## UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT MIDDLE DISTRICT OF FLORIDA TAMPA DIVISION

ANGELA EVANS, on behalf of herself and on behalf of all others similarly situated,

Plaintiff,	Case No.:

v.

SOUTHERN STAR RESTAURANT MANAGEMENT, INC d/b/a DUNKIN DONUTS & BASKIN ROBBINS,

Defendant.	
	/

## COMPLAINT AND DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL

Plaintiff, ANGELA EVANS ("Plaintiff"), by and through undersigned counsel, on behalf of herself and on behalf of all others similarly situated, brings this action against Defendant, SOUTHERN STAR RESTAURANT MANAGEMENT, INC d/b/a DUNKIN DONUTS & BASKIN ROBBINS ("Defendant"), and in support of her claims states as follows:

### JURISDICTION AND VENUE

I. This is an action for damages under the Fair Labor Standards Act ("FLSA"), 29 U.S.C. § 201 et seq., for failure to pay overtime wages under 29 U.S.C. § 215(a)(3) and for violations of the Family and Medical Leave Act of 1993, as amended, 29 U.S.C. § 2601 et seq. ("FMLA"). Count I of this Complaint is filed as a collective action under 29 U.S.C. § 216(b).

- 2. This Court has subject matter jurisdiction under 28 U.S.C. § 1331 and 29 U.S.C. § 201 et seq.
- 3. Venue is proper in the Middle District of Florida, because all of the events giving rise to these claims occurred in Hillsborough County, Florida.

### **PARTIES**

- 4. Plaintiff is a resident of Hillsborough County, Florida.
- 5. Defendant operates a restaurant in Tampa, in Hillsborough County, Florida.

### **GENERAL ALLEGATIONS**

- 6. Plaintiff has satisfied all conditions precedent, or they have been waived.
- 7. Plaintiff has hired the undersigned attorneys and agreed to pay them a fee.
- 8. Plaintiff requests a jury trial for all issues so triable.
- 9. At all times material hereto, Named Plaintiff ANGELA EVANS was employed by Defendant as a shift leader.
- 10. At all times material hereto, Plaintiff and the similarly situated employees were "engaged in the production of goods" for commerce within the meaning of Sections 6 and 7 of the FLSA, and as such were subject to the individual coverage of the FLSA.
- 11. At all times material hereto, Plaintiff and the similarly situated employees were "employees" of Defendant within the meaning of the FLSA.
- 12. At all times material hereto, Defendant was an "employer" within the meaning of the FLSA, 29 U.S.C. § 203(d).
  - 13. Defendant continues to be an "employer" within the meaning of the FLSA.

- 14. At all times material hereto, Defendant was and continues to be an enterprise covered by the FLSA, as defined under 29 U.S.C. §§ 203(r) and 203(s).
- 15. At all times relevant to this action, Defendant engaged in interstate commerce within the meaning of the FLSA, 29 U.S.C. § 203(s).
- 16. At all times relevant to this action, the annual gross sales volume of Defendant exceeded \$500,000 per year.
- 17. At all times material hereto, the work performed by Plaintiff and the similarly situated employees was directly essential to the business performed by Defendant.
- 18. At the time of these events, Plaintiff was an employee of Defendant, and she worked at least 1250 hours in the 12 months preceding her request for leave under the FMLA.
- 19. Thus, Plaintiff is an "eligible employee" within the meaning of the FMLA, 29 U.S.C. § 2611(2).
- 20. Defendant is an "employer" within the meaning of the FMLA, 29 U.S.C. § 2611(4).

### **FACTS**

- 21. Named Plaintiff ANGELA EVANS began working for Defendant as a shift leader in May 2016, and she continues to work in this capacity.
- 22. At various times material hereto, Plaintiff and the similarly situated employees worked hours in excess of forty (40) hours within a work week for Defendant, and they were entitled to be compensated for these overtime hours at a rate equal to one and one-half times their individual regular hourly rates.

- 23. Defendant failed to pay Plaintiff and the similarly situated employees an overtime premium for all of the overtime hours that they worked, in violation of the FLSA.
- 24. Specifically, Defendant's General Manager, Deborah Coddington, was altering Plaintiff and the similarly situated employee's time cards.
- 25. During her employment, Plaintiff observed Ms. Coddington say, "I'm not wasting labor on these people."
- 26. In March 2017, Plaintiff complained to Defendant about its failure to properly pay her and the similarly situated employee an overtime premium.
- 27. By failing to accurately record, report, and/or preserve records of hours worked by Plaintiff and the similarly situated employees, Defendant has failed to make, keep, and preserve records with respect to each of its employees in a manner sufficient to determine their wages, hours, and other conditions of employment, including Defendant's employment practices, in violation of the FLSA, 29 U.S.C. § 201 et seq.
- 28. Defendant's actions were willful, and showed reckless disregard for the provisions of the FLSA.
- 29. In July 2017, Plaintiff notified Defendant that she required time off to care for her father because he suffered from a serious health condition within the meaning of the FMLA.
- 30. Defendant failed to offer Plaintiff FMLA leave or otherwise notify her of her rights under the FMLA.
- 31. In retaliation for her request for leave to care for her father, Defendant cut Plaintiff's hours.

- 32. By requesting time off to care for her father Plaintiff exercised and/or attempted to exercise her rights under the FMLA.
- 33. By cutting Plaintiff's hours, Defendant violated Plaintiff's rights under the FMLA.

### **COLLECTIVE ACTION ALLEGATIONS**

- 34. Plaintiff brings this case as an "opt-in" collective action on behalf of similarly situated employees of Defendant pursuant to 29 U.S.C. § 216(b). The collective action is composed of employees whom Defendant failed to compensate for all overtime hours worked in accordance with the FLSA.
- 35. Therefore, Notice is properly sent to: "All employees whom Defendant failed to compensate for all of the overtime hours that they worked from the three years preceding the filing of this complaint to the present."
- 36. The total number and identities of the similarly situated employees may be determined from the records of Defendant, and the similarly situated employees may easily and quickly be notified of the pendency of this action.
- 37. Plaintiff and the similarly situated employees have been unlawfully denied full payment of their overtime wages as mandated by the FLSA.
- 38. Plaintiff's experience with Defendant's payroll practices is typical of the experiences of the similarly situated employees.
- 39. Defendant's failure to pay all overtime wages due at the rates required by the personal circumstances of the named Plaintiff or the similarly situated employees is common to both.

- 40. Overall, Plaintiff's experience is typical of that of the similarly situated employees.
- 41. Specific job titles or job duties of the similarly situated employees do not prevent collective treatment.
- 42. Although the issues of damages can be individual in character, there remains a common nucleus of operative facts concerning Defendant's liability under the FLSA in this case.

## **COUNT I – FLSA OVERTIME VIOLATIONS**

- 43. Plaintiff realleges and readopts the allegations of Paragraphs 1 through 28 and 34 through 42 of this Complaint, as fully set forth herein. Plaintiff brings this action on behalf of herself and all other similarly situated employees in accordance with 29 U.S.C. § 216(b). Plaintiff anticipates that as this case proceeds, other individuals will sign consent forms and join this collective action as plaintiffs.
- 44. During the statutory period, Plaintiff and the similarly situated employees worked overtime hours while employed by Defendant, and they were not properly compensated for all of these hours under the FLSA.
- 45. Defendant failed to compensate Plaintiff and the similarly situated employees for all of the overtime hours that Plaintiff and they worked.
- 46. The similarly situated employees are similarly situated because they were all employed by Defendant, were compensated in the same manner, and were all subject to Defendant's common policy and practice of failing to pay its employees for all of the overtime hours that they worked in accordance with the FLSA.

- 47. This reckless practice violates the provisions of the FLSA, specifically 29 U.S.C. § 207(a)(1). As a result, Plaintiff and the similarly situated employees who have opted into this action are each entitled to an amount equal to their unpaid overtime wages as liquidated damages.
- 48. All of the foregoing conduct, as alleged, constitutes a willful violation of the FLSA, within the meaning of 29 U.S.C. § 255(a).
- 49. As a result of the foregoing, Plaintiff and the similarly situated employees have suffered damages.

**WHEREFORE**, Plaintiff and all similarly situated employees who join this collective action demand:

- (a) Designation of this action as a collective action on behalf of the Plaintiff and the similarly situated employees that she seeks to represent, in accordance with the FLSA;
- (b) Prompt issuance of notice pursuant to 29 U.S.C. § 216(b) to all similarly situated members of the FLSA putative collective action, apprising them of the pendency of this action and permitting them to assert timely FLSA claims in this action by filing individual consent to sue forms pursuant to 29 U.S.C. § 216(b);
- (c) Equitable tolling of the statute of limitations from the date of the filing of this complaint until the expiration of the deadline for filing consent to sue forms under 29 U.S.C. § 216(b);

- (d) Leave to add additional plaintiffs by motion, the filing of written consent forms, or any other method approved by this Court;
- (e) Judgment against Defendant for an amount equal to the unpaid overtime wages of Plaintiff and of opt-in similarly situated employees at the applicable overtime rate;
- (f) A declaratory judgment stating that the practices complained of herein are unlawful under the FLSA;
- (g) Judgment against Defendant for an amount equal to the unpaid back wages of Plaintiff and of opt-in similarly situated employees at the applicable overtime rate as liquidated damages;
- (h) Judgment against Defendant, stating that its violations of the FLSA were willful;
- (i) To the extent liquidated damages are not awarded, an award of prejudgment interest;
- (j) All costs and attorney's fees incurred in prosecuting these claims; and
- (k) For such further relief as this Court deems just and equitable.

## COUNT II – FMLA INTERFERENCE brought by Plaintiff only

- 50. Plaintiff realleges and readopts the allegations of paragraphs 1 through 8, 18 through 20, and 29 through 33 of this Complaint, as fully set forth herein.
- 51. Plaintiff required time off from work to care for her father, because he suffered from a serious health condition within the meaning of the FMLA, requiring leave protected under the FMLA.

- 52. By failing to offer Plaintiff FMLA leave or otherwise notifying of her rights under the FMLA and then cutting her hours, Defendant interfered with Plaintiff's FMLA rights, in violation of 29 U.S.C. §§ 2614(a)(1)(A) and 2615(a)(2).
  - 53. Defendant's actions were willful and done with malice.
- 54. Plaintiff was injured due to Defendant's violations of the FMLA, for which Plaintiff is entitled to legal and injunctive relief.

### WHEREFORE, Plaintiff demands:

- a) That this Court enter a judgment that Defendant interfered with Plaintiff's rights in violation of the FMLA;
- b) An injunction restraining continued violation of the FMLA by

  Defendant;
- c) Compensation for lost wages, benefits, and other remuneration;
- Reinstatement of Plaintiff to a position comparable to Plaintiff's prior position with back pay plus interest, pension rights and all benefits, or, in the alternative, the entry of a judgment under 29 U.S.C. § 2617(a)(1)(A)(i)(II), against Defendant and in favor of Plaintiff, for the monetary losses that Plaintiff suffered as a direct result of Defendant's violations of the FMLA;
- e) Front pay;
- f) Liquidated Damages;
- g) Prejudgment interest on all monetary recovery obtained;
- h) All costs and attorney's fees incurred in prosecuting these claims; and

i) For such further relief as this Court deems just and equitable.

## COUNT II – FMLA RETALIATION brought by Plaintiff only

- 55. Plaintiff realleges and readopts the allegations set forth in Paragraphs 1 through 8, 18 through 20, and 29 through 33 of this Complaint, as fully set forth herein.
- 56. Plaintiff required time off from work to care for her father, because he suffered from a serious health condition within the meaning of the FMLA, requiring leave protected under the FMLA.
- 57. Plaintiff engaged in protected activity under the FMLA by exercising and/or attempting to exercise her FMLA rights.
- 58. Defendant retaliated against Plaintiff for engaging in protected activity under the FMLA by cutting her hours.
  - 59. Defendant's actions were willful and done with malice.
- 60. Plaintiff was injured by Defendant's violations of the FMLA, for which Plaintiff is entitled to legal and injunctive relief.

### WHEREFORE, Plaintiff demands:

- (a) That this Court enter a judgment that Defendant retaliated against Plaintiff in violation of the FMLA;
- (b) An injunction restraining continued violation of the FMLA by

  Defendant;
- (c) Compensation for lost wages, benefits, and other remuneration;

- (d) Reinstatement of Plaintiff to a position comparable to Plaintiff's prior position with back pay plus interest, pension rights and all benefits or, in the alternative, entry of a judgment under 29 U.S.C. § 2617(a)(1)(A)(i)(II), against Defendant and in favor of Plaintiff, for the monetary losses Plaintiff suffered as a direct result of Defendant's violations of the FMLA;
- (e) Front pay;
- (f) Liquidated Damages;
- (g) Prejudgment interest on all monetary recovery obtained;
- (h) All costs and attorney's fees incurred in prosecuting these claims; and
- (i) For such further relief as this Court deems just and equitable.

## **JURY TRIAL DEMAND**

Plaintiff demands trial by jury as to all issues so triable.

Dated this day of December, 2017.

Respectfully submitted,

CHRISTOPHER J. SABA

Florida Bar Number: 0092016
WENZEL FENTON CABASSA, P.A.

1110 North Florida Avenue, Suite 300

Tampa, Florida 33602

Main Number: 813-224-0431 Direct Dial: 813-321-4086 Facsimile: 813-229-8712 Email: csaba@wfclaw.com Email: tsoriano@wfclaw.com

**Attorneys for Plaintiff** 

JS 44 (Rev. 12/12)

## **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. ISSENSTRUCTIONS ON NEXT PAGE OF THIS FORM.)

purpose or unitiating the civil d	ocket sneet. ANEE INSTRUC	TIONS ON NEXT PAGE O	# THIS FO	RML)				
l. (a) PLAINTIFFS	DEFENDANTS							
ANGELA EVANS, on bel similarly situated, (b) County of Residence of (E)  (c) Attorneys therm Name. CHRISTOPHER J. SABA North Florida Avenue, St.	110	SOUTHERN STAR RESTAURANT MANAGEMENT, INC d/b/a DUNKIN DONUTS & BASKIN ROBBINS,  County of Residence of First Listed Defendant Hillsborough  (IN U.S. PLAINTIFF CASES ONLY)  NOTE: IN LAND CONDEMNATION CASES, USE THE LOCATION OF THE TRACT OF LAND INVOLVED.  Attorneys (If Known)						
813-224-0431 								
II. BASIS OF JURISDI	ICTION (Place on "X" in t	me Box Only)			RINCIPA	L PARTIES.	(Place on "X" in One Box for Plaintif	
コ 1 U.S. Government Plaintiff	■ 3 Federal Question (U.S. Government Not a Party)			(For Diversity Cases Only)  PTF DEF  PTF DEF  PTF DEF  Of This State  Of Business In This State				
2 U.S. Government Defendant	1 4 Diversity (Indicate Citizenship of Parties in Item [II)		Citize	ren of Another State				
IV. NATURE OF CUIT	<u> </u>			n or Subject of a  cign Country	3 (7) 3	Foreign Nation	O 6 O 6	
IV. NATURE OF SUIT		nty)	FO	RFEITURE/PENALTY	I RAN	KRUPTCY	OTHER STATUTES	
☐ 110 Insurance ☐ 120 Marine ☐ 130 Miller Act ☐ 140 Negotiable Instrument ☐ 150 Recovery of Overpayment Æ Enforcement of Judgment ☐ 151 Medicare Act ☐ 152 Recovery of Defaulted Student Loans (Excludes Veterans) ☐ 153 Recovery of Overpayment of Veteran's Benefits ☐ 160 Stockholders' Suits ☐ 190 Other Contract ☐ 195 Contract Product Liability ☐ 196 Franchise  REAL PROPERTY ☐ 210 Land Condemnation ☐ 220 Foreclosure ☐ 230 Rent Lease & Ejectment ☐ 245 Tort Product Liability ☐ 290 All Other Real Property	PERSONAL INJURY ☐ 310 Airplane ☐ 315 Airplane Product Liability ☐ 320 Assault, Libel &	PERSONAL INJURY  365 Personal Injury - Product Liability  367 Heath Care' Pharmaceutical Personal injury Product Liability  368 Asbestos Personal Injury Product Liability PERSONAL PROPER  370 Other Fraud  371 Truth in Lending  380 Other Personal Property Damage Product Liability  PRISONER PETITION  Habeas Carpus:  463 Alien Detainee  510 Motions to Vacate Sentence  530 General  535 Death Penalty Other:	7	5 Drug Related Scizure of Property 21 USC 881 0 Other  LABOR 0 Fair Labor Standards Act 0 Labor/Management Relations 0 Railway Labor Act 1 Family and Medical Leave Act 0 Other Labor Litigation 1 Employee Retirement Income Security Act  IMMIGRATION 2 Naturalization Application 5 Other Immigration Actions	☐ 422 Appe ☐ 423 With ☐ 28 U  PROPEE ☐ 820 Copy ☐ 830 Paten ☐ 840 Trade  SOCIAL ☐ 861 HIA (☐ 862 Black ☐ 863 DIW ☐ 864 SSID ☐ 865 RSI (☐ ☐ 870 Taxes or Dc ☐ 871 IRS— ☐ 26 U.	ral 28 USC 158 drawal ISC 157  RTY RIGHTS rrights at emark  SECURITY (1395ft) k Lung (923) C/DIWW (405(g)) Title XVI 405(g))  AL TAX SUITS s (U.S. Plaintiff efendant)	OTHER STATUTES  ☐ 375 False Claims Act ☐ 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	
Proceeding Sta	Cite the U.S. Civil Sta 29 U.S.C. § 201 6 Brief description of ca FLSA OVERTIME	Appeliate Court state under which you ar st seq., 29 U.S.C. § suse: E VIOLATIONS, FM IS A CLASS ACTION	2601 et		r District futes unless div. § 216(b)	ON and COLLI	ECTIVE ACTION  If demanded in complaint:	
COMPLAINT: VIII. RELATED CASE IF ANY DATE FOR OFFICE USE ONLY	E(S) (See instructions):	JUDGE SUNVIURE OF ATT	DRNEY O	FRECORD		URY DEMAND:		
RECEIPT # AN	SOUNT	APPLYING IFP _		JUDGE		MAG. JUE	OGE	

# **ClassAction.org**

This complaint is part of ClassAction.org's searchable class action lawsuit database and can be found in this post: <u>Tampa Dunkin Donuts/Baskin Robbins Operator Facing Unpaid Overtime Allegations in Suit</u>