FILED

# UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT MIDDLE DISTRICT OF FLORIDA FORT MYERS DIVISION CLERK, US DISTRICT COURT HIDDLE DISTRICT OF FLORIDA FORT MYERS FLORIDA

DOROTHY JERNIGAN, on behalf of herself and others similarly situated,

Plaintiff,

v.

CASENO -CV- 265 - FEM-PAMRIM

1<sup>st</sup> STOP RECOVERY, INC, a Florida for Profit Corporation, and JUDITH MARRA-PTASHINSKI, Individually,

De	efe	nd	an	ts.

#### COMPLAINT AND DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL

Plaintiff, DOROTHY JERNIGAN ("<u>Plaintiff</u>"), on behalf of herself, and others similarly situated, and by and through the undersigned counsel, files this Complaint against Defendants, 1<sup>st</sup> STOP RECOVERY, INC, ("<u>1<sup>st</sup> STOP</u>"), and JUDITH MARRA-PTASHINSKI, Individually ("<u>MARRA</u>" and together with 1<sup>st</sup> STOP, "<u>Defendants</u>"), and state as follows:

## **INTRODUCTION**

- 1. This is an action for failure to pay overtime wages pursuant to 29 U.S.C. § 216(b) and 29 U.S.C. § 207(a).
- 2. Section 7(a) of the FLSA requires payment of time-and-one-half an employee's regular hourly rate whenever a covered employee works in excess of forty (40) hours per work week. 29 U.S.C. § 207(a).
- 3. Defendants have violated the FLSA by requiring Plaintiff, and those similarly situated, to work while not clocked in and failing to pay Plaintiff, and those similarly situated,

overtime at time-and-one-half of the Plaintiff's regular rate whenever Plaintiff, and those similarly situated, worked in excess of 40 hours per work week.

#### **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: (i) recover unpaid overtime wages; (ii) recover an additional equal amount as liquidated damages; and (iii) recover reasonable attorney's fees and costs.
- 2. The jurisdiction of the Court over this controversy is based upon 29 U.S.C. §216(b).
- 3. Venue is proper as the acts and omissions giving rise to Plaintiffs' claims occurred in Lee County, Florida.

#### **PARTIES**

- 4. At all times material hereto, Plaintiff was, and continues to be a resident of Lee County, Florida.
- 5. At all times material to this action, Defendant 1<sup>st</sup> STOP RECOVERY, INC, was and continues to be a Florida for Profit Corporation. Further at all times material hereto, Defendant 1<sup>st</sup> STOP RECOVERY, INC, was, and continues to be, engaged in business throughout The United States as well as in Florida with a principle place of business in Lee County, Florida.
- 6. At all times material to this action, Defendant, JUDITH MARRA-PTASHINSKI, was an individual resident of the State of Florida, who owned and operated Defendant, 1<sup>st</sup> STOP RECOVERY, INC.
  - 7. At all times material hereto, Marra regularly held and/or exercised the authority to

hire and fire employees of 1st Stop.

- 8. At all times material hereto, Marra regularly held and/or exercised the authority to determine the work schedules for the employees of 1<sup>st</sup> Stop.
- 9. At all times material hereto, Marra regularly held and/or exercised the authority to control the finances and operations of 1<sup>st</sup> Stop.
- 10. By virtue of having regularly held and/or exercised the authority to: (a) hire and fire employees of 1<sup>st</sup> Stop; (b) determine the work schedules for the employees of 1<sup>st</sup> Stop; and (c) control the finances and operations of 1<sup>st</sup> Stop, Johnson is an employer as defined by 29 U.S.C. 201 et. seq.
  - 11. Defendants provide repossession vehicle towing service for financial institutions.
- 12. At all times hereto, Plaintiff was "engaged in commerce" within the meaning of sections 6 and 7 of the FLSA.
- 13. At all times material hereto, Plaintiff was an "employee" of Defendants within the meaning of the FLSA.
- 14. At all times material hereto, Defendants were Plaintiff's "employer" within the meaning of the FLSA.
- 15. Defendants were and continue to be, an "Employer" within the meaning of the FLSA.
- 16. At all times material hereto, Defendants were, and continue to be an "enterprise engaged in commerce" within the meaning of the FLSA.
- 17. At all times material hereto, Defendants were and continue to be, an enterprise engaged in interstate commerce, within the meaning of the FLSA.
  - 18. Based upon information and belief, the annual gross revenue of Defendants is in

excess of \$500,000.00 per annum during the relevant time periods.

- 19. At all times hereto, Plaintiff was "engaged in commerce" and subject to individual coverage of the FLSA.
- 20. At all times hereto, Plaintiff was engaged in interstate commerce and subject to the individual coverage of the FLSA, as she regularly placed and accepted interstate phone calls, used the internet, emails, cloud based software and computing devices to interface with out of state lending institutions regarding delinquent car loans and subsequent repossession efforts
- 21. At all times material to this action, Defendants advertised on the internet, processed credit cards, communicated via mail, email, and telephone with the clients within and without Florida, and purchased goods produced out of state for use in its business here in Lee County.
- 22. Further, Defendant(s) had two or more employees who regularly handle vehicles and Defendant(s)' products and equipment, including painting supplies, cleaning supplies, design material, and other equipment, which had previously moved through interstate commerce, during performance of their duties.
- 23. At all times material hereto, the work performed by the Plaintiff was directly essential to the business performed by Defendant.

#### **STATEMENT OF FACTS**

- 24. Defendants operate a vehicle repossession business in this state.
- 25. Plaintiff worked for Defendants as an in office repossession agent/office assistant from approximately September 2015 to December 2016.
  - 26. Plaintiff was compensated on an hourly basis.
  - 27. Plaintiff was a non-exempt employee for Defendants.

- 28. Throughout the duration of her employment, Plaintiff was required to complete various non-exempt duties as her primary job function which included, but were not limited to, placing and receiving telephone calls, drafting and responding to email, data entry, tow truck coordination, and other activities facilitating the repossession of automobiles on behalf of Defendants' clients.
- 29. At various times, Defendants required Plaintiff to work, and Plaintiff did work, off the clock, without receiving compensation for the hours worked.
- 30. Plaintiff was not compensated for all of her overtime hours worked at a rate of time-and-a-half-her regular rate.
- 31. Plaintiff should be compensated at a rate of one and one-half times Plaintiff's regular rate for those hours that Plaintiff worked in excess of forty (40) hours per week as required by the FLSA.
- 32. Defendant has violated Title 29 U.S.C. §207 from at least September 2015 and continuing through today, in that:
  - a. Plaintiff, and those similarly situated, worked in excess of forty (40) hours in one or more workweeks for the period of employment with Defendants;
  - b. No payments or provisions for payment have been made by Defendants to properly compensate Plaintiff, and those similarly situated, at the statutory rate of one and one-half times their regular rate for all hours worked in excess of forty (40) hours per workweek, as provided by the FLSA; and
  - c. Defendant has failed to maintain proper time records as mandated by the FLSA.
  - 33. Upon information and belief, Defendants did not rely upon any written

administrative regulation, order, ruling, approval or interpretation of the Department of Labor Wage and Hour Division in creating Plaintiff's pay structure.

- 34. Defendants knew or should have known with reasonable diligence that their conduct violated the Fair Labor Standards Act or was in reckless disregard for its provisions. As such, Defendants' violation of the law was willful.
- 35. Defendant failed and/or refused to properly disclose or apprise Plaintiff of her rights under the FLSA.
- 36. Defendants were unjustly enriched by accepting the benefit and value of Plaintiff's work pursuant to the policies and procedures outlined above, but not compensating Plaintiff for this work.
- 37. Defendants employed and are employing other individuals who perform(ed) the same or similar job duties under the same pay provisions as Plaintiff.
- 38. Plaintiff has retained the law firm of MORGAN & MORGAN, P.A. to represent Plaintiff in the litigation and have agreed to pay the firm a reasonable fee for its services.

# COUNT I RECOVERY OF OVERTIME COMPENSATION

- 39. Plaintiff realleges and reavers paragraphs 1 through 38 of the Complaint as if fully set forth herein.
  - 40. Plaintiff was an employee of Defendant.
  - 41. Defendants were employers as defined by the FLSA.
  - 42. Defendant, 1<sup>st</sup> Stop, is a covered enterprise as defined by the FLSA.
- 43. From at least and approximately from September 2015 and continuing through December 2016, Plaintiff worked in excess of the forty (40) hours in one or more workweeks for

which Plaintiff was not compensated at the statutory rate of one and one-half times Plaintiff's regular rate of pay.

- 44. Plaintiff was, and is, entitled to be paid at the statutory rate of one and one-half times Plaintiff's regular rate of pay for all hours worked in excess of forty (40) hours in a workweek.
- 45. At all times material hereto, on information and belief, Defendants failed, and continue to fail, to maintain proper time records as mandated by the FLSA.
- 46. Defendants' actions were willful and/or showed reckless disregard for the provisions of the FLSA, as evidenced by their failure to compensate Plaintiff, and those similarly situated, at the statutory rate of one and one-half times Plaintiff's regular rate of pay for all hours worked in excess of forty (40) hours per week when it knew, or should have known, such was, and is, due.
- 47. Defendants have failed to properly disclose or apprise Plaintiff of her rights under the FLSA.
- 48. Due to the intentional, willful, and unlawful acts of Defendants, Plaintiff, and those similarly situated, suffered and continue to suffer damages and lost compensation for time worked over forty (40) hours per week, plus liquidated damages.
- 49. At all times material hereto, Defendants failed to comply with Title 29 and United States Department of Labor Regulations, 29 C.F.R. §§516.2 and 516.4, by virtue of the management policy, plan or decision that intentionally provided for the compensation of such employee for fewer hours than they actually worked.
- 50. Plaintiff is entitled to an award of reasonable attorney's fees and costs pursuant to 29 U.S.C. §216(b).

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff, on behalf of herself and on behalf of those similarly situated, request conditional certification; pursuant to Section 216(b) of the FLSA, of the employees who worked over 40 hours in one or more workweeks, an order permitting Notice to all potential class members; a Declaration that Defendants' policy violates the FLSA; entry of judgment in Plaintiff's favor and against Defendants for actual and liquidated damages, as well as costs, expenses and attorneys' fees and such other relief deemed proper by this Court.

## COUNT II UNJUST ENRICHMENT

- 51. Plaintiff re-alleges and reincorporate paragraphs 1 through 38 as if fully set forth herein.
- 52. This Court has supplemental jurisdiction over Plaintiff's unjust enrichment claims pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1367(a) because Plaintiff's unjust enrichment claims form a part of the same case or controversy and arise out of the common nucleus of operative facts as her overtime claims.
- 53. Plaintiff, and all others similarly situated to her, performed work for Defendants off the clock for which they were not compensated.
- 54. Plaintiff, and all others similarly situated to her, seek compensation for the time spent working while not clocked in to the extent that these hours cannot be captured as part of their overtime claims in Count One, because the addition of these work hours may be less than forty (40) hours within a single work week.
- 55. Defendants accepted the performance of, and retained the benefit of, the work performed by Plaintiff, and all others similarly situated to her, on their behalf without paying for that work.
  - 56. Defendants have been unjustly enriched as a result of its accepting the work of

Plaintiff, and others similarly situated to her, without proper compensation. It would be unjust to

allow Defendants to enjoy the fruits of the collective class's labor without proper compensation.

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff, on behalf of herself and on behalf of those similarly

situated, request class certification, pursuant to rule 23 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure,

of the employees who worked less than 40 hours in one or more workweeks who were not

compensated for all of their time worked while in the employ of Defendants, an order permitting

Notice to all potential class members; a Declaration that Defendants' were unjustly enriched by

failing to compensate Plaintiff, and those similarly situated, for work performed while in the

employ of Defendants; entry of judgment in Plaintiff's favor and against Defendants for actual

and punitive damages, as well as costs, expenses and attorneys' fees and such other relief

deemed proper by this Court.

JURY DEMAND

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

DATED this 12th day of May, 2017.

Respectfully submitted,

Morgan & Morgan, P.A.

By: /s/ Paul M. Botros

Paul M. Botros, Esq. FL Bar No.: 63365

600 N. Pine Island Rd., Ste. 400

Plantation, FL 33324

Tel: 954-318-0268

Fax: 954-333-3517

E-mail: PBotros@forthepeople.com

Trial Counsel for Plaintiff

9

JS 44 (Rev. 08/16)

## **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 do	cket sheet. (SEE INSTRUCT	TIONS ON NEXT PAGE O	F THIS FO	PRM.)	274, 13 roqui	ica for the ase of t	and Citik of Co.		
I. (a) PLAINTIFFS DOROTHY JERNIGAN, on behalf of herself and others similarly situate				DEFENDANTS 1st STOP RECOVERY, INC, a Florida for Profit Corporation, and JUDITH MARRA-PTASHINSKI,					
(b) County of Residence of First Listed Plaintiff Lee County (EXCEPT IN U.S. PLAINTIFF CASES)				County of Residence of First Listed Defendant Lee County  (IN U.S. PLAINTIFF CASES ONLY)  NOTE: IN LAND CONDEMNATION CASES, USE THE LOCATION OF THE TRACT OF LAND INVOLVED.					
(c) Attorneys (Firm Name, Address, and Telephone Number) Morgan & Morgan, P.A.				Attorneys (If Known)					
600 N.Pine Island Road, (954) 318-0268	#400, Plantation, Flori	da 33324							
II. BASIS OF JURISDI	CTION (Place an "X" in O	ne Box Only)		TIZENSHIP OF P	RINCIPA	L PARTIES	Place an "X" in ( and One Box fo		
□ 1 U.S. Government Plaintiff	3 Federal Question (U.S. Government Not a Party)		l	en of This State		Incorporated or Pri	ncipal Place	PTF	DEF 4
2 U.S. Government Defendant			Citiz	en of Another State	2 🛭 2	Incorporated and Proof Business In A		<b>a</b> s	O 5
				Citizen or Subject of a					O 6
IV. NATURE OF SUIT		ly) RTS	- 1	ORFEITURE/PENALTY"."		for: Nature of Sui			FS
☐ 110 Insurance ☐ 120 Marine	PERSONAL INJURY  310 Airplane	PERSONAL INJUR  365 Personal Injury -	Y 06	25 Drug Related Seizure of Property 21 USC 881	3 422 Appo 423 With	al 28 USC 158 drawal	375 False Cl 376 Qui Tan	aims Act n (31 USC	
☐ 130 Miller Act ☐ 140 Negotiable Instrument	☐ 315 Airplane Product Liability ☐ 320 Assault, Libel &	Product Liability  367 Health Care/	0 69	90 Other		SC 157	3729(a)  3729(a)  400 State Re  410 Antitrus	apportion	ment
☐ 150 Recovery of Overpayment & Enforcement of Judgment	Slander	Pharmaceutical Personal Injury			☐ 820 Copy		🗇 430 Banks ar	nd Bankir	ng
☐ 151 Medicare Act ☐ 152 Recovery of Defaulted	☐ 330 Federal Employers' Liability	Product Liability  368 Asbestos Persona	.		330 Pater 840 Trade		450 Commer	lion	
Student Loans (Excludes Veterans)	☐ 340 Marine ☐ 345 Marine Product	Injury Product Liability	÷. ‡	LABOR	SOCIAL	SECURITY 477	470 Racketed Corrupt	er Influen Organizat	
☐ 153 Recovery of Overpayment of Veteran's Benefits	Liability  350 Motor Vehicle	PERSONAL PROPEI  370 Other Fraud	KTY 🗗 7	10 Fair Labor Standards Act	☐ 861 HIA ☐ 862 Black	(1395ff) c Lung (923)	☐ 480 Consum ☐ 490 Cable/Sa		
☐ 160 Stockholders' Suits	☐ 355 Motor Vehicle	371 Truth in Lending	0 72	20 Labor/Management Relations		C/DIWW (405(g))	850 Securitie     Exchange	s/Commo	odities/
☐ 190 Other Contract ☐ 195 Contract Product Liability	Product Liability  360 Other Personal	O 380 Other Personal Property Damage		40 Railway Labor Act	☐ 865 RSI		☐ 890 Other St	atutory A	
☐ 196 Franchise	Injury  362 Personal Injury -	385 Property Damage Product Liability	0 7:	51 Family and Medical Leave Act			☐ 891 Agricult ☐ 893 Environ		
REAL PROPERTY	Medical Malpractice CIVIL RIGHTS	PRISONER PETITIO	_	90 Other Labor Litigation 91 Employee Retirement	PENED	AL TAX SUITS	3 895 Freedom Act	ı of Infor	mation
210 Land Condemnation	☐ 440 Other Civil Rights	Habeas Corpus:		Income Security Act	☐ 870 Taxe	s (U.S. Plaintiff	O 896 Arbitrati		
220 Foreclosure     230 Rent Lease & Ejectment	☐ 441 Voting ☐ 442 Employment	<ul> <li>463 Alien Detainee</li> <li>510 Motions to Vacat</li> </ul>			or D 871 IRS-	efendant) -Third Party	□ 899 Adminis Act/Rev	iew or Ap	peal of
240 Torts to Land 245 Tort Product Liability	443 Housing/ Accommodations	Sentence  530 General			26 U		Agency 250 Constitu	Decision	
290 All Other Real Property	445 Amer. w/Disabilities -	535 Death Penalty		IMMIGRATION	1	726	State Sta		
	Employment  446 Amer. w/Disabilities -	Other: 3 540 Mandamus & Otl		62 Naturalization Application 65 Other Immigration		SES	<u>~</u>	ני	)
	Other  448 Education	550 Civil Rights 555 Prison Condition		Actions		<del>2</del> 2525	5	با	Ť
		560 Civil Detainee - Conditions of				7200	- ⊋	N N	-
		Confinement				875			
	moved from 🗇 3	Remanded from Appellate Court			r District	DA MEDISTRI	• •	Multidis Litigatio	strict on -
	Cite the U.S. Civil Sta	tute under which you a	re filing (	(specify) <b>Do not cite jurisdictional s</b> tat		Transfer versity):		Direct F	110
VI. CAUSE OF ACTIO	ON Brief description of ca Recovery of unpa	iuse:					-		
VII. REQUESTED IN COMPLAINT:	CHECK IF THIS UNDER RULE 2	IS A CLASS ACTIO 3, F.R.Cv.P.	N D	DEMAND S		HECK YES only URY DEMAND:		complai	
VIII. RELATED CASI	E(S) (See instructions):	JUDGE			роскі	ET NUMBER			
DATE		SIGNATURE OF	TOKNEY	OPRECORP					
FOR OFFICE USE ONLY	11 00	PA	/_						
	CO T THUOM	APPLYING IFP		Judge 2:	c√	-QMAGJUI	-FEM-	<u>π</u> Φ <i>f</i>	(OL ^^
~ WX08	<i>J</i> /							. (10)	バルノ

2000 mz

# **ClassAction.org**

This complaint is part of ClassAction.org's searchable class action lawsuit database and can be found in this post: Florida Repo Service Facing Unpaid Overtime Allegations