IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT 2017 JUN 19 AM 9: 22 FOR THE MIDDLE DISTRICT OF FLORIDA OCALA DIVISION

DYLAN FRACASSE, individually and on behalf of other similarly situated,

Plaintiff(s),

v.

Case No.: 5:17-W-273-Dc-40 PRL

AMERIGAS PROPANE, INC., a Foreign for Profit Corporation doing business in Florida,

Defendant.

COMPLAINT AND DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL

Plaintiff, DYLAN FRACASSE ("Plaintiff"), on behalf of himself and current and former employees similarly situated, by and through undersigned counsel, files this Complaint against Defendant, AMERIGAS PROPANE, INC. ("Defendant" or "AMERIGAS") and in support thereof states as follows:

JURISDICTION

- 1. Jurisdiction in this Court is proper as the claims are brought pursuant to the Fair Labor Standards Act, as amended (29 U.S.C. §201, et seq., hereinafter called the "FLSA") to recover unpaid back wages, an additional equal amount as liquidated damages, obtain declaratory relief, and reasonable attorney's fees and costs.
 - 2. The Court has jurisdiction over this claim pursuant to 29 U.S.C. §216(b).

PARTIES

- 3. At all times material hereto, Plaintiff was and continues to be a resident of Lake County, Florida.
- 4. At all times material hereto, AMERIGAS is a Foreign Corporation with headquarters in Pennsylvania and operates and conducts business in Orange County, Florida, and is therefore within the jurisdiction of this Court. Further, at all times material hereto, AMERIGAS was and continues to be engaged in business in Florida, with a place of business in Orange County, Florida.
- 5. At all times material hereto, AMERIGAS was and continues to be an organization providing propane service. Defendant specializes in converting appliances to propane, tank installations, propane system design and maintenance, and propane deliveries for homes and businesses.
- 6. At all times material hereto, Plaintiff was "engaged in commerce" within the meaning of §6 and §7 of the FLSA.
- 7. At all times material hereto, Plaintiff was an "employee" of Defendant within the meaning of FLSA.
- 8. At all times material hereto, Defendant was the "employer" within the meaning of the FLSA.
- 9. Defendant was and continues to be an "employer" within the meaning of the FLSA.
- 10. At all times material hereto, AMERIGAS was and is an enterprise covered by the FLSA pursuant to 29 U.S.C. § 203(s)(1)(C).

11. The additional persons who may become plaintiffs in this action are/were other employees for AMERIGAS who were paid by the hour and who worked in excess of forty (40) hours during one or more work weeks during the relevant time periods but who did not receive pay at one and one-half times their regular rate for all hours worked in excess of forty (40) hours.

STATEMENT OF FACTS

- 12. Plaintiff worked for AMERIGAS from approximately July 2015 through March 2017.
- 13. Plaintiff worked for AMERIGAS as a "Service Technician" from approximately July 2015 through February 2017.
- 14. In this capacity, Plaintiff's duties included, but were not limited to, performing maintenance, repairs, fixing leaks and installation of propane tanks.
- 15. Plaintiff worked as an "operations manager" from approximately February 2017 through March 2017. This Complaint does not contemplate the period of time that Plaintiff worked as an operations manager.
 - 16. As a Service Technician, Plaintiff was paid \$17.91 per hour.
- 17. At various material times hereto, Plaintiff regularly worked for Defendant in excess of forty (40) hours within a workweek.
 - 18. Service Technician s were/are hourly paid employees.
- 19. Service Technician s are/were not paid overtime, in one or more weeks, when they worked more than forty (40) hours per week.

- 20. Plaintiff and other Service Technician s are not exempt from the overtime provisions of the FLSA.
- 21. All Service Technician s were entitled to be paid for all hours worked for Defendant.
- 22. In order to perform their jobs to completion, Plaintiff and all Service Technician s worked beyond their scheduled hours, including often working "off the clock" during one or more weeks.
- 23. Defendant's supervisors and other managers knew Plaintiff and the other hourly employees were working overtime hours.
- 24. As a result, Defendant has failed to compensate Plaintiff and all other hourly employees for all overtime hours actually worked.
- 25. At all times material hereto, Plaintiff was required to submit to Defendant time sheets for all hours worked at the end of each shift.
- 26. At all times material hereto, when Plaintiff submitted timesheets indicating that he did not take a lunch Defendant automatically deducted thirty (30) minutes for a lunch break from Plaintiff and other hourly workers for each day worked.
- 27. This automatic deduction was done whether or not Plaintiff took a thirty (30) minute lunch break.
- 28. Plaintiff usually did not take a lunch break each day that he worked for Defendant.

- 29. Other Service Technicians also were not able to take a non-compensable lunch break most days yet Defendant still deducted thirty (30) minutes per day from their pay for a lunch break.
- 30. Defendant's supervisors and other managers knew Plaintiff and the other hourly employees were working during the automatically deducted lunch break.
- 31. Plaintiff brought up the fact that he was not being paid overtime to his area director, Sean Daughtry, and was told that the company was in a period of "no overtime." Additionally, Plaintiff and other Service Technicians were told to limit what they put on their timesheets for overtime even if they worked it.
- 32. As a result, Defendant has failed to compensate Plaintiff and all other hourly employees for all overtime hours actually worked.
- 33. Plaintiff and the other hourly workers should have been paid an overtime rate of pay for all hours worked over forty (40) in a workweek due to the improperly deducted hours as well as the hours in which they were required to work off the clock to complete their duties.
- 34. The records, to the extent they are accurate, detailing the time recorded and pay received by Plaintiff and the other workers are in the possession of Defendant.

COUNT I <u>VIOLATION OF 29 U.S.C. §207 OVERTIME COMPENSATION</u>

35. Plaintiff re-alleges and reincorporates paragraphs 1 through 34 of the Complaint, as if fully set forth herein.

- 36. For the last three years, Plaintiff and those similarly situated to him were subjected to Defendant's policy wherein Defendant did not pay overtime hours which were mostly worked "off the clock" and which Plaintiff's supervisors and managers were aware of.
- 37. For the last three years, Plaintiff and those similarly situated to him were subject to Defendant's policy wherein Defendant automatically deducted thirty (30) minutes per day for a lunch break even though Plaintiff routinely did not take a deductible lunch break.
- 38. Plaintiff often recorded at or above forty (40) hours per week, therefore this unpaid time would be considered unpaid overtime compensation.
- 39. All other hourly employees of Defendant were subject to the same policies and as a result were also shorted overtime pay from Defendant.
- 40. Plaintiff and the other workers are and were entitled to be paid at the statutory rate of one and one-half times their hourly rate of pay for all hours worked in excess of forty (40) hours.
- 41. At all times material hereto, Defendant failed and continues to fail to maintain proper time records in regards to actual "working hours" in violation of the FLSA.
- 42. Defendant's actions were willful and/or showed reckless disregard for the provisions of the FLSA in that Defendant knew Plaintiff and other hourly workers were performing work "off the clock" yet Defendant continued to deduct and/or omit overtime hours worked per week from these hourly workers' pay.

- 43. Defendant failed to properly disclose or apprise Plaintiff and other hourly workers of their rights under the FLSA.
- 44. Plaintiff is entitled to an award of reasonable attorney's fees and costs pursuant to 29 U.S.C. §216(b).

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff respectfully requests that judgment be entered in her favor against Defendant:

- a. Declaring that the acts and practices complained of herein are in violation of the maximum hour provisions of the FLSA;
- b. Awarding Plaintiff and other hourly workers similarly situated to him overtime compensation in the amount due to them for their uncompensated work in excess of forty (40) hours per work week;
- c. Awarding Plaintiff and the other hourly workers liquidated damages in an amount equal to the overtime award;
- d. Awarding Plaintiff reasonable attorney's fees and costs and expenses of the litigation pursuant to 29 U.S.C. §216(b);
- e. Awarding Plaintiff pre-judgment interest;
- f. Issue of an Order, as soon as is practicable, authorizing Plaintiff to send notice of the instant lawsuit to all similarly situated hourly workers employed by Defendant within the past 3 years; and
- g. Ordering any other further relief the Court deems just and proper.

JURY DEMAND

Plaintiff demands trial by jury on all issues so triable as a matter of right by jury.

DATED this 15 day of June 2017.

Respectfully submitted,

James J. Henson, Esq. Florida Bar No. 77476

MORGAN & MORGAN, P.A.

20 North Orange Avenue

14th Floor

P.O. Box 4979

Orlando, FL 32802-4979

Tel.: (407) 428-6241 Fax: (407) 245-3342

Email: jjhenson@forthepeople.com

Attorneys for Plaintiff(s)

8232

CIVIL COVER SHEET 5:17-CN-273-De-40 PRC

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. GSF INSTRUCTIONS ON NEXT PAGE OF THIS FORM.

purpose of initiating the civil d	ocket sheet. SEE INSTRUC	TIONS ON NEXT PAGE O	F THIS FO	PRM.)	, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,	100 101 110 030 01		Juli 101 0.0	
I. (a) PLAINTIFFS DYLAN FRACASSE, individually and on behalf of other similarly situated,				DEFENDANTS AMERIGAS PROPANE, INC., a Foreign for Profit Corporation doing business in Florida,					
(h) County of Peridence of	f Circu 1 inted Disimble	.ake		County of Davidson	- CPi 1 i	-d D-6d	Orango		
(b) County of Residence of	r irst listed Plaintitt <u>L</u> XCEPT IN U.S. PLAINTIFF CA			County of Residence		ed Detendant LAINTIFF CASES O	Orange		
(4.4	CH I'M CAL I MINITE CA	ww		NOTE: IN LAND CO				OF	
				THE TRACT	OF LAND IN	ON CASES, USE TI VOLVED.	<u></u>	••	
(a) Au									
(c) Attorneys (Firm Name, Address, and Telephone Number) MORGAN & MORGAN, P.A.				Attorneys (If Known)				78	
20 North Orange Avenue							9		
Tel.: (407) 428-6241							•	E 21	
							AP		
II. BASIS OF JURISDI	CTION (Place an "X" in O	ne Box Only)	III. CI	TIZENSHIP OF P	RINCIPA	L PARTIES	(Place on "X" in	One Box for Plain	
1 U.S. Government	≱ 3 Federal Question			(For Diversity Cases Only)	F DEF		and One Box f	for Defendant) PTF DEF	
Plaintiff	(U.S. Government	Citiz	PTF DEF Citizen of This State						
	(0.0. 00.0		0	•. • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •		of Business In T		5, 5,	
2 U.S. Government	O 4 Diversity		Cirio	on of American State		1	himainal Dlaga		
Defendant		Diversity (Indicate Citizenship of Parties in Item III)		Citizen of Another State					
	,								
				en or Subject of a reign Country	3 0 3	Foreign Nation		06 06	
IV. NATURE OF SUIT	Colore on "Y" in One Box Or	.41		reign Country					
CONTRACT	TO	ers	. Fr	ORFEITURE/PENALTY	BAN	KRUPTCY	OTHER	STATUTES	
O 110 Insurance	PERSONAL INJURY	PERSONAL INJUR		25 Drug Related Seizure	1	al 28 USC 158	375 False C		
120 Marine	310 Airplane	365 Personal Injury -	. [of Property 21 USC 881	0 423 With		376 Qui Ta		
130 Miller Act	O 315 Airplane Product	Product Liability	CJ 69	00 Other	28 U	SC 157	3729(a	1))	
☐ 140 Negotiable Instrument ☐ 150 Recovery of Overpayment	Liability (7) 320 Assault, Libel &	367 Health Care/ Pharmaceutical			BOARDET	TY RIGHTS	400 State R	leapportionment	
& Enforcement of Judgment		Personal Injury			□ 820 Copy		0 430 Banks		
O 151 Medicare Act	330 Federal Employers'	Product Liability			🗇 830 Paten		450 Common	егсе	
☐ 152 Recovery of Defaulted Student Loans	Liability 340 Marine	☐ 368 Asbestos Personal Injury Product			340 Trade	mark	460 Deport	ation eer Influenced and	
(Excludes Veterans)	O 345 Marine Product	Liability		LABOR	SOCIAL	SECURITY		t Organizations	
☐ 153 Recovery of Overpayment	Liability	PERSONAL PROPER	TY Ø 7	10 Fair Labor Standards	O 861 HIA (480 Consur		
of Veteran's Benefits 160 Stockholders' Suits	O 350 Motor Vehicle O 355 Motor Vehicle	(7) 370 Other Fraud (7) 371 Truth in Lending	0.73	Act O Labon/Management	0 862 Black	: Lung (923) C/DIWW (405(g))	490 Cable/S	Sat TV ties/Commodities/	
190 Other Contract	Product Liability	380 Other Personal	"	Relations	D 864 SSID		Exchai		
195 Contract Product Liability	☐ 360 Other Personal	Property Damage		10 Railway Labor Act	☐ 865 RSI (405(g))		Statutory Actions	
196 Franchise	Injury 362 Personal Injury -	☐ 385 Property Damage Product Liability	י טן	I Family and Medical Leave Act			O 891 Agricul	Itural Acts nmental Matters	
	Medical Malpractice		0 79	00 Other Labor Litigation	l			m of Information	
REAL PROPERTY	CIVIL RIGHTS	PRISONER PETITION	NS. 0 79	I Employee Retirement	man .	L TAX SUITS	Act		
210 Land Condemnation 220 Foreclosure	440 Other Civil Rights 441 Voting	Ilabeas Corpus: 1 463 Alien Detainee		Income Security Act		s (U.S. Plaintiff efendant)	O 896 Arbitra	ition istrative Procedure	
230 Rent Lease & Ejectment	O 442 Employment	510 Motions to Vacate	.		Ø 871 IRS-	•		view or Appeal of	
240 Toris to Land	443 Housing/	Sentence				SC 7609	Agency	Decision	
245 Tort Product Liability 290 All Other Real Property	Accommodations 1 445 Amer. w/Disabilities -	530 General	-	IMMIGRATION	4		950 Constit		
S 277711 Calc. Real Flopalty	Employment	Other:	O 40	52 Naturalization Application	1		State St	ididies	
	446 Amer. w/Disabilities -	540 Mandamus & Oth		55 Other Immigration					
	Other Other 448 Education	550 Civil Rights 555 Prison Condition		Actions	ļ				
	O 440 CALOURON	560 Civil Detainee -							
		Conditions of							
		Confinement					<u> </u>		
V. ORIGIN (Place an "X" ii									
	moved from 3 ute Court	Remanded from (Appellate Court	J 4 Rein Reol		erred from or District	6 Multidistr Litigation			
- tococamp on		••		(specify))				
	Cite the U.S. Civil Sta 29 U.S.C. §201,	tute under which you as	re filing (Do not cite jurisdictional stat	tutes unless div	rersity):	,		
VI. CAUSE OF ACTIO	ON 29 0.3.0. 9201, 1	ar sad							
	Action to recover	iuse: ' unpaid back wage:	s. liauid	ated damages, obtai	n declarate	orv relief, and	other relief.		
VII. REQUESTED IN		IS A CLASS ACTION		EMAND S WAY KNOW		HECK YES only		oomplaint:	
-	UNDER RULE 2					•			
COMPLAINT:		<u></u>	-	at this time		URY DEMAND:	<u> </u>	O No	
VIII. RELATED CASI	E(S) (See instructions):								
IF ANY	iert Homachunsj:	JUDGE			DOCKE	T NUMBER			
DATE		SIGNATURE OF AT	TORNEY	DERECORD					
06/15/2017									
FOR OFFICE USE ONLY		/		_					
RECEIPT # OCA AN	MOUNT A COM	APPLY SGJFP	1	JUDGE		3445 44	VCE.		
VECENTIA OCH A	"WON' / (DT) -	WELLT !! JOHN !	.bg	JUDGE		MAG. JUI	AIE.		

ClassAction.org

This complaint is part of ClassAction.org's searchable class action lawsuit database and can be found in this post: Former Employee Claims Amerigas Propane Denies Wages