/Tax-Professionals/Standard-Mileage-Rates. Using that IRS rate as a reasonable approximation of Plaintiff Eason's automobile expenses, every mile driven on the job decreased his net wages by approximately \$.325 (\$.535 \$.21) per mile. Considering Plaintiff Eason's estimate of at least 6 average miles per delivery, Defendants under-reimbursed him about \$1.95 per delivery (\$.325 x 6 miles) or more.
- 30. During his employment by Defendants, Plaintiff Eason typically averaged approximately 2 deliveries per hour.

- 31. Thus, comparing Defendants' reimbursement rate to the IRS rate, Plaintiff Eason consistently "kicked back" to Defendants approximately \$3.90 per hour (\$1.95 per delivery x 2 deliveries per hour), for an effective hourly wage rate of about \$3.35 (\$7.25 per hour \$3.90 kickback) or less.
- 32. All of Defendants' delivery drivers had similar experiences to those of Plaintiff Eason. They were subject to the same reimbursement policy; received similar reimbursements; incurred similar automobile expenses; completed deliveries of similar distances and at similar frequencies; and were paid at or near the federal minimum wage before deducting unreimbursed business expenses.
- 33. Because Defendants paid their drivers a gross hourly wage at precisely, or at least very close to, the federal minimum wage, and because the delivery drivers incurred unreimbursed automobile expenses, the delivery drivers "kicked back" to Defendants an amount sufficient to cause minimum wage violations.
- 34. While the amount of Defendants' actual reimbursements per delivery may vary over time, Defendants are relying on the same flawed policy and methodology with respect to all delivery drivers at all of their other Papa John's stores. Thus, although reimbursement amounts may differ somewhat by time or region, the amounts of underreimbursements relative to automobile costs incurred are relatively consistent between time and region.

- 35. Defendants' low reimbursement rates were a frequent complaint of at least some of Defendants' delivery drivers, including Plaintiff, yet Defendants continued to reimburse at a rate much less than any reasonable approximation of delivery drivers' automobile expenses.
- 36. The net effect of Defendants' flawed reimbursement policy is that they willfully fail to pay the federal minimum wage to their delivery drivers. Defendants thereby enjoy ill-gained profits at the expense of their employees.

Collective Action Allegations

- 37. Plaintiff brings this FLSA claim as an "opt-in" collective action on behalf of similarly situated delivery drivers pursuant to 29 U.S.C. § 216(b).
- 38. The FLSA claims may be pursued by those who opt-in to this case pursuant to 29 U.S.C. § 216(b).
- 39. Plaintiff, individually and on behalf of other similarly situated employees, seeks relief on a collective basis challenging Defendants' practice of failing to pay employees federal minimum wage. The number and identity of other plaintiffs yet to opt-in may be ascertained from Defendants' records, and potential class members may be notified of the pendency of this action via mail.
 - 40. Plaintiff and all of Defendants' delivery drivers are similarly situated in that:
 - a. They have worked as delivery drivers for Defendants delivering pizza and other food items to Defendants' customers;

- b. They have delivered pizzas and food items using automobiles not owned or maintained by Defendants;
- c. Defendants required them to maintain these automobiles in a safe, legallyoperable, and insured condition;
- d. They incurred costs for automobile expenses while delivering pizzas and food items for the primary benefit of Defendants;
- e. They were subject to similar driving conditions, automobile expenses, delivery distances, and delivery frequencies;
- f. They were subject to the same pay policies and practices of Defendants;
- g. They were subject to the same delivery driver reimbursement policy that underestimates automobile expenses per mile, and thereby systematically deprived them of reasonably approximate reimbursements, resulting in wages below the federal minimum wage in some or all workweeks;
- h. They were reimbursed similar set amounts of automobile expenses per delivery; and
- They were paid at or near the federal minimum wage before deducting unreimbursed business expenses.

Count I: Violation of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938

41. Plaintiff reasserts and re-alleges the allegations set forth above.

- 42. The FLSA regulates, among other things, the payment of minimum wage by employers whose employees are engaged in interstate commerce, or engaged in the production of goods for commerce, or employed in an enterprise engaged in commerce or in the production of goods for commerce. 29 U.S.C. §206(a).
- 43. Defendants are subject to the FLSA's minimum wage requirements because they are enterprises engaged in interstate commerce, and their employees are engaged in commerce.
- 44. At all relevant times herein, Plaintiff has been entitled to the rights, protections, and benefits provided under the FLSA, 29 U.S.C. §§ 201, et seq.
- 45. Section 13 of the FLSA, codified at 29 U.S.C. § 213, exempts certain categories of employees from federal minimum wage obligations. None of the FLSA exemptions apply to Plaintiff or other similarly situated delivery drivers.
- 46. Under Section 6 of the FLSA, codified at 29 U.S.C. § 206, employees have been entitled to be compensated at a rate of at least \$7.25 per hour since July 24, 2009.
- 47. As alleged herein, Defendants have and continue to uniformly reimburse delivery drivers less than the reasonably approximate amount of their automobile expenses to such an extent that it diminishes these employees' wages beneath the federal minimum wage.

- 48. Defendants knew or should have known that their pay and reimbursement policies, practices and methodology result in failure to compensate delivery drivers at the federal minimum wage.
- 49. Defendants, pursuant to their policy and practice, violated the FLSA by refusing and failing to pay federal minimum wage to Plaintiff and other similarly situated employees.
- 50. Plaintiff and all similarly situated delivery drivers are victims of a uniform and employer-based compensation and reimbursement policy. This uniform policy, in violation of the FLSA, has been applied, and continues to be applied, to all delivery driver employees in Defendants' stores.
- 51. Plaintiff and all similarly situated employees are entitled to damages equal to the minimum wage minus actual wages received after deducting reasonably approximated automobile expenses within the later of three years from the date each Plaintiff joins this case or the date that Defendants became the employers of each Plaintiff, plus periods of equitable tolling, because Defendants acted willfully and knew, or showed reckless disregard for, whether their conduct was unlawful.
- 52. Defendants have acted neither in good faith nor with reasonable grounds to believe that their actions and omissions were not a violation of the FLSA, and as a result, Plaintiff and other similarly situated employees are entitled to recover an award of liquidated damages in an amount equal to the amount of unpaid minimum wages

under 29 U.S.C. § 216(b). Alternatively, should the Court find Defendants are not liable for liquidated damages, Plaintiff and all similarly situated employees are entitled to an award of prejudgment interest at the applicable legal rate.

53. As a result of the aforesaid willful violations of the FLSA's minimum wage provisions, minimum wage compensation has been unlawfully withheld by Defendants from Plaintiff and all similarly situated employees. Accordingly, Defendants are liable under 29 U.S.C. § 216(b), together with an additional amount as liquidated damages, pre-judgment and post-judgment interest, reasonable attorneys' fees, and costs of this action.

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff and all similarly situated delivery drivers demand judgment against Defendants and request: (1) compensatory damages; (2) liquidated damages; (3) attorneys' fees and costs as allowed by Section 16(b) of the FLSA; (4) pre-judgment and post-judgment interest as provided by law; and (5) such other relief as the Court deems fair and equitable.

Demand for Jury Trial

Plaintiff hereby requests a trial by jury of all issues triable by jury.

Dated: May 23, 2017

PAUL LLP

Richard M. Paul III (MO #44233)

(pro hac vice forthcoming)

601 Walnut Street, Suite 300

Kansas City, Missouri 64106

Telephone: (816) 984-8100

Facsimile: (816) 984-8101

Rick@PaulLLP.com

Respectfully submitted,

WATTS GUERRA LLP

/s/ Ryan Thompson

Ryan Thompson

Attorney in Charge

State Bar No. 24046969

So. Dist. of Tex. Bar No. 602642

4 Dominion Drive

Building 3, Suite 100

San Antonio, Texas 78257

Telephone: (210) 527-0500

Facsimile: (210) 527-0501

rthompson@wattsguerra.com

WEINHAUS & POTASHNICK

Mark A. Potashnick

(pro hac vice forthcoming)

11500 Olive Blvd., Suite 133

St. Louis, Missouri 63141

Telephone: (314) 997-9150

Facsimile: (314) 997-9170

markp@wp-attorneys.com

ATTORNEYS FOR PLAINTIFF

Case 4:17-cv-01574 Document $\frac{1}{2}$ Eiled in TXSD on 05/23/17 Page 1 of 2

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 a	ocket sneet. (SEE INSTRUC	TIONS ON NEXT PAGE O	FTHISFC	ORM.)					
I. (a) PLAINTIFFS TRAVIS EASON, JR., in- persons	dividually and on beha	If of similarly situate	ed	DEFENDANTS HOUSTON PIZZA	VENTUR	E LP, HPV-C	LLC, and HF	'V STAF	FF LLC
(b) County of Residence of First Listed Plaintiff Minnehaha SD (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.					
(c) Attorneys (Firm Name, Richard M. Paul III (Paul (816) 984-8100); Ryan T Building 3, Suite 100, Sa	LLP, 601 Walnut, Suit hompson (Watts Guer	te 300, KCMO 6410 ra LLP, 4 Dominior	Dr,	Attorneys (If Known)					
II. BASIS OF JURISDI	ICTION (Place an "X" in O	ne Box Only)		TIZENSHIP OF P	RINCIPA	AL PARTIES			
☐ 1 U.S. Government Plaintiff	★ 3 Federal Question (U.S. Government)	Not a Party)		(For Diversity Cases Only) PT en of This State		Incorporated or Proof Business In T		PTF	DEF
☐ 2 U.S. Government Defendant	☐ 4 Diversity (Indicate Citizenshi)	ip of Parties in Item III)	Citiz	en of Another State	2 🗖 2	Incorporated and of Business In		□ 5	□ 5
				en or Subject of a reign Country	3 🗖 3	Foreign Nation		□ 6	□ 6
IV. NATURE OF SUIT			F	ADEFITIIDE/DENALTV					FS
□ 110 Insurance □ 120 Marine □ 130 Miller Act □ 140 Negotiable Instrument □ 150 Recovery of Overpayment	PERSONAL INJURY ☐ 310 Airplane ☐ 315 Airplane Product Liability ☐ 320 Assault, Libel &	PERSONAL INJURY 365 Personal Injury - Product Liability Pharmaceutical Personal Injury - Product Liability 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 & Othersion Confirement	X	CABOR LABOR Other LABOR Fair Labor Standards Act Labor/Management Relations Railway Labor Act Family and Medical Leave Act Character Labor Litigation Employee Retirement Income Security Act IMMIGRATION Not Naturalization Application Nother Immigration Actions	□ 422 App □ 423 With 28 U PROPE □ 820 Copp □ 830 Pate □ 840 Trad □ 861 HIA □ 862 Blae □ 863 DIW □ 864 SSII □ 865 RSI □ 870 Taxe or E □ 871 IRS- 26 U	RTY RIGHTS yrights nt emark SECURITY (1395ff) k 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 □ 490 Cable/s □ 890 Other S □ 891 Agricu □ 893 Enviro □ 895 Freedo Act □ 896 Arbitra □ 899 Admin Act/Re Agency □ 950 Constit	Code Descriptions. OTHER STATUTES □ 375 False Claims Act □ 376 Qui Tam (31 USC 3729(a)) □ 400 State Reapportionment □ 410 Antitrust □ 430 Banks and Banking □ 450 Commerce □ 460 Deportation □ 470 Racketeer Influenced and Corrupt Organizations □ 480 Consumer Credit □ 490 Cable/Sat TV □ 850 Securities/Commodities/ Exchange □ 890 Other Statutory Actions □ 891 Agricultural Acts □ 893 Environmental Matters □ 895 Freedom of Information Act □ 896 Arbitration □ 899 Administrative Procedure Act/Review or Appeal of Agency Decision □ 950 Constitutionality of State Statutes	
	moved from 3 tte Court Cite the U.S. Civil Sta	Appellate Court	Reoj	istated or	r District	☐ 6 Multidist Litigation Transfer		Multidis Litigatio Direct F	n -
VI. CAUSE OF ACTIO	ON 29 U.S.C. 201 et Brief description of carecovery of unpair	nuse:							
VII. REQUESTED IN COMPLAINT:		IS A CLASS ACTION) D	EMAND \$		CHECK YES only URY DEMAND	•	n complair	nt:
VIII. RELATED CASI IF ANY	E(S) (See instructions):	JUDGE			DOCKI	ET NUMBER			
DATE 5/23/2017		signature of att s/ Ryan L. Tho		OF RECORD					
FOR OFFICE USE ONLY									
RECEIPT # Al	MOUNT	APPLYING IFP		JUDGE		MAG. JU	DGE		

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 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

Southern District of Texas

Southern District of Texas								
TRAVIS EASON, JR., individually and on behalf of similarly situated persons, Plaintiff V. HOUSTON PIZZA VENTURE, LP, HPV-C LLC, and HPV Staff, LLC Defendant))) Civil Action No.))							
SUMMONS	IN A CIVIL ACTION							
FRED R FRANZONI IV 25329 BUDDE R,D STE	To: (Defendant's name and address) Houston Pizza Venture, LP							
A lawsuit has been filed against you. Within 21 days after service of this summons or	n you (not counting the day you received it) — or 60 days if you							
are the United States or a United States agency, or an officer or employee of the United States described in Fed. R. Civ. P. 12 (a)(2) or (3) — you must serve on the plaintiff an answer to the attached complaint or a motion under Rule 12 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure. The answer or motion must be served on the plaintiff or plaintiff's attorney, whose name and address are: Richard M. Paul III (Paul LLP, 601 Walnut, Suite 300, KCMO 64106, (816) 984-8100); Ryan Thompson (Watts Guerra LLP, 4 Dominion Dr, Building 3, Suite 100, San Antonio, Texas 78257, (210) 527-0500); Mark A. Potashnick (Weinhaus & Potashnick, 11500 Olive Blvd., Suite 133, St. Louis, Missouri 63141, (314) 997-9150)								
If you fail to respond, judgment by default will be entered against you for the relief demanded in the complaint. You also must file your answer or motion with the court.								
	CLERK OF COURT							
Date:								
	Signature of Clerk or Deputy Clerk							

AO 440 (Rev. 12/09) 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))

	This summons for (na	me of individual and title, if	^c any)			
was re	ceived by me on (date)					
	☐ I personally served	d the summons on the i	ndividual at (place)			
				on (date)	; or	
	☐ I left the summons	s at the individual's resi	idence or usual pla	ce of abode with (name)		
		,	, a person of suitab	le age and discretion who resid	des the	e,
	on (date)	, and mailed	a copy to the indiv	idual's last known address; or		
	☐ I served the summ	ons on (name of individua	<i>l</i>)			, who is
	designated by law to	accept service of proce				
				on (date)	; or	
	☐ I returned the sum	mons unexecuted becar	use			; or
	☐ Other (specify):					
	My fees are \$	for travel and	d\$	for services, for a total of \$		0.00
	I declare under penalt	ty of perjury that this ir	nformation is true.			
Date:		-		Server's signature		
		_		Printed name and title		
		_		Server's address		

Additional information regarding attempted service, etc:

Print Save As... Reset

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

for the

District of T

Southern District of Texas					
TRAVIS EASON, JR., individually and on behalf of similarly situated persons, Plaintiff					
SUMMONS IN A CIVIL ACTION					
To: (Defendant's name and address) HPV STAFF LLC c/o FRED R FRANZONI IV 25329 BUDDE R,D STE 704 THE WOODLANDS, TX 77380-1695					
A lawsuit has been filed against you.					
Within 21 days after service of this summons on you (not counting the day you received it) — or 60 days if you are the United States or a United States agency, or an officer or employee of the United States described in Fed. R. Civ. P. 12 (a)(2) or (3) — you must serve on the plaintiff an answer to the attached complaint or a motion under Rule 12 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure. The answer or motion must be served on the plaintiff or plaintiff's attorney, whose name and address are: Richard M. Paul III (Paul LLP, 601 Walnut, Suite 300, KCMO 64106, (816) 984-8100); Ryan Thompson (Watts Guerra LLP, 4 Dominion Dr, Building 3, Suite 100, San Antonio, Texas 78257, (210) 527-0500); Mark A. Potashnick (Weinhaus & Potashnick, 11500 Olive Blvd., Suite 133, St. Louis, Missouri 63141, (314) 997-9150)					
If you fail to respond, judgment by default will be entered against you for the relief demanded in the complaint. You also must file your answer or motion with the court.					
CLERK OF COURT					
Date:					

AO 440 (Rev. 12/09) 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))

was re	ceived by me on (date)	·					
	☐ I personally served	the summons on the individual a	t (place)				
			on (date)	; or			
	☐ I left the summons a	at the individual's residence or us	sual place of abode with (name)				
	, a person of suitable age and discretion who resides the						
	on (date)	, and mailed a copy to t	he individual's last known address; or				
	☐ I served the summo	ons on (name of individual)		, who is			
	designated by law to a	accept service of process on behal	If of (name of organization)				
			on (date)	; or			
	☐ I returned the summ	nons unexecuted because		; or			
	☐ Other (specify):						
	My fees are \$	for travel and \$	for services, for a total of \$	0.00			
	I declare under penalty	of perjury that this information	is true.				
Date:							
			Server's signature				
			Printed name and title				
			Server's address				

Additional information regarding attempted service, etc:

Print Save As... Reset

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

for the

Southern District of Texas

Southern District of Texas								
TRAVIS EASON, JR., individually and on behalf of similarly situated persons, Plaintiff V. HOUSTON PIZZA VENTURE, LP, HPV-C LLC, and HPV Staff, LLC Defendant))) Civil Action No.))							
SUMMONS I	IN A CIVIL ACTION							
25329 BUDDE R,D STE								
A lawsuit has been filed against you.								
Within 21 days after service of this summons on you (not counting the day you received it) — or 60 days if you are the United States or a United States agency, or an officer or employee of the United States described in Fed. R. Civ. P. 12 (a)(2) or (3) — you must serve on the plaintiff an answer to the attached complaint or a motion under Rule 12 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure. The answer or motion must be served on the plaintiff or plaintiff's attorney, whose name and address are: Richard M. Paul III (Paul LLP, 601 Walnut, Suite 300, KCMO 64106, (816) 984-8100); Ryan Thompson (Watts Guerra LLP, 4 Dominion Dr, Building 3, Suite 100, San Antonio, Texas 78257, (210) 527-0500); Mark A. Potashnick (Weinhaus & Potashnick, 11500 Olive Blvd., Suite 133, St. Louis, Missouri 63141, (314) 997-9150)								
If you fail to respond, judgment by default will be entered against you for the relief demanded in the complaint. You also must file your answer or motion with the court.								
	CLERK OF COURT							
Date:								
	Signature of Clerk or Deputy Clerk							

AO 440 (Rev. 12/09) 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))

	This summons for (na	me of individual and title, if	^c any)			
was re	ceived by me on (date)					
	☐ I personally served	d the summons on the i	ndividual at (place)			
				on (date)	; or	
	☐ I left the summons	s at the individual's resi	idence or usual pla	ce of abode with (name)		
		,	, a person of suitab	le age and discretion who resid	des the	e,
	on (date)	, and mailed	a copy to the indiv	idual's last known address; or		
	☐ I served the summ	ons on (name of individua	<i>l</i>)			, who is
	designated by law to	accept service of proce				
				on (date)	; or	
	☐ I returned the sum	mons unexecuted becar	use			; or
	☐ Other (specify):					
	My fees are \$	for travel and	d\$	for services, for a total of \$		0.00
	I declare under penalt	ty of perjury that this ir	nformation is true.			
Date:		-		Server's signature		
		_		Printed name and title		
		_		Server's address		

Additional information regarding attempted service, etc:

Print Save As... Reset

ClassAction.org

This complaint is part of ClassAction.org's searchable class action lawsuit database and can be found in this post: Papa John's Delivery Drivers Claim to be Underpaid