JS 44 (Rev. 06/17)

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. (SEE INSTRUCTIONS ON NEXT PAGE OF THIS FORM.)

I. (a) PLAINTIFFS THOMAS HOLBERT, individually and on behalf of all persons similarly situated,		alf of	DEFENDANTS WASTE MANAGEMENT, INC.		
(b) County of Residence of First Listed Plaintiff (EXCEPT IN U.S. PLAINTIFF CASES)		ounty, PA	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.		
	Address, and Telephone Number) ah R. Schalman-Bergen, Camille Fund C., 1622 Locust Street, Philadelphia, I		Attorneys (If Known)		
II. BASIS OF JURISDI	CTION (Place an "X" in One Box Only)			RINCIPAL PARTIES	Place an "X" in One Box for Plaintif
☐ 1 U.S. Government Plaintiff	X3 Federal Question (U.S. Government Not a Party)		(For Diversity Cases Only) P1 en of This State		
☐ 2 U.S. Government Defendant	' 4 Diversity (Indicate Citizenship of Parties in Item I	(11)	en of Another State	of Business In A	Another State
PRIVATOR MANAGEMENT AND			en or Subject of a ' reign Country	3 ' 3 Foreign Nation	' 6 ' 6
IV. NATURE OF SUIT	(Place an "X" in One Box Only) TORTS	T FC	ORFEITURE/PENALTY		of Suit Code Descriptions.
110 Insurance 120 Marine 130 Marine 130 Marine 140 Negotiable Instrument 150 Recovery of Overpayment & 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 240 Torts to Land 245 Tort Product Liability 290 All Other Real Property	PERSONAL INJURY 310 Airplane 315 Airplane Product Liability 320 Assault, Libel & Slander Slander 330 Federal Employers' Liability 340 Marine 345 Marine Product Liability 350 Motor Vehicle Product Liability 350 Motor Vehicle Product Liability 360 Other Personal Injury 362 Personal Injury Medical Malpractice CIVIL RIGHTS 441 Voting 442 Employment 443 Housing/ Accommodations 445 Amer. w/Disabilities - Employment 446 Amer. w/Disabilities - Other 448 Education PERSONAL IN Product Liability PERSONAL PR 370 Other Frauc B70 Other Frauc B71 Truth in Le. B70 Other Personal B71 Truth in Le. B71 Truth in Le. B72 PRISONER PET B73 PRISONER PET B74 Abeas Corpus B75 Prison Conc B75 Prison C	NJURY 62 jury - ability 69 s/ contained 69 solution 69 solution	CABOR DESCRIPTION OF THE PROPERTY OF THE PROP	* 422 Appeal 28 USC 158 * 423 Withdrawal	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
	n One Box Only) moved from	☐ 4 Rein Reo _l		r District Litigation	
VI. CAUSE OF ACTIO	ON Cite the U.S. Civil Statute under which Fair Labor Standards Act, 29 U.S.C. see Brief description of cause:				Directine
	Unpaid wages and overtime compensati			T	
VII. REQUESTED IN COMPLAINT:	CHECK IF THIS IS A CLASS AC UNDER RULE 23, F.R.Cv.P.	TION D	EMAND S	CHECK YES only JURY DEMAND:	if demanded in complaint: X Yes 'No
VIII. RELATED CASE	(See instructions): JUDGE		7	DOCKET NUMBER	
DATE 6/22/2018	SIGNATURE	OF ATTOKNEY C	OF RECORD		
FOR OFFICE USE ONLY					
RECEIPT # AMOUNT APPLYING IFP JUDGE MAG. JUDGE					
Print	Save As				Reset

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA

CASE MANAGEMENT TRACK DESIGNATION FORM

THOMAS HOLBERT, individually and on behalf of all:

CIVIL ACTION

Telephone	FAX Number	E-Mail Address	
215-875-3000	215-875-4604	sschalman-bergen@bm.net	
Date	Attorney-at-law	Attorney for	
6/22/2018	Jell	Plaintiff	1
(f) Standard Management –	Cases that do not fall into a	any one of the other tracks.	
		cial or intense management by	()
(d) Asbestos – Cases involving exposure to asbestos.	ng claims for personal inju	ry or property damage from	()
(c) Arbitration – Cases required to be designated for arbitration under Local Civil Rule 53.2.			
(b) Social Security – Cases re and Human Services deny	equesting review of a decisying plaintiff Social Securi	tion of the Secretary of Health ty Benefits.	()
(a) Habeas Corpus – Cases b	rought under 28 U.S.C. § 2	2241 through § 2255.	()
SELECT ONE OF THE FO	LLOWING CASE MAN	AGEMENT TRACKS:	
plaintiff shall complete a Cas filing the complaint and serve side of this form.) In the ev designation, that defendant sh	e Management Track Desi a copy on all defendants. (yent that a defendant does hall, with its first appearan- ties, a Case Management T	y Reduction Plan of this court, couns gnation Form in all civil cases at the tin See § 1:03 of the plan set forth on the renot agree with the plaintiff regarding ce, submit to the clerk of court and ser track Designation Form specifying the gned.	me of verse said ve on
WASTE MANAGEMENT, INC.		NO.	
persons similarly situated, V.			

(Civ. 660) 10/02

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA

THOMAS HOLBERT, individually and on

: Civil Action No.:

behalf of all persons similarly situated,

Complaint— Class and Collective Action

Plaintiff,

Jury Trial Demanded

 \mathbf{v} .

WASTE MANAGEMENT, INC.

Defendant.

CLASS AND COLLECTIVE ACTION COMPLAINT

Plaintiff Thomas Holbert ("Plaintiff"), through his undersigned counsel, individually and on behalf of all persons similarly situated, files this Complaint against Defendant Waste Management, Inc. ("WM" or "Defendant") seeking all available relief under the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, 29 U.S.C. §§ 201, et seq. ("FLSA") and Pennsylvania state law. The following allegations are based on personal knowledge as to Plaintiff's own conduct and on information and belief as to the acts of others.

JURISDICTION AND VENUE

- 1. Jurisdiction over Plaintiff's FLSA claim is proper under 29 U.S.C. § 216(b) and 28 U.S.C. § 1331.
- 2. This Court has supplemental jurisdiction under 28 U.S.C. § 1367 over Plaintiff's state law claims because those claims derive from a common nucleus of operative facts.
- 3. Venue in this Court is proper pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1391(b)(2) in that a substantial part of the events giving rise to Plaintiff's and Class Members' claims occurred within this judicial district. Plaintiff and other Class Members performed work in this judicial district and were paid pursuant to Defendant's unlawful pay policy in this judicial district, and Defendant routinely

conducts business in this judicial district.

4. Venue in this Court is also proper pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1391(b)(1) & (d) in that Defendant resides in this judicial district and is subject to personal jurisdiction in this judicial district.

PARTIES

- 5. Plaintiff Thomas Holbert was employed by Defendant as a Waste collector for the Delaware Valley South location in Pennsylvania between approximately August 1990 and May 31, 2017, and pursuant to 29 U.S.C. § 216(b), has consented in writing to being a Plaintiff in this action. *See* Exhibit A.
- 6. Defendant Waste Management, Inc. is a corporation with its principal place of business in Houston, Texas. Defendant provide sanitation and trash collection services to customers throughout the U.S. "Waste Management is the largest environmental solutions provider in North America, serving more than 21 million municipal, commercial and industrial customers the U.S. and Canada." About Us, MANAGEMENT, in WASTE INC., https://www.wm.com/about/index.jsp (last visited May 24, 2018).
- 7. Defendant employed Plaintiff and continues to employ similarly situated employees.
- 8. Defendant employs individuals engaged in commerce or in the production of goods for commerce and/or handling, selling, or otherwise working on goods or materials that have been moved in or produced in commerce by any person, as required by 29 U.S.C. §§ 206-207.
 - 9. Defendant's annual gross volume of business exceeds \$500,000.
- 10. Defendant is not an independently owned and controlled local enterprise within the meaning of 29 U.S.C. § 207(b)(3).

CLASS DEFINITIONS

11. Plaintiff brings this lawsuit for Count I pursuant to 29 U.S.C. § 216(b) as a collective action on behalf of himself and the following class of potential opt-in litigants:

All current or former waste collectors of Waste Management, Inc. ("WM") who performed work in the United States at any time between June 22, 2015 and the present, who were paid hourly (the "FLSA Class").

12. Plaintiff brings this lawsuit for Counts II and III as a class action pursuant to FED. R. CIV. P. 23, on behalf of himself and the following class:

All current or former waste collectors of Waste Management, Inc. ("WM") who performed work in Pennsylvania at any time between June 22, 2014 ¹ and the present, who were paid hourly (the "Pennsylvania Class").

- 13. The FLSA Class and the Pennsylvania Class are together referred to as the "Classes."
- 14. Plaintiff reserves the right to redefine the Classes prior to notice or class certification, and thereafter, as necessary.

FACTS

- 15. Defendant employs waste collectors, such as Plaintiff, who perform a variety of sanitation services for Defendant's residential and corporate clients in this judicial district and throughout the United States.
- 16. Between August 1990 and May 31, 2017, Plaintiff was employed as a non-exempt hourly waste collector with Defendant, performing sanitation services for residential and commercial clients.
 - 17. Plaintiff and the Class Members are blue collar workers who are primarily engaged

¹ The statute of limitations on Plaintiff's unjust enrichment claim is four years. Therefore, employees may be members of the Pennsylvania Class if they were employed on or after June 22, 2014 for at least one of the Claims alleged on behalf of the Pennsylvania Class.

in manual labor duties.

- 18. Defendant has a policy or practice of failing to compensate Plaintiff and the Classes for all hours worked, including overtime compensation.
 - 19. Defendant paid Plaintiff and the Class Members an hourly rate.
- 20. Waste collectors begin their workday by checking into the Waste Management facility, picking up and preparing their equipment to being their work route following a mandatory morning meeting. Waste collectors are required to have their equipment and vehicles ready prior to the morning meetings.
- 21. Prior to the mandatory morning meetings, Plaintiff and Class Members are required to pick up their equipment from Waste Management necessary for the day, such as protective personal equipment, review the day's work on Waste Management computer tablets, change work orders, retrieve and review paperwork and proper manifests, and finalize the day's route. Plaintiff and Class Members were required to have completed these tasks before the meeting in order to begin their route immediately after the morning meeting.
- 22. Plaintiff and Class Members are also required to perform pre- and post-trip inspections of their assigned Waste Management vehicles and document the inspections.
- 23. These activities before the morning meetings Plaintiff and Class Members were required to perform are integral and indispensable to their principal activities. Waste Management employed Plaintiff and Class Members to operate the Waste Management vehicles and collect residential and/or business waste or recyclable material. Plaintiff and Class Members reviewed the day's work orders to retrieve the necessary equipment to complete the day's activities, and ensure the proper paperwork is completed in order to perform his/her work.
 - 24. Plaintiff was permitted to and often did perform his pre-check inspection prior to

the morning meeting.

- 25. Despite performing these work activities, Plaintiff and Class Members were not compensated for any time prior to the beginning of the morning meetings.
- 26. Waste collectors are required to clock in and out electronically using the timekeeping system called Kronos.
- 27. Defendant has a policy where a waste collector cannot clock in until about 15 minutes before the morning meeting.
- 28. While waste collectors are allowed to clock in 15 minutes prior to the morning meeting, they are not paid for those 15 minutes, even though waste collectors are performing the required tasks integral and indispensable to their performance at Defendant's locations.
- 29. Supervisors were made aware of the off-the-clock work prior to the meetings, including General Manager Steve Mitchell. Nonetheless, no changes were made and Class Members remained uncompensated for their time.
- 30. In addition, Plaintiff was required to take a 30-minute lunch break each day. However, due to the workload, Plaintiff would work through his lunch on average three (3) times per week. Defendant automatically deducted 30 minutes for lunch each workday whether or not Plaintiff worked through his lunch break.
- 31. Plaintiff was not paid for the time spent working through lunch. Plaintiff observed that the members of the Classes routinely work through lunch and were also not compensated for this time.
- 32. Accordingly, on average Plaintiff would work 2 hours and 45 minutes to 3 hours off-the-clock each workweek. Plaintiff observed other Class Members work similar off-the-clock hours each workweek.

- 33. Defendant does not maintain accurate records of the hours that Plaintiff and the Class Members worked each workday and the total number of hours worked each workweek as required by the FLSA. *See* 29 C.F.R. § 516.2(a)(7).
- 34. Plaintiff routinely worked five (5) days per week and every other Saturday. Each day he worked, he routinely worked between eight (8) to ten (10) hours per day. Plaintiff observed that the members of the Classes routinely worked similar schedules.
- 35. In actuality, Plaintiff and Class Members regularly worked more than forty (40) hours per workweek in executing their duties with off-the-clock work. Defendant did not properly pay Plaintiff and Class Members overtime compensation for hours worked in excess of forty (40) per workweek.
- 36. As a nationwide corporation, there is no question that Defendant has access to human resource expertise and legal counsel who can advise Defendant on its FLSA compliance obligations.
- 37. Defendant acted willfully and/or with reckless disregard of the applicable FLSA and Pennsylvania state law provisions, by failing to properly compensate Plaintiff and the Classes for hours worked in excess of forty (40) during the workweek.
- 38. Moreover, during the entire relevant time period, Defendant were aware that the Classes were not properly compensated under the FLSA and Pennsylvania state law when supervisors received complaints regarding the timekeeping system. Also, Defendant has been the subject of numerous similar FLSA lawsuits in courts across the United States.
- 39. Furthermore, Defendant failed to properly track, monitor or record the actual number of hours per day that the FLSA Class Members worked, as required by the FLSA. *See* 29 U.S.C.A. § 211(c): 29 C.F.R. §§ 516.5(a), 516.6(a)(1), 516.2(c) (requiring employers to maintain

payroll records for three years and time sheets for two years, including the exact number of hours worked each day and each week).

COLLECTIVE ACTION ALLEGATIONS

- 40. Plaintiff brings this lawsuit pursuant to 29 U.S.C. § 216(b) as a collective action on behalf of the FLSA Class defined above.
- 41. Plaintiff desires to pursue his FLSA claim on behalf of any individuals who opt-in to this action pursuant to 29 U.S.C. § 216(b).
- 42. Plaintiff and the FLSA Class are "similarly situated," as that term is used in 29 U.S.C. § 216(b), because, *inter alia*, all such individuals worked pursuant to Defendant's previously described common pay practices and, as a result of such practices, were not paid the full and legally mandated overtime compensation for hours worked over forty (40) during the workweek. Resolution of this action requires inquiry into common facts, including, *inter alia*, Defendant's common compensation, timekeeping and payroll practices.
- 43. The similarly situated employees are known to Defendant, are readily identifiable, and may be located through Defendant's records and the records of any payroll companies that Defendant utilizes.
- 44. Defendant employs many FLSA Class Members throughout the United States. These similarly situated employees may be readily notified of this action through direct U.S. mail and/or other appropriate means, and allowed to opt into it pursuant to 29 U.S.C. § 216(b), for the purpose of collectively adjudicating their claims for overtime compensation, liquidated damages (or, alternatively, interest), and attorneys' fees and costs under the FLSA.

CLASS ACTION ALLEGATIONS

45. Plaintiff brings this action as a class action pursuant to FED. R. CIV. P. 23 on behalf

of himself and the Pennsylvania Class defined above.

- 46. The members of the Pennsylvania Class are so numerous that joinder of all members is impracticable. Upon information and belief, there are more than forty (40) members of the Pennsylvania Class.
- 47. Plaintiff will fairly and adequately represent and protect the interests of the Pennsylvania Class because there is no conflict between the claims of Plaintiff and those of the Pennsylvania Class, and Plaintiff's claims are typical of the claims of the Pennsylvania Class. Plaintiff's counsel are competent and experienced in litigating class actions and other complex litigation matters, including wage and hour cases like this one.
- 48. There are questions of law and fact common to the proposed Pennsylvania Class, which predominate over any questions affecting only individual Class Members, including, without limitation: whether Defendant has violated and continues to violate Pennsylvania law through its policy or practice of not paying its day rate employees overtime compensation.
- 49. Plaintiff's claims are typical of the claims of the Pennsylvania Class in the following ways, without limitation: (a) Plaintiff is a member of the Pennsylvania Class; (b) Plaintiff's claims arise out of the same policies, practices and course of conduct that form the basis of the claims of the Pennsylvania Class; (c) Plaintiff's claims are based on the same legal and remedial theories as those of the Pennsylvania Class and involve similar factual circumstances; (d) there are no conflicts between the interests of Plaintiff and the Pennsylvania Class Members; and (e) the injuries suffered by Plaintiff are similar to the injuries suffered by the Pennsylvania Class Members.
- 50. Class certification is appropriate under FED. R. CIV. P. 23(b)(3) because questions of law and fact common to the Pennsylvania Class predominate over any questions affecting only

individual Class Members.

- 51. Class action treatment is superior to the alternatives for the fair and efficient adjudication of the controversy alleged herein. Such treatment will permit a large number of similarly situated persons to prosecute their common claims in a single forum simultaneously, efficiently, and without the duplication of effort and expense that numerous individual actions would entail. No difficulties are likely to be encountered in the management of this class action that would preclude its maintenance as a class action, and no superior alternative exists for the fair and efficient adjudication of this controversy. The Pennsylvania Class is readily identifiable from Defendant's own employment records. Prosecution of separate actions by individual members of the Pennsylvania Class would create the risk of inconsistent or varying adjudications with respect to individual Pennsylvania Class Members that would establish incompatible standards of conduct for Defendant.
- 52. A class action is superior to other available methods for adjudication of this controversy because joinder of all members is impractical. Further, the amounts at stake for many of the Pennsylvania Class Members, while substantial, are not great enough to enable them to maintain separate suits against Defendant.
- 53. Without a class action, Defendant will retain the benefit of its wrongdoing, which will result in further damages to Plaintiff and the Pennsylvania Class. Plaintiff envisions no difficulty in the management of this action as a class action.

COUNT I Violation of the FLSA (On Behalf of the FLSA Class)

- 54. All previous paragraphs are incorporated as though fully set forth herein.
- 55. The FLSA requires that covered employees be compensated for all hours worked

in excess of forty (40) hours per week at a rate not less than one and one-half (1 ½) times the

regular rate at which he is employed. See 29 U.S.C. § 207(a)(1).

56. Defendant is subject to the wage requirements of the FLSA because Defendant is

an "employer" under 29 U.S.C. § 203(d).

57. During all relevant times, Plaintiffs and the FLSA Class are covered employees

entitled to the above-described FLSA's protections. See 29 U.S.C. § 203(e).

58. Defendant's compensation and timekeeping scheme applicable to Plaintiff and the

FLSA Class failed to comply with either 29 U.S.C. § 207(a)(1).

59. Defendant knowingly failed to compensate Plaintiff and the FLSA Class at a rate

of one and one-half (1 ½) times their regular hourly wage for all hours worked in excess of forty

(40) hours per week, in violation of 29 U.S.C. § 207(a)(1).

60. Defendant also failed to make, keep, and preserve records with respect to Plaintiffs

and the FLSA Class sufficient to determine their wages, hours, and other conditions of

employment in violation of the FLSA. 29 U.S.C. § 211(c); 29 C.F.R. §§ 516.5(a), 516.6(a)(1),

516.2(c).

61. In violating the FLSA, Defendant acted willfully and with reckless disregard of

clearly applicable FLSA provisions.

62. Pursuant to 29 U.S.C. § 216(b), employers such as Defendant, who intentionally

fail to pay an employee wages in conformance with the FLSA shall be liable to the employee for

unpaid wages, liquidated damages, court costs and attorneys' fees incurred in recovering the

unpaid wages.

COUNT II

Violation of the Pennsylvania Minimum Wage Act

(On Behalf of the Pennsylvania Class)

- 63. All previous paragraphs are incorporated as though fully set forth herein.
- 64. The Pennsylvania Minimum Wage Act of 1968 ("PMWA") requires that covered employees be compensated for all hours worked. See 43 P.S. § 333.104(a) and 34 PA. CODE § 231.21(b).
- 65. The PMWA also requires that covered employees be compensated for all hours worked in excess of forty (40) hours per week at a rate not less than one and one-half (1 ½) times the regular rate at which he is employed. *See* 43 P.S. § 333.104(c) and 34 PA. CODE § 231.41.
- 66. Defendant is subject to the overtime requirements of the PMWA because Defendant is an employer under 43 P.S. § 333.103(g).
- 67. During all relevant times, Plaintiff and the Pennsylvania Class were covered employees entitled to the above-described PMWA's protections. *See* 43 P.S. § 333.103(h).
- 68. Defendant's compensation scheme that is applicable to Plaintiff and the Pennsylvania Class failed to comply with 43 P.S. §§ 333.104(a) and (c), 34 PA. CODE §§ 231.1(b) and 43(b).
- 69. Defendant knowingly failed to compensate Plaintiff and the Pennsylvania Class at a rate of one and one-half (1 ½) times their regular hourly wage for hours worked in excess of forty (40) hours per week, in violation of 43 P.S. § 333.104(c) and 34 PA. CODE § 231.41.
- 70. Defendant fails to accurately track all of the hours that Plaintiffs and the Pennsylvania Class work. See 43 P.S. § 333.108 and 34 PA. CODE § 231.31.
- 71. Pursuant 43 P.S. § 333.113, employers, such as Defendant, who intentionally fail to pay an employee wages in conformance with the PMWA shall be liable to the employee for the wages or expenses that were intentionally not paid, court costs and attorneys' fees incurred in recovering the unpaid wages.

72. In violating the PMWA, Defendant acted willfully and with reckless disregard of clearly applicable PMWA provisions.

COUNT III Unjust Enrichment (On Behalf of the Pennsylvania Class)

- 73. All previous paragraphs are incorporated as though fully set forth herein.
- 74. Defendant has received and benefited from the uncompensated labors of Plaintiff and the Pennsylvania Class, such that to retain said benefit without compensation would be inequitable and rise to the level of unjust enrichment.
- 75. At all relevant times hereto, Defendant devised and implemented a plan to increase its earnings and profits by fostering a scheme of securing work from Plaintiff and the Pennsylvania Class without paying overtime compensation for all hours worked.
- 76. Contrary to all good faith and fair dealing, Defendant induced Plaintiff and the Pennsylvania Class to perform work while failing to pay overtime compensation for all hours worked as required by law.
- 77. By reason of having secured the work and efforts of Plaintiff and the Pennsylvania Class without paying overtime compensation as required by law, Defendant enjoyed reduced overhead with respect to its labor costs, and therefore realized additional earnings and profits to its own benefit and to the detriment of Plaintiff and the Pennsylvania Class. Defendant retained and continues to retain such benefits contrary to the fundamental principles of justice, equity, and good conscience.
- 78. Accordingly, Plaintiff and the Pennsylvania Class are entitled to judgment in an amount equal to the benefits unjustly retained by Defendant.

PRAYER FOR RELIEF

WHEREFORE. Plaintiff. individually and on behalf of all others similarly situated, seeks

the following relief:

- A. An order permitting this litigation to proceed as an FLSA collective action pursuant to 29 U.S.C. § 216(b);
- B. Prompt notice, pursuant to 29 U.S.C. § 216(b), of this litigation to all potential FLSA Class Members;
- C. An order permitting this litigation to proceed as a class action pursuant to FED. R. CIV. P. 23 on behalf of the Pennsylvania Class;
- D. Back pay damages (including unpaid overtime compensation, unpaid spread of hours payments, and unpaid wages) and prejudgment interest to the fullest extent permitted under the law;
- E. Liquidated damages to the fullest extent permitted under the law;
- F. Litigation costs, expenses, and attorneys' fees to the fullest extent permitted under the law; and
- G. Such other and further relief as this Court deems just and proper.

JURY TRIAL DEMAND

Plaintiff demands a trial by jury for all issues of fact.

Dated: June 22, 2018

Respectfully submitted,

BERGER & MONTAGUE, P.C.

Shanon J. Carson (PA 85957)

Sarah R. Schalman-Bergen (PA 206211)

Camille Fundora (PA 312533)

BERGER & MONTAGUE, P.C.

1622 Locust Street

Philadelphia, PA 19103

Telephone: (215) 875-3000

Facsimile: (215) 875-4604

scarson@bm.net

sschalman-bergen@bm.net

cfundora@bm.net

Attorneys for Plaintiff and the Proposed Classes

Exhibit A

DocuSign Envelope ID: 9C609C0D-B643-4DE5-9F2F-4C714F7636B4

OPT-IN CONSENT FORM

Unpaid Wages and Overtime Litigation – Waste Management, Inc.

Complete And Mail (or Email) To:

WASTE MANAGEMENT, INC. OVERTIME LITIGATION ATTN: CAMILLE FUNDORA BERGER & MONTAGUE, P.C. 1622 LOCUST STREET PHILADELPHIA, PA 19103

> Email: cfundora@bm net Phone: (215) 875-3033 Fax: (215) 875-4604

Name:	Thomas Holbert (Please Print)	Phone No.:				
Address:		Email:				
CONSENT TO JOIN COLLECTIVE ACTION						
Pursuant to Fair Labor Standards Act, 29 U.S.C. § 216(b)						
	. I consent and agree to pursue my claims arising out of alleged violations of the Fair Labor Standards Act, 29 U.S.C. § 201, <i>et seq.</i> in connection with the above-referenced lawsuit.					
2.	I have worked for Waste Management, Inc. ("Defendant" or "WM") in (state(s)) Pennsylvania from on or about (dates(s)) 8/20/90 to on or about (dates(s)) 5/31/17					
	I understand that this lawsuit is brought under the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, as amended, 29 U.S.C. § 201, et seq. I hereby agree and opt-in to become a Plaintiff herein and be bound by any judgment of the Court or any settlement of this action.					
	I specifically authorize the attorneys, Berger & Montague, P.C., as my agents to prosecute this lawsuit on my behalf and to negotiate a settlement of any and all claims I have against the Defendant in this case.					
5/31	./2018 (Date Signed)	Thomas Holbert(Signature)				
IMPORTANT NOTE Statute of Limitations concerns mandate that you return this form as soon as possible to preserve your rights						

Statute of Limitations concerns mandate that you return this form as soon as possible to preserve your rights.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA

DESIGNATION FORM

(to be used by counsel or pro se plaintiff to indicate the category of the case for the purpose of assignment to the appropriate calendar)

Address of Plaintiff:	Clifton Heights, PA				
Address of Defendant:	1001 Fannin Street, Houston, Texas				
Place of Accident, Incident or Transaction:					
RELATED CASE, IF ANY:					
Case Number:	Judge:	Date Terminated:			
Civil cases are deemed related when <i>Yes</i> is answere	ed to any of the following questions:				
Is this case related to property included in an operationally terminated action in this court?	earlier numbered suit pending or within one year	Yes No 🗸			
	2. Does this case involve the same issue of fact or grow out of the same transaction as a prior suit Yes No V pending or within one year previously terminated action in this court?				
3. Does this case involve the validity or infringer numbered case pending or within one year pre	3. Does this case involve the validity or infringement of a patent already in suit or any earlier numbered case pending or within one year previously terminated action of this court?				
4. Is this case a second or successive habeas corpasse filed by the same individual?	ve habeas corpus, social security appeal, or pro se civil rights Yes No				
I certify that, to my knowledge, the within case this court except as noted above. DATE: 06/25/2018	is / • is not/related to any case now pending of	206211 Attorney I.D. # (if applicable)			
CIVIL: (Place a √in one category only)					
A. Federal Question Cases: 1. Indemnity Contract, Marine Contract, an 2. FELA 3. Jones Act-Personal Injury 4. Antitrust 5. Patent 6. Labor-Management Relations 7. Civil Rights 8. Habeas Corpus 9. Securities Act(s) Cases 10. Social Security Review Cases 11. All other Federal Question Cases (Please specify): Fair Labor Sta	2. Airplane Pers 3. Assault, Defa 4. Marine Perso 5. Motor Vehicl 6. Other Persona 7. Products Liab 8. Products Liab 9. All other Dive	ntract and Other Contracts sonal Injury unation onal Injury le Personal Injury al Injury (Please specify): bility bility — Asbestos ersity Cases			
ARBITRATION CERTIFICATION					
. Sarah R. Schalman-Bergen	ect of this certification is to remove the case from eligibile, counsel of record or pro se plaintiff, do hereby certify:				
exceed the sum of \$150,000,000 exclusive		e damages recoverable in this civil action case			
Relief other than monetary damages is so	ought.				
DATE: 06/25/2018		206211			
NOTE: A trial de novo will be a trial by jury only if there	has been compliance with F.R.C.P. 38.	Attorney L.D. # (if applicable)			