#### IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF VIRGINIA Richmond Division

KIMBERLY HAUGHT, on behalf of herself and all othe situated	ers similarly	
Pla	nintiffs,	Case No:
<b>v.</b>		JURY TRIAL DEMANDED
THE WIRELESS CENTER, I	NC.	
De	fendant.	

#### **COLLECTIVE ACTION COMPLAINT**

Plaintiff Kimberly Haught ("Haught" or "Plaintiff"), by counsel, brings this action, on behalf of herself and all other similarly situated Managers and Managers in Training, to recover unpaid wages and overtime, liquidated damages and attorneys' fees from her former employer, The Wireless Center, Inc. ("Wireless Center" or "Company" or Defendant"), for violations of the Fair Labor Standards Act (hereinafter "FLSA"), 29 U.S.C. § 201 et seq. By virtue of Defendant's store staffing model, Plaintiff and others similarly situated were deemed exempt employees despite never regularly supervising the work of two full time employees or their equivalent. Defendant is a large specialty-based retailer of wireless communication products, services and accessories, that has operated over 90 locations throughout Virginia, Maryland, Pennsylvania, Ohio, Kentucky, New York, New Jersey, Washington D.C., and West Virginia., employing more than 200 people. At all times alleged in this Complaint, Plaintiff, and all others similarly situated, were the victims of a uniform policy and practice to deprive them of lawful

wages and earned overtime in willful violation of the FLSA.

#### **JURISDICTION AND VENUE**

- 1. This Court has jurisdiction over this matter pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1337 (commerce), 28 U.S.C. § 1331 (federal question) and 29 U.S.C. § 216(b) (FLSA).
- 2. Venue is proper in this Court under 28 U.S.C. § 1391. The causes of action asserted herein occurred and/or accrued in Hanover County, Virginia. Venue is also appropriate in this Court because Defendant owns and/or operates one or more retail stores in areas surrounding Richmond, Virginia within this Judicial District and Division. In addition, Defendant's unlawful conduct occurred in, among other places, Virginia.

#### **PARTIES**

- 3. Haught is a natural person residing in Tappahannock, Virginia and, at all relevant times asserted in this Complaint, was an employee of Defendant in its retail stores located at 11657 Lakeridge Parkway, Ashland, Virginia and 4915 Richmond Tappahannock Hwy., Aylett, Virginia.
- 4. Defendant is a an Ohio corporation and is an enterprise, as defined in 29 U.S.C. § 203(r)(1), engaged in business in the State of Virginia, operating retail stores for the sale of wireless communication products, services and accessories throughout Virginia with more than 25 physical retail locations in Virginia, and currently more than 60 locations nationwide. Defendant operates as an authorized, independent retailer of Verizon Wireless services and equipment.

#### **FACTUAL ALLEGATIONS**

5. On or about December 3, 2014, Haught became employed by Defendant as a Sales Consultant at its Aylett, Virginia location.

- 6. In December of 2015, approximately a year after joining the company, Haught was promoted to Manager/Manager in Training at the Ashland, Virginia location.
- 7. Defendant paid Plaintiff and other similarly situated Managers and Managers in Training a flat salary plus commissions. Plaintiff, and others similarly situated, consistently worked more than 40 hours a week but were deemed exempt by Defendant and not eligible for overtime compensation despite the fact they did not regularly supervise the work of two full time employees or their equivalent.
  - 8. In early May of 2016, Haught's employment with Defendant concluded.
- 9. Plaintiff, and other similarly situated Managers and Managers in Training were regularly scheduled to work at least 45 hours a week, but often were required to work more.
- 10. Plaintiff, and other similarly situated Mangers and Managers in Training, were informed by Defendant that the store was to be regularly staffed with less than 80 weekly hours of non-exempt sales consultant time so as to prevent the accrual of overtime to said sales consultants.
- 11. To the extent the allotted sales consultant time was inadequate to meet store needs, the Plaintiff and other similarly situated, were required to make up for any shortfalls leading to weekly hours worked well in excess of 40.
- 12. Plaintiff, and others similarly situated, regularly oversaw less than 80 weekly hours of subordinate hours worked.
- 13. Defendant employed numerous other Managers and Managers in Training who were similarly situated to Plaintiff in that they were classified as exempt despite their working at Wireless Center locations where they regularly oversaw less than 80 hours of subordinate work time.

- 14. As a Manager in Training and/or as Store Managers, Plaintiff, and others similarly situated, regularly worked hours in excess of forty hours per week.
- 15. The day to day duties of Plaintiff, and others similarly situated were non-office and manual and predominantly sales/storefront related, but also included training new hires, cleaning, making bank deposits and reviewing store sales reports. Plaintiff, and others similarly situated, had no authority to hire or fire employees and played little to no role in any related decision-making process.
- 16. Defendant paid, and on information and belief, continues to pay, its Manager and Manager in Training employees based on their titles and method of compensation ("salary, exempt") rather than based on their actual eligibility for any FLSA exemption category.
- 17. Plaintiff and all others similarly situated were not exempt from overtime pay under FLSA because they manifestly were not employed in a bona fide executive, administrative or professional capacity, nor did they qualify as exempt Retail/Service Establishment employees. Rather, Plaintiff, and all others similarly situated did not regularly supervise two full time employees and did not earn more than one-half of their total compensation from commissions.
- 18. Defendant's classifications and its policy and practice with respect to the payment of overtime wages to Plaintiff, and all others similarly situated violated the FLSA, and deprived Plaintiff and all others similarly situated of the lawful wages to which they were entitled.

#### **COLLECTIVE CLAIMS UNDER FLSA**

19. Plaintiff brings this action on her own behalf and as collective action on behalf of others similarly situated to recover unpaid compensation, in the form of overtime compensation, pursuant to FLSA. On information and belief, for at least three years prior to filing this complaint, Defendant has had a uniform policy and practice of requiring its Managers in

Training and Managers to work well in excess of 40 hours per week for a salary without overtime compensation. Plaintiff, and others similarly situated, are or were employed with the Defendant in positions denominated Manager and/or Managers in Training but Defendant's own store staffing model makes application of the Executive Exemption impossible as Plaintiff and other similarly situated employees did/do not regularly supervise the work of two or more full time employees or their equivalent. Additionally, Plaintiff, and others similarly situated did not earn more than one-half of their total compensation from commissions and thus could not be exempt Retail/Service Establishment employees.

- 20. On information and belief Defendant manages the classification of employees for FLSA purposes, including store managers, in a centralized and uniform fashion, from its Cleveland, Ohio home office in all states in which Defendant operates.
- 21. On further information and belief, Defendant's payroll function is operated in a centralized and uniform manner from its Cleveland, Ohio home office and Plaintiffs' paychecks were regularly issued from this centralized payroll operation. On information and belief, paychecks for all similarly situated employees were issued from the same, centralized payroll department in Defendant's Cleveland, Ohio home office for all states in which Defendant operates.
- 22. Damages owed to Plaintiff, and others similarly situated, include unpaid overtime, unpaid overtime on commissions, and any unpaid overtime associated with any work performed off-the-clock.
- 23. Plaintiff and others similarly situated Managers and Managers in Training were paid a specified salary and were not paid any overtime compensation notwithstanding the fact that they worked in excess of 40 hours per week and the vast majority of those hours were spent

performing non-managerial duties. Plaintiff, and others similarly situated, who elect to participate in this action seek unpaid overtime wage compensation, an equal amount of liquidated damages, attorneys' fees, and costs pursuant to 29 U.S.C. § 216(b).

- 24. Defendant is an enterprise engaged in commerce or in the production of goods for commerce as defined by § 203(s)(1) of the FLSA.
  - 25. Defendant is an employer as defined by § 203(d) of the FLSA.
- 26. At all times material to this action, the Plaintiff, and others similarly situated, are and/or were employees of Defendant as defined by § 203(e)(1) of the FLSA, and worked for Defendant within three years preceding the filing of this action.
- 27. The provisions set forth in §§ 206 and 207, respectively, of the FLSA apply to Defendant, and all members of the Plaintiff collective herein were covered by §§ 206 and 207 of the FLSA while they were employed by Defendant.
- 28. At all times relevant to this action, Defendant employed Plaintiff, and others similarly situated in the capacity of Managers in Training and/or Store Managers.
- 29. The Plaintiff, and all others similarly situated were required to perform non-exempt work without overtime compensation.
- 30. Defendant has knowingly and/or intentionally and/or recklessly failed and/or refused to pay the Plaintiffs and others similarly situated overtime compensation as required by the provisions of the FLSA.
- 31. For at least three years, the Defendant has been aware of the requirements of the FLSA and its corresponding regulations, notwithstanding it willfully refused and failed to pay its store managers and/or managers in training overtime wages as required by FLSA.

- 32. Defendant has failed, and on information and belief, continues to fail, to maintain accurate time records for Plaintiff, and all other similarly situated employees, as required by the FLSA.
- 33. Defendant willfully violated the FLSA by failing to keep accurate time records of all hours worked by Plaintiff, and all other similarly situated employees.
- 34. The foregoing conduct constitutes a willful violation of the FLSA within the meaning of 29 U.S.C. § 255(a), as Defendant knew or showed reckless disregard for the fact that its compensation practices were in violation of these laws.
- 35. Plaintiff, and all other similarly situated present and former employees, are entitled to statutory damages equal to the mandated overtime premium pay within the three (3) (or more) years preceding the filing of this Complaint.
- 36. Defendant has shown a reckless disregard for the FLSA's overtime requirements. Although Defendant had an obligation to make proper inquiry into their FLSA compliance obligations, it failed to do so or, having inquired, it ignored or willfully attempted to avoid its legal obligations.
- 37. Moreover, Defendant instructed its Store Managers and Managers in Training that they had complied with the FLSA and was not required to pay them overtime under federal law. As such, Plaintiff, and all other similarly situated employees were misled into believing that Defendant was in full compliance with the FLSA laws concerning payment of overtime compensation.
- 38. Defendant has not acted in good faith with respect to the failure to pay overtime compensation. Defendant had no legitimate reason to believe their actions and omissions were *not* a violation of the FLSA, thus entitling Plaintiff, and those similarly situated, to recover an

award of liquidated damages in an amount equal to the amount of unpaid overtime compensation described above.

- 39. There are numerous employees and former employees of Defendant who are similarly situated to Plaintiff who have been denied overtime compensation in violation of the FLSA, who would benefit from the issuance of Court-Supervised Notice and opportunity to join the present lawsuit. Those similarly situated employees and former employees are best known to Defendant, they are readily identifiable from Defendant's records, and their overtime hours have been recorded and maintained. Accordingly, all Managers, Managers in Training and former Managers and Managers in Training who are or have been employed with Defendant for the last three years, who have worked overtime hours and who have not been compensated overtime wages, and who regularly supervised less than 80 weekly hours of subordinate employee time, should be given Court-Supervised Notice of this lawsuit and opportunity to join herein.
- 40. Plaintiff's consent to become a party plaintiff in this representative FLSA action pursuant to 29 U.S.C. § 216(b), as evidenced by Plaintiff's "Consent to Become Party to Collective Action Under 29 U.S.C. § 216," filed herewith.

# COUNT I Violation of the Fair Labor Standards Act (Collective Action)

- 41. Plaintiff re-alleges and incorporates the preceding and subsequent paragraphs as if fully set forth herein.
- 42. Defendant violated Plaintiff's, and all others similarly situated, rights under the FLSA by failing to pay them overtime compensation for hours worked in excess of forty (40) hours for each workweek that they worked as Managers and/or Managers in Training.

- 43. Plaintiff, and all others similarly situated, were entitled to all the rights and protections of the FLSA and Defendant's failure to pay them overtime was in violation of the FLSA.
- 44. Defendant acted willfully and with reckless disregard for Plaintiff's, and others similarly situated, rights under the FLSA.
- 45. Plaintiff, and all others similarly situated, are entitled to back pay for all overtime hours worked during their employment with Defendant in an amount equal to one and one-half times their regular rate(s) of pay.
- 46. As a result of Defendant's willful and reckless actions, Plaintiff and all others similarly situated, are entitled to recover liquidated damages pursuant to 29 U.S.C. § 216(b).
- 47. Plaintiff, and all others similarly situated, are entitled to recover attorney's fees pursuant to 29 U.S.C. § 216(b).

#### PRAYER FOR RELIEF

WHEREFORE, the Plaintiff, individually and on behalf of all other similarly situated employees and former employees of Defendant, pray for the following relief:

- A. At the earliest possible time, she be allowed to give notice, or that the Court issue such Notice, to all other potential Plaintiffs who may be similarly situated informing them that this action has been filed, the nature of the action, and of their right to opt-into this lawsuit if they worked overtime but were not paid overtime wages therefore, pursuant to 29 U.S.C. § 216(b);
- B. Designate this action as a collective action on behalf of the FLSA collective class pursuant to 29 U.S.C. § 216(b);
- C. Enter judgment declaring that the acts and practices complained of herein are

- violations of the Fair Labor Standards Act, 29 U.S.C. § 201 et seq.;
- D. Enter judgment that the Plaintiff, and all others similarly situated, be awarded damages in the amount of their respective unpaid overtime wage compensation, plus an equal amount of liquidated damages pursuant to 29 U.S.C. § 216(b), and prejudgment interest;
- E. Enter judgment that Defendant's violations of the FLSA were willful;
- F. Enter judgment awarding Plaintiff, and those similarly situated, reasonable attorney's fees and costs of this suit, pursuant to 29 U.S.C. § 216(b);
- G. Enter judgment for post-judgment interest at the applicable legal rate;
- H. Grant leave to amend to add additional plaintiffs by motion, the filing of written consent forms, or any other method approved by the Court; to add claims under applicable state and federal laws, including claims for minimum wages pursuant to 29 U.S.C. § 206; and/or to add other Defendants who meet the definition of Plaintiffs' employer, pursuant to 29 U.S.C. § 203(d);
- I. Enjoin Defendant from future violations of the FLSA through the mandated payment of overtime compensation to similarly situated employees for hours worked in excess of forty (40) per week;
- J. Such other legal and equitable relief including, but not limited to, any injunctive and/or declaratory relief, to which they may be entitled; and
- K. Such further relief as this Court deems just and appropriate.

#### Trial by Jury is Demanded.

Respectfully submitted,

#### KIMBERLY HAUGHT, ON BEHALF OF HERSELF AND ALL OTHERS SIMILARLY SITUATED

By:\_\_\_\_/s/Paul M. Falabella\_

Harris D. Butler, III (VSB No. 26483) Zev H. Antell (VSB No. 74634) Paul M. Falabella (VSB No. 81199) Butler Royals, PLC 140 Virginia Street, Ste. 302 Richmond, Virginia 23219

Tel: (804) 648-4848 Fax: (804) 237-0413

Email: harris.butler@butlerroyals.com zev.antell@butlerroyals.com paul.falabella@butlerroyals.com

Attorneys for Plaintiffs

### JS 44 (Rev. 08/16) Case 3:16-cv-00942-HEH Crepture 15/12/12/16 Page 1 of 1 PageID# 12

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 decket sheet.

purpose of initiating the civil do	ocket sneet. (SEE INSTRUC	TIONS ON NEXT PAGE O	F THIS FO	PRM.)						
I. (a) PLAINTIFFS KIMBERLY HAUGHT, on behalf of herself and all others similarly situated				DEFENDANTS THE WIRELESS CENTER, INC.						
(c) Attorneys (Firm Name, Address, and Telephone Number) BUTLER ROYALS, Harris D. Butler, Zev Antell, Paul M. Falabella 140 Virginia Street, Suite 302, Richmond, VA 23219 (804) 648-4848			<del></del>	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.  Attorneys (If Known)						
II. BASIS OF JURISDI	CTION (Place on "X" in O	ne Box ()nlv)	III. CI	TIZENSHIP OF P	RINCIPA	L PARTIES	Place an "X" in C	)ne Box fo	or Plaintil	
	<b>Ճ</b> 3 Federal Question	"		(For Diversity Cases Only)		,	and One Box fo	r Defendai	nt)	
U.S. Government Plaintiff	(U.S. Government)	Not a Party)	Citizo		FF DEF	Incorporated or Prin of Business In TI		PTF 4	DEF 4	
☐ 2 U.S. Government Defendant	☐ 4 Diversity (Indicate Citizenshi	ip of Parties in Item III)	Citizo	en of Another State	2 🗇 2	Incorporated and Pr of Business In A	•	<b>5</b>	O 5	
				en or Subject of a  reign Country	3 🗇 3			<b>0</b> 6	<b>1</b> 6	
IV. NATURE OF SUIT		ly) RTS	100	ORFEITURE/PENALTY		for: Nature of Suit KRUPTCY	t Code Descript OTHER S			
☐ 110 Insurance ☐ 120 Marine ☐ 130 Miller Act ☐ 140 Negotiable Instrument ☐ 150 Recovery of Overpayment & Enforcement of Judgment ☐ 151 Medicare Act ☐ 152 Recovery of Defaulted Student Loans	PERSONAL INJURY  310 Airplane 315 Airplane Product Liability 320 Assault, Libel & Slander 330 Federal Employers' Liability 340 Marine	PERSONAL INJUR' 365 Personal Injury - Product Liability 367 Health Care/ Pharmaceutical Personal Injury Product Liability 368 Asbestos Personal Injury Product	Y	5 Drug Related Seizure of Property 21 USC 881 0 Other	422 Appe   423 With   28 U   PROPEI   820 Copy   830 Paten   840 Trade	al 28 USC 158 trawal SC 157  KTY RIGHTS rights t	□ 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			
(Excludes Veterans)  ☐ 153 Recovery of Overpayment of Veteran's Benefits  ☐ 160 Stockholders' Suits  ☐ 190 Other Contract  ☐ 195 Contract Product Liability  ☐ 196 Franchise	☐ 345 Marine Product Liability ☐ 350 Motor Vehicle ☐ 355 Motor Vehicle Product Liability ☐ 360 Other Personal Injury ☐ 362 Personal Injury - Medical Malpractice	Liability PERSONAL PROPER  370 Other Fraud  371 Truth in Lending 380 Other Personal Property Damage  385 Property Damage Product Liability	0 72 0 74 0 75	LABOR  0 Fair Labor Standards Act 0 Labor/Management Relations 0 Railway Labor Act 11 Family and Medical Leave Act 10 Other Labor Litigation	☐ 861 HIA ☐ 862 Black ☐ 863 DIW ☐ 864 SSID ☐ 865 RSI (	Lung (923) C/DIWW (405(g)) Title XVI 405(g))	480 Consum 490 Cable/Si 850 Securitie Exchang 890 Other St 891 Agricult 893 Environe 895 Freedom	at TV es/Commo ge atutory Ac ural Acts mental Ma	odities/ ctions	
REAL PROPERTY	CIVIL RIGHTS	PRISONER PETITION	NS 0 79	1 Employee Retirement		L TAX SUITS	Act			
<ul> <li>□ 210 Land Condemnation</li> <li>□ 220 Foreclosure</li> <li>□ 230 Rent Lease &amp; Ejectment</li> <li>□ 240 Torts to Land</li> <li>□ 245 Tort Product Liability</li> <li>□ 290 All Other Real Property</li> </ul>	☐ 440 Other Civil Rights ☐ 441 Voting ☐ 442 Employment ☐ 443 Housing/ Accommodations ☐ 445 Amer. w/Disabilities - Employment	Habeas Corpus:  463 Alien Detainee 510 Motions to Vacate Sentence 530 General 535 Death Penalty Other:		Income Security Act  IMMIGRATION  2 Naturalization Application	or Defendant)  871 IRS—Third Party 26 USC 7609		□ 899 Adminis Act/Rev Agency □ 950 Constitu	<ul> <li>■ 896 Arbitration</li> <li>■ 899 Administrative Procedure         Act/Review or Appeal of         Agency Decision</li> <li>■ 950 Constitutionality of         State Statutes</li> </ul>		
	☐ 446 Amer. w/Disabilities - Other ☐ 448 Education	☐ 540 Mandamus & Othe ☐ 550 Civil Rights ☐ 555 Prison Condition ☐ 560 Civil Detainee - Conditions of Confinement	er 🗇 46	5 Other Immigration Actions						
	moved from	Appellate Court		pened Anothe (specify)		6 Multidistri Litigation Transfer	-	Multidist Litigation Direct Fi	n -	
VI. CAUSE OF ACTIO	I Fair Labor Standa	ards Act 29 U.S.C.		Do not cite jurisdictional stat SEQ.	iutes unless di	versity):				
VII. REQUESTED IN COMPLAINT:	<del></del>	IS A CLASS ACTION	N D	EMAND \$		HECK YES only i	if demanded in	complair	ıt:	
VIII. RELATED CASE(S) IF ANY  (See instructions): JUDGE DOCKET NUMBER										
DATE SIGNATURE OF ATTORNEY OF RECORD										
FOR OFFICE USE ONLY										
RECEIPT # AN	MOUNT	APPLYING IFP		JUDGE		MAG. JUD	GE			

#### IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF VIRGINIA Richmond Division

KIMBERLY HAUGHT,	)		
on behalf of herself and all others similarly	)		
situated	)		
Plaintiffs	)		
	)	Case No.	
v.	)		
	)		
THE WIRELESS CENTER, INC.,	)		
	)		
	)		
Defendant.	)		

### CONSENT TO BECOME PARTY TO COLLECTIVE ACTION UNDER 29 U.S.C. § 216

I hereby consent to opt-in to become a plaintiff in this representative Fair Labor Standards Act ("FLSA") action pursuant to 29 U.S.C. § 216(b).

Signature

Printed Name

## **ClassAction.org**

This complaint is part of ClassAction.org's searchable class action lawsuit database and can be found in this post: <u>The Wireless Center Hit with Employee Misclassification, Unpaid OT Suit</u>