UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT MIDDLE DISTRICT OF FLORIDA TAMPA DIVISION CASE NO.

LA SHANNA FAREED, individually, and as class representatives of others similarly situated,

Plaintiffs,

vs.

PURE NATURAL NAIL LOUNGE, LLC A Florida Limited Liability Company, and COY V. BENTLEY, TUYEN T. BENTLEY, and IAN PRATT Individually.

Defendants.

COMPLAINT AND DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL

The Plaintiff, LA SHANNA FAREED, , individually, and as class representative of others similarly situated (herein after referred to as "Plaintiffs"), by and through their undersigned counsel, sue PURE NATURAL NAIL LOUNGE, LLC, COY V. BENTLEY, individually; TUYEN T. BENTLEY, individually; and IAN PRATT, individually, (collectively referred to as "Defendants") for violations of the minimum wage and overtime provisions of the Fair Labor Standards Act ("FLSA") 29 USC §§ 206 and 207 and states as follows:

PRELIMINARY STATEMENT

1. The Plaintiffs bring this action for violations of the FLSA §207 for failure to pay overtime compensation.

- The Plaintiffs bring this action for violations of the FLSA §206 for failure to pay minimum wages.
- 3. Defendants unlawfully misclassified Plaintiffs as exempt employees to avoid compensating them for time worked in excess of forty (40) hours per week.
- 4. Defendants failed to pay Plaintiffs in accordance with the FLSA. Specifically, Plaintiffs were not paid minimum wages or time and a half of their regular rate of pay for all hours worked in excess of forty (40) hours per week.
- In this pleading, "Defendants", means the named Defendants, PURE NATURAL NAIL LOUNGE, LLC; COY V. BENTLEY, individually; TUYEN T. BENTLEY, individually; and IAN PRATT, individually, and other corporations, organization's or entities responsible for the employment practices complained of herein (discovery may reveal additional Defendants that should be included).
- 6. The allegations in this pleading are made without any admission that, as to any particular allegation, Plaintiffs bear the burden of pleading, proof, or persuasion.

 Plaintiffs reserve all rights to plead in the alternative.

PARTIES, JURISDICTION AND VENUE

- 7. This Court has subject matter jurisdiction over Plaintiffs' claims pursuant to 28 USC §§ 1331 and 1337 and 29 USC § 216(b) because this action involves a federal question under the Fair Labor Standards Act.
- 8. The Court has supplemental jurisdiction with respect to claims arising under state law pursuant to 28 USC § 1367.
- Venue is proper in the District Court because Defendants operate substantial business in the Middle District of Florida. Furthermore, the damages complained

- of occurred in the Middle District at the Defendants' places of business located in the Middle District of Florida.
- 10. Plaintiff, LA SHANNA FAREED, is a resident of Pinellas County, Florida, and was employed by Defendants as a nail technician, massage therapist and hair stylist from approximately January 5, 2015 until November 17, 2016.
- 11. At all times relevant to this action, Plaintiffs have been employees within the meaning of 29 USC § 203(e)(I).

PURE NATURAL NAIL LOUNGE, LLC

- Defendant PURE NATURAL NAIL LOUNGE, LLC is a Florida Limited Liability Company with its principal address at 204 37th Ave. N., #364, St. Petersburg, FL 33704 and may be served through its registered agent for service of process, COY V. BENTLEY, at his stated address at 204 37th Ave. N., #364, St. Petersburg, FL 33704.
- 13. At all times material hereto, PURE NATURAL NAIL LOUNGE, LLC was an "enterprise engaged in commerce" within the meaning of the FLSA.
- 14. At all times material hereto, PURE NATURAL NAIL LOUNGE, LLC was the "employer" of Plaintiffs within the meaning of the FLSA, 29 USC § 203.
- 15. The FLSA defines "employer" as any "person" acting directly or indirectly in the interests of an employer in relation to an employee. 29 USC § 203(d). See also *Boucher v. Shaw*, 572 Fed. 3d 1087, 1090 (9th Cir. 2009) (the definition of "employer" under the Fair Labor Standards Act (FLSA) is not limited by the common-law concept of "employer", but is to be given an expansive interpretation in order to effectuate the FLSA's broad remedial purposes).

- 16. This action is brought under the FLSA to recover from Defendants unpaid minimum wages, overtime wages, monies due and owing, liquidated damages, and reasonable attorneys' fees and costs.
- 17. All conditions precedent to the filing of this action have been performed.

COY V. BENTLEY

Defendant COY V. BENTLEY is a Florida resident and/or is an individual who conducts business in the State of Florida. He is the Managing Member of PURE NATURAL NAIL LOUNGE, LLC. He created and directed the pay practices and controlled and directed the work of Plaintiffs, thus making him an employer within the meaning of the FLSA. See *In Re: Van Diepen, P.A.*, 236 F. App'x 498, 12 Wage & Hour Cas. 2d (BNA) 1358 (11th Cir. 2007) (allowing individual liability).

TUYEN T. BENTLEY.

19. Defendant TUYEN T. BENTLEY is a Florida resident and/or is an individual who conducts business in the State of Florida. She is a Managing Member of PURE NATURAL NAIL LOUNGE, LLC. She created and directed the pay practices and controlled and directed the work of Plaintiffs, thus making her an employer within the meaning of the FLSA. See *In Re: Van Diepen, P.A.*, 236 F. App'x 498, 12 Wage & Hour Cas. 2d (BNA) 1358 (11th Cir. 2007) (allowing individual liability).

IAN <u>PRATT</u>

20. Defendant IAN PRATT is a Florida resident and/or is an individual who conducts business in the State of Florida. He is the Managing Partner of PURE NATURAL NAIL LOUNGE, LLC. He created and directed the pay practices and controlled and directed the work of Plaintiffs, thus making him an employer within the

meaning of the FLSA. See *In Re: Van Diepen, P.A.*, 236 F. App'x 498, 12 Wage & Hour Cas. 2d (BNA) 1358 (11th Cir. 2007) (allowing individual liability).

GENERAL ALLEGATIONS

- 21. The Plaintiff, LA SHANNA FAREED, is a resident of Pinellas County, Florida, and was employed by Defendants as a nail technician, massage therapist and a hair stylist from approximately January 5, 2015 until November 17, 2016.
- 22. Plaintiffs' job duties also included performing hair, nail and spa services for customs and patrons, and all other activities so directed by COY V. BENTLEY, PURE NATURAL NAIL LOUNGE, LLC, TUYEN T. BENTLEY, and IAN PRATT, and its officer and agents.
- 23. Plaintiffs were provided with a list of duties and tasks to perform by PURE NATURAL NAIL LOUNGE, LLC, and its officer and agent COY V. BENTLEY.
- 24. At all times relevant, Plaintiffs were supervised by PURE NATURAL NAIL LOUNGE, LLC, and its officers and agents TUYEN T. BENTLEY, IAN PRATT and COY V. BENTLEY, and did not have the right to independent operations or decision-making.
- 25. Plaintiffs were paid less than the minimum wage for work performed on behalf of the Defendants.
- 26. Plaintiffs worked in excess of forty (40) hours per week, but did not receive appropriate overtime compensation.
- 27. Defendants' failure to properly pay Plaintiffs was a willful violation of the FLSA.
- 28. Defendants have no good faith basis for failing to pay Plaintiffs appropriately nor for failing to pay the appropriate overtime.

- 29. Defendants, as business owners, are fully aware of the minimum hourly pay, overtime, and classification of individuals performing work for the Defendants.
- 30. Plaintiffs did not have the authority to hire, fire, or discipline other employees.
- 31. Plaintiffs were a non-exempt employee whose duties dictate the same; their job duties do not involve the use of discretion in the performance of their job.
- 32. Plaintiffs' positions were subject to the FLSA wage provisions.
- 33. Plaintiffs worked overtime hours during their employment and were not properly compensated.
- 34. Defendants agreed to compensate Plaintiff, LA SHANNA FAREED, at a rate of \$11.25 per hour.
- 35. For purposes of this action, Defendants operated multiple interrelated salons in Middle District of Florida. Those salons utilized the same documentation, the same management and the same operating/managing owners and shared clients. Furthermore, those salons utilized the same pay practices to pay all employees.
- 36. The salons were identical in their operation and Plaintiffs were performing the same job duties under the same management for both locations.
- 37. Plaintiffs complained to Defendants regarding their unlawful pay practices.
- 38. After being advised by Plaintiffs of the unlawful pay practices, Defendants advised that they had no obligation to pay minimum wage or overtime and regardless of hours worked, refused to pay Plaintiffs for regular time and any overtime hours worked, all in violation of the FLSA.
- Plaintiffs ceased work for Defendants under duress due to compensation terms prohibited by the FLSA.

- 40. The United States Department of Labor was contacted and performed an investigation of the Defendants and their pay practices and rendered a finding that the Defendants had misclassified their employees and that Plaintiffs were owed money for back wages.
- 41. That finding required Defendants to make payments for back wages to Plaintiff no later than August 29, 2017.
- 42. Defendants failed to make the payment mandated by the Department of Labor.

COUNT I VIOLATION OF OVERTIME PROVISIONS OF THE FLSA (§ 207) (as to PURE NATURAL NAIL LOUNGE, LLC)

- 43. Plaintiffs re-adopt and re-allege the allegations set forth in Paragraphs 1 through 42 as if fully set forth herein.
- 44. Plaintiffs were employees of Defendant within the meaning of 29 USC § 203(e)(1).
- 45. Defendant is an employer within the meaning of 29 USC § 203(d).
- 46. The overtime wage provisions set forth in FLSA §207 apply to Defendant, who engaged in commerce under the definition of the FLSA.
- During the relevant time period, Plaintiffs were not paid overtime compensation for all hours worked in excess of forty (40) per week.
- 48. During the relevant time period, Defendant required Plaintiffs, non-exempt employees under the FLSA, to regularly work in excess of forty (40) hours per week without payment of overtime.
- 49. Defendant is, or should have been, aware of FLSA's overtime calculations, its provisions and exemptions, and know, or should have known, that withholding wages from Plaintiffs constituted a willful violation of the FLSA.

- Therefore, Defendant willfully and intentionally engaged in a pattern and practice of violating the overtime provisions of the FLSA by refusing to pay overtime to Plaintiffs for all hours worked in excess of forty (40) hours per week.
- 51. Defendant cannot show in good faith reliance upon any factor or law for misclassifying Plaintiffs as management.
- 52. Evidence reflecting the precise number of overtime hours worked by Plaintiffs is in the possession of Defendant. If these records are unavailable, Plaintiffs may establish the hours worked solely by their testimony and the burden of overcoming such testimony shifts to the employer. See *Anderson v. Mount Clemens Pottery Company*, 328 US 680 (1946).
- 53. Plaintiffs are entitled to time and one-half of their regular hourly rate for each hour worked in excess of forty (40) hours per work week.
- 54. As a direct result of Defendant's violation of the FLSA, Plaintiffs suffered damages by being denied overtime wages in accordance with Section 207 and Section 216(b) of the FLSA, in addition with the damages associated with the loss of their Social Security and employer contributions to Social Security benefits.
- 55. Defendant has not made a good faith effort to comply with the FLSA with respect to their compensation of Plaintiffs.

- A. Order Defendant to pay an award of damages to fully compensate Plaintiffs for overtime wages and other compensation to which they are entitled;
- B. Order Defendant to pay liquidated damages;

- C. Order Defendant to pay pre-judgment interest on all sums due Plaintiffs;
- D. Order Defendant to pay compensatory damages allowable at law;
- E. Order Defendant to pay an award of attorney's fees pursuant to 29 USC § 216(b), and grant such further relief as the court deems just, necessary, and proper.

<u>COUNT II</u> <u>VIOLATION OF OVERTIME PROVISIONS OF THE FLSA (§207)</u> (as to COY V. BENTLEY)

- 56. Plaintiffs re-adopt and re-allege the allegations set forth in Paragraphs 1 through 42 as if fully set forth herein.
- 57. Plaintiffs were employees of Defendant within the meaning of 29 USC § 203(e)(1).
- 58. Defendant is an employer within the meaning of 29 USC § 203(d).
- 59. The overtime wage provisions set forth in FLSA § 207 apply to Defendant, who engaged in commerce under the definition of the FLSA.
- 60. During the relevant time period, Plaintiffs were not paid overtime compensation for all hours worked in excess of forty (40) per week.
- 61. During the relevant time period, Defendant required Plaintiffs, non-exempt employees under the FLSA, to regularly work in excess of forty (40) hours per week without payment of overtime.
- 62. Defendant is, or should have been, aware of FLSA's overtime calculations, its provisions and exemptions, and know, or should have known, that withholding wages from Plaintiffs' constituted a willful violation of the FLSA.
- 63. Therefore, Defendant willfully and intentionally engaged in a pattern and practice of violating the overtime provisions of the FLSA by refusing to pay overtime to Plaintiffs for all hours worked in excess of forty (40) hours per week.

- 64. Defendant cannot show in good faith reliance upon any factor or law for misclassifying Plaintiffs as independent contractors.
- 65. Evidence reflecting the precise number of overtime hours worked by Plaintiffs is in the possession of Defendant. If these records are unavailable, Plaintiffs may establish the hours worked solely by their testimony and the burden of overcoming such testimony shifts to the employer. See *Anderson v. Mount Clemens Pottery Company*, 328 US 680 (1946).
- 66. Plaintiffs are entitled to time and one-half of their regular hourly rate for each hour worked in excess of forty (40) hours per work week.
- As a direct result of Defendant's violation of the FLSA, Plaintiffs suffered damages by being denied overtime wages in accordance with Section 207 and Section 216(b) of the FLSA, in addition with the damages associated with the loss of their Social Security and employer contributions to Social Security benefits.
- 68. Defendant has not made a good faith effort to comply with the FLSA with respect to their compensation of Plaintiffs.

- A. Order Defendant to pay an award of damages to fully compensate Plaintiffs for overtime wages and other compensation to which they are entitled;
- B. Order Defendant to pay liquidated damages;
- C. Order Defendant to pay pre-judgment interest on all sums due Plaintiff;
- D. Order Defendant to pay compensatory damages allowable at law;

E. Order Defendant to pay an award of attorney's fees pursuant to 29 USC § 216(b), and grant such further relief as the court deems just, necessary, and proper.

<u>COUNT III</u> <u>VIOLATION OF OVERTIME PROVISIONS OF THE FLSA (§ 207)</u> (as to IAN PRATT)

- 69. Plaintiffs re-adopt and re-allege the allegations set forth in Paragraphs 1 through 42 as if fully set forth herein.
- 70. Plaintiffs were employees of Defendant within the meaning of 29 USC § 203(e)(1).
- 71. Defendant is an employer within the meaning of 29 USC § 203(d).
- 72. The overtime wage provisions set forth in FLSA § 207 apply to Defendant, who engaged in commerce under the definition of the FLSA.
- 73. During the relevant time period, Plaintiffs were not paid overtime compensation for all hours worked in excess of forty (40) per week.
- 74. During the relevant time period, Defendant required Plaintiffs, non-exempt employees under the FLSA, to regularly work in excess of forty (40) hours per week without payment of overtime.
- 75. Defendant is, or should have been, aware of FLSA's overtime calculations, its provisions and exemptions, and know, or should have known, that withholding wages from Plaintiffs' constituted a willful violation of the FLSA.
- 76. Therefore, Defendant willfully and intentionally engaged in a pattern and practice of violating the overtime provisions of the FLSA by refusing to pay overtime to Plaintiffs for all hours worked in excess of forty (40) hours per week.
- 77. Defendant cannot show in good faith reliance upon any factor or law for misclassifying Plaintiffs as independent contractors.

- 78. Evidence reflecting the precise number of overtime hours worked by Plaintiffs is in the possession of Defendant. If these records are unavailable, Plaintiffs may establish the hours worked solely by their testimony and the burden of overcoming such testimony shifts to the employer. See *Anderson v. Mount Clemens Pottery Company*, 328 US 680 (1946).
- 79. Plaintiffs are entitled to time and one-half of their regular hourly rate for each hour worked in excess of forty (40) hours per work week.
- 80. As a direct result of Defendant's violation of the FLSA, Plaintiffs suffered damages by being denied overtime wages in accordance with Section 207 and Section 216(b) of the FLSA, in addition with the damages associated with the loss of their Social Security and employer contributions to Social Security benefits.
- 81. Defendant has not made a good faith effort to comply with the FLSA with respect to their compensation of Plaintiffs.

- A. Order Defendant to pay an award of damages to fully compensate Plaintiffs for overtime wages and other compensation to which they are entitled;
- B. Order Defendant to pay liquidated damages;
- C. Order Defendant to pay pre-judgment interest on all sums due Plaintiff;
- D. Order Defendant to pay compensatory damages allowable at law;
- E. Order Defendant to pay an award of attorney's fees pursuant to 29 USC § 216(b), and grant such further relief as the court deems just, necessary, and proper.

<u>COUNT IV</u> <u>VIOLATION OF OVERTIME PROVISIONS OF THE FLSA (§ 207)</u> (as to TUYEN T. BENTLEY.)

- 82. Plaintiffs re-adopt and re-allege the allegations set forth in Paragraphs 1 through 42 as if fully set forth herein.
- 83. Plaintiffs were employees of Defendant within the meaning of 29 USC § 203(e)(1).
- 84. Defendant is an employer within the meaning of 29 USC § 203(d).
- 85. The overtime wage provisions set forth in FLSA § 207 apply to Defendant, who engaged in commerce under the definition of the FLSA.
- 86. During the relevant time period, Plaintiffs were not paid overtime compensation for all hours worked in excess of forty (40) per week.
- 87. During the relevant time period, Defendant required Plaintiffs, non-exempt employees under the FLSA, to regularly work in excess of forty (40) hours per week without payment of overtime.
- 88. Defendant is, or should have been, aware of FLSA's overtime calculations, its provisions and exemptions, and know, or should have known, that withholding wages from Plaintiffs' constituted a willful violation of the FLSA.
- 89. Therefore, Defendant willfully and intentionally engaged in a pattern and practice of violating the overtime provisions of the FLSA by refusing to pay overtime to Plaintiffs for all hours worked in excess of forty (40) hours per week.
- 90. Defendant cannot show in good faith reliance upon any factor or law for misclassifying Plaintiffs as independent contractors.
- 91. Evidence reflecting the precise number of overtime hours worked by Plaintiffs is in the possession of Defendant. If these records are unavailable, Plaintiffs may

- establish the hours worked solely by their testimony and the burden of overcoming such testimony shifts to the employer. See *Anderson v. Mount Clemens Pottery Company*, 328 US 680 (1946).
- 92. Plaintiffs are entitled to time and one-half of their regular hourly rate for each hour worked in excess of forty (40) hours per work week.
- 93. As a direct result of Defendant's violation of the FLSA, Plaintiffs suffered damages by being denied overtime wages in accordance with Section 207 and Section 216(b) of the FLSA, in addition with the damages associated with the loss of their Social Security and employer contributions to Social Security benefits.
- 94. Defendant has not made a good faith effort to comply with the FLSA with respect to their compensation of Plaintiffs.

- A. Order Defendant to pay an award of damages to fully compensate Plaintiffs for overtime wages and other compensation to which they are entitled;
- B. Order Defendant to pay liquidated damages;
- C. Order Defendant to pay pre-judgment interest on all sums due Plaintiff;
- Order Defendant to pay compensatory damages allowable at law;
- E. Order Defendant to pay an award of attorney's fees pursuant to 29 USC § 216(b), and grant such further relief as the court deems just, necessary, and proper.

COUNT V VIOLATION OF MINIMUM WAGE PROVISIONS OF THE FLSA (§ 206) (as to PURE NATURAL NAIL LOUNGE, LLC)

- 95. Plaintiffs re-adopt and re-allege the allegations set forth in Paragraphs 1 through 42 as if fully set forth herein.
- 96. Defendant failed to pay Plaintiffs the minimum wages due pursuant to the FLSA as described in part in § 6(a) of the FLSA.
- 97. Plaintiffs were damaged by Defendant's failure to pay the Federal minimum wage.

WHEREFORE, Plaintiffs, LA SHANNA FAREED, individually, and as class representative of others similarly situated, requests this Honorable Court to:

- A. Wages found to be due and owing;
- An additional amount equal to the unpaid minimum wages found to be due
 and owing as liquidated damages;
- C. Prejudgment interest in the event liquidated damages are not awarded;
- D. A reasonable attorney's fee and costs; and
- E. Such other relief as the Court deems just and equitable.

COUNT VI VIOLATION OF MINIMUM WAGE PROVISIONS OF THE FLSA (§ 206) (as to COY V. BENTLEY)

- 98. Plaintiffs re-adopt and re-allege the allegations set forth in Paragraphs 1 through 42 as if fully set forth herein.
- 99. Defendant failed to pay Plaintiffs the minimum wages due pursuant to the FLSA as described in part in § 6(a) of the FLSA.

100. Plaintiffs were damaged by Defendant's failure to pay the Federal minimum wage.

WHEREFORE, Plaintiffs, LA SHANNA FAREED, individually, and as class representative of others similarly situated, requests this Honorable Court to:

- Wages found to be due and owing;
- B. An additional amount equal to the unpaid minimum wages found to be due and owing as liquidated damages;
- C. Prejudgment interest in the event liquidated damages are not awarded;
- D. A reasonable attorney's fee and costs; and,
- E. Such other relief as the Court deems just and equitable.

VIOLATION OF MINIMUM WAGE PROVISIONS OF THE FLSA (§ 206) (as to IAN PRATT)

- 101. Plaintiffs re-adopt and re-allege the allegations set forth in Paragraphs 1 through 42 as if fully set forth herein.
- 102. Defendant failed to pay Plaintiffs the minimum wages due pursuant to the FLSA as described in part in § 6(a) of the FLSA.
- 103. Plaintiffs were damaged by Defendant's failure to pay the Federal minimum wage.

- Wages found to be due and owing;
- An additional amount equal to the unpaid minimum wages found to be due and owing as liquidated damages;
- C. Prejudgment interest in the event liquidated damages are not awarded;

- D. A reasonable attorney's fee and costs; and,
- E. Such other relief as the Court deems just and equitable.

<u>COUNT VIII</u> <u>VIOLATION OF MINIMUM WAGE PROVISIONS OF THE FLSA (§ 206)</u> (as to TUYEN T. BENTLEY)

- 104. Plaintiffs re-adopt and re-allege the allegations set forth in Paragraphs 1 through 42 as if fully set forth herein.
- 105. Defendant failed to pay Plaintiffs the minimum wages due pursuant to the FLSA as described in part in § 6(a) of the FLSA.
- 106. Plaintiffs were damaged by Defendant's failure to pay the Federal minimum wage.

WHEREFORE, Plaintiffs, LA SHANNA FAREED, individually, and as class representative of others similarly situated, requests this Honorable Court to:

- A. Wages found to be due and owing;
- B. An additional amount equal to the unpaid minimum wages found to be due and owing as liquidated damages;
- C. Prejudgment interest in the event liquidated damages are not awarded;
- D. A reasonable attorney's fee and costs; and,
- E. Such other relief as the Court deems just and equitable.

COUNT IX (Unpaid wages as to all defendants)

- 107. Plaintiffs re-adopt and re-allege the allegations set forth in Paragraphs 1 through 42 as if fully set forth herein.
- 108. Plaintiffs have earned unpaid wages which are owed and payable by the Defendants pursuant to Florida Statute Chapter 448.

109. Defendants, despite Plaintiffs reasonable attempts to obtain payment of these earned monies, has failed and refused to make payments as required by Florida Statute Chapter 448.

WHEREFORE, Plaintiffs, LA SHANNA FAREED, individually and as the class representative of others similarly situated, prays for a judgment against Defendants, for the following damages:

- A. Payment of their earned unpaid wages;
- B. Pre-judgment interest;
- C. Post-judgment interest;
- D. Attorney's fees;
- E. Costs;
- F. For such other relief as this court deems equitable.

DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL

Pursuant to Rule 38(b) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, Plaintiffs demand a trial by jury on all questions of fact raised by this Complaint and on all issues so triable.

WHEREFORE, the Plaintiffs, LA SHANNA FAREED, individually and as the class representative of others similarly situated, demands judgment for damages, including punitive damages, against the Defendants, PURE NATURAL NAIL LOUNGE, LLC, COY V. BENTLEY, TUYEN T. BENTLEY, and IAN PRATT, individually, together with such other and further relief as this Honorable Court deems necessary and appropriate.

Dated this 15nd day of September, 2017.

TRAGOS, SARTES & TRAGOS, PLLC

PETER L. TRAGOS, ESQ. Florida Bar No: 0106744 petertragos@greeklaw.com

PETER A. SARTES, MBA/JD Florida Bar No. 582905

Florida Bar No. 58290. peter@greeklaw.com

601 Cleveland Street

Suite 800

Clearwater, FL 33755 Ph: (727) 441-9030 Fax: (727 441-9254

Secondary: linda@greeklaw.com

JS 44 (Rev. 11/15)

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 de	ocket sneet. (SEE INSTRUC	HONS ON NEXT PAGE G	W THIS PO	rkvi.)			
I. (a) PLAINTIFFS LA SHANNA FAREED, ii similarly situationd	of others	DEFENDANTS PURE NATURAL NAIL LOUNGE, LLC, A Florida Limited Liability Company, COY V. BENTLEY, TUYEN T. BENTLEY and IAN PRATT, individually					
(b) County of Residence of First Listed Plaintiff Pinellas (EXCEPT IN U.S. PLAINTIFF CASES)				County of Residence	of First List	ed Defendant	Pinellas
				AN U.S. PLAINTIFF CASES ONLY)			
				NOTE: IN LAND CO THE TRACT	ONDEMNATI OF LAND IN	DN CASES, USE T VOLVED.	THE LOCATION OF
(c) Attorneys (Firm Name, PETER L. TRAGOS, ESTRAGOS, SARTES & TRAGOS, SARTES & TRAGOS, FL 33755	Address, and Telephone Numbe Q. and PETER A. SAF RAGOS, PLLC, 601 Cl	RTES, MBA/JD leveland Street, Ste	э. 800	Attorneys (If Known) Unknown			
II. BASIS OF JURISDI	ICTION (Place an "X" in C	ne Box Only)		TIZENSHIP OF P	RINCIPA	L PARTIES	(Place an "X" in One Box for Plaintift and One Box for Defendant)
□ 1 U.S. Government	Ճ 3 Federal Question			PT			PTF DEF
Plaintiff	(U.S. Government Not a Party)		Citizo	Citizen of This State			
2 U.S. Government Defendant	······		Citize	en of Another State	2 🗇 2	Incorporated and of Business In	
			1	en or Subject of a reign Country	3 🗇 3	Foreign Nation	0606
IV. NATURE OF SUIT		nby ORTS	1 84	ORFEITURE/PENALTY	DAN	KRUPTCY	OTHER STATUTES
CONTRACT 110 Insurance	PERSONAL INJURY	PERSONAL INJUR		25 Drug Related Seizure		al 28 USC 158	☐ 375 False Claims Act
☐ 120 Marine	310 Airplane	☐ 365 Personal Injury -		of Property 21 USC 881 00 Other	☐ 423 With	drawal SC 157	☐ 376 Qui Tam (31 USC 3729(a))
 ☐ 130 Miller Act ☐ 140 Negotiable Instrument 	☐ 315 Airplane Product Liability	Product Liability 367 Health Care/	0.65	o Other	<u> </u>		☐ 400 State Reapportionment
□ 150 Recovery of Overpayment & Enforcement of Judgment	320 Assault, Libel & Slander	Pharmaceutical Personal Injury			PROPEI ■ 820 Copy	rights	☐ 410 Antitrust ☐ 430 Banks and Banking
☐ 151 Medicare Act	330 Federal Employers'	Product Liability	.		☐ 830 Paten	t	☐ 450 Commerce ☐ 460 Deportation
☐ 152 Recovery of Defaulted Student Loans	Liability ☐ 340 Marine	☐ 368 Asbestos Persona Injury Product	'		D 840 Frace	mark	470 Racketeer Influenced and
(Excludes Veterans) D 153 Recovery of Overpayment	(3) 345 Marine Product Liability	Liability PERSONAL PROPER	RTY (* 7 1	LABOR 0 Fair Labor Standards	SOCIAL 861 HIA	SECURITY (1395ft)	Corrupt Organizations 480 Consumer Credit
of Veteran's Benefits	☐ 350 Motor Vehicle	370 Other Fraud		Act	☐ 862 Black		☐ 490 Cable/Sat TV
 ☐ 160 Stockholders' Suits ☐ 190 Other Contract 	☐ 355 Motor Vehicle Product Liability	371 Truth in Lending380 Other Personal		0 Labor/Management Relations	☐ 864 SSID	Title XVI	☐ 850 Securities/Commodities/ Exchange
 □ 195 Contract Product Liability □ 196 Franchise 	☐ 360 Other Personal Injury	Property Damage 385 Property Damage		10 Railway Labor Act 51 Family and Medical	□ 865 RSI (405(g))	☐ 890 Other Statutory Actions ☐ 891 Agricultural Acts
E) 170 (Tabeliise	☐ 362 Personal Injury •	Product Liability		Leave Act			☐ 893 Environmental Matters ☐ 895 Freedom of Information
REAL PROPERTY	Medical Malpractice CIVIL RIGHTS	PRISONER PETITIO		90 Other Labor Litigation 91 Employee Retirement	FEDERA	AL TAX SUITS	Act Ava Precion of information
☐ 210 Land Condemnation	☐ 440 Other Civil Rights	Hubeas Corpus: ☐ 463 Alien Detainee		Income Security Act		s (U.S. Plaintiff efendant)	☐ 896 Arbitration ☐ 899 Administrative Procedure
☐ 220 Foreclosure ☐ 230 Rent Lease & Ejectment	☐ 441 Voting ☐ 442 Employment	510 Motions to Vacate	e		☐ 871 IRS-	-Third Party	Act/Review or Appeal of
240 Torts to Land245 Tort Product Liability	☐ 443 Housing/ Accommodations	Sentence 530 General			26 13	SC 7609	Agency Decision 950 Constitutionality of
☐ 290 All Other Real Property	☐ 445 Amer, w/Disabilities -	☐ 535 Death Penalty		IMMIGRATION	1		State Statutes
	Employment 446 Amer. w/Disabilities -	Other: 540 Mandamus & Other		62 Naturalization Application 65 Other Immigration	1		
	Other 448 Education	☐ 550 Civil Rights ☐ 555 Prison Condition		Actions			
		560 Civil Detainee - Conditions of					
		Confinement	_				
	in One Box Onlygemoved from	Remanded from Appellate Court	□ 4 Reir Reo	pened Anothe	r District	☐ 6 Multidist	
	Cite the U.S. Civil Su	atute under which you a	re filing ((specify, Do not cite jurisdictional stat) tutes unless di	versity):	
VI. CAUSE OF ACTIO	Brief description of c						
VII. REQUESTED IN COMPLAINT: CHECK IF THIS IS A CLASS ACTION UNDER RULE 23, F.R.Cv.P.				MAND S CHECK YES only if demanded in complaint: JURY DEMAND: ★ Yes □ No			
VIII. RELATED CASI	E(S) (See instructions):	JUDGE			DOCKE	T NUMBER	
DATE	SIGNATURE OF ATTORNEY OF RECORD						
09/15/2017				1	- American de la company		
FOR OFFICE USE ONLY	L LANGE FROM	anni kinin inn		11/2/20		SESO II	aves.
RECEIPT # Af	MOUNT	APPLYING IFP		JUDGE		MAG. JU	/DATE

ClassAction.org

This complaint is part of ClassAction.org's searchable class action lawsuit database and can be found in this post: <u>Lawsuit: Pure Natural Nail Lounge Refused to Pay Proper Wages</u>