#### UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF FLORIDA FT. LAUDERDALE DIVISION

## MELISSA JOHNSON, on behalf of herself and on behalf of all other similarly situated persons,

Plaintiffs,

v.

Case No.:

#### CENTERFIELD MEDIA HOLDING COMPANY,

Defendant.

## <u>CLASS ACTION COMPLAINT</u> (JURY TRIAL DEMANDED)

Plaintiff, Melissa Johnson ("Plaintiff") on behalf of herself and on behalf of a putative class comprised of other similarly-situated persons, by and through her undersigned counsel, files this Class Action Complaint against Defendant, Centerfield Media Holding Company ("Defendant"), and alleges as follows:

#### **NATURE OF THE ACTION**

1. This is a class action for the recovery by the Plaintiff, on her own behalf and on behalf of approximately 200 other similarly situated former employees (collectively the "Class", as defined below), seeking damages in the amount of 60 days' compensation and benefits for each of them by reason of the Defendant's violation of their rights under the Worker Adjustment and Retraining Notification Act, 29 U.S.C. § 2101 *et seq.* (the "WARN Act"). The WARN Act class is defined as follows:

# <u>WARN ACT CLASS</u>: All similarly-situated persons worked for Defendant at its Margate, Florida, facility and were laid off without cause by Defendant as part of or

# as the reasonably foreseeable result of a plant shutdown ordered by Defendant at the Facility in March of 2018.

2. The WARN Act requires that the employer provide 60 days written notice of the intention to lay off more than 50 employees during any 30-day period as part of a plant closing. The notice must be provided to employees, the State dislocated worker unit and the chief elected official of the unit of local government in which the employment site is located, and any collective bargaining unit. Defendant violated the WARN Act by failing to follow these requirements, as set forth in detail herein.

3. Plaintiff and the other Class members were employees of Defendant who were terminated without cause on their part in or about March 31, 2018, as part of or as the reasonably expected consequence of a mass layoff or plant closing, which was effectuated by Defendant on or about that date.

4. Defendant failed to give the Plaintiff and the Class Members at least 60 days' advance notice of their termination. As a consequence, the Plaintiff and the Class members are entitled under the WARN Act to recover from the Defendant their respective compensation and benefits for 60 days, no part of which has been paid.

#### **JURISDICTION**

5. This Court has jurisdiction over this proceeding pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1331 and 29 U.S.C. § 2104(a)(5).

6. The violation of the WARN Act alleged herein occurred in this District.

7. Venue in this Court is proper pursuant to 29 U.S.C. § 2104(a)(5).

#### THE PARTIES

8. At all relevant times Defendant was a corporation authorized to conduct business in the State of Florida.

9. Defendant maintained an office or facility in Margate, Florida (the "Facility").

10. In 2017 through March of 2018 Defendant employed approximately 200 persons at the Facility.

11. Prior to their terminations, Plaintiff and the Class Members were employees of Defendant who worked at the Facility.

12. In March of 2018 the Plaintiff and the Class Members were terminated from their employment, without cause on their part, by the Defendant.

13. Plaintiff brings this action on her own behalf and, pursuant to rules 23(a) and(b)(3) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, on behalf of all other members of the Class.

#### **CLASS ACTION ALLEGATIONS**

14. Defendant operates call centers in California, New York, and Florida. Plaintiff and the Class Members worked at Defendant's Margate, Florida call center until they were laid off in violation of the WARN Act mass-layoff requirements. According to its website, Defendant "offers a fully integrated (end to end) marketing and sales solution engaging the consumer from initial touch point all the way through completed sale." *See* https://www.centerfield.com.

15. At all relevant times, Defendant employed 100 or more employees, exclusive of part-time employees, *i.e.*, those employees who had worked fewer than 6 of the 12 months prior to the date notice was required to be given or who had worked fewer than an average of 20 hours per week during the 90 day period prior to the date notice was required to be given (the "Part-Time Employees"), or employed 100 or more employees who in the aggregate worked at least 4,000 hours per week exclusive of hours of overtime within the United States.

16. Plaintiff and the Class members worked at Defendant's Margate, Florida, call center and handled in-bound calls for Defendant who, prior to the mass layoff, had a temporary contract with Sprint. When the Sprint contract ended, Defendant violated the WARN Act by engaging in a mass layoff of Plaintiff and the Class Members without proper notice.

17. Instead of complying with the WARN Act's mass-layoff notification requirements, Defendant waited until February of 2018 to vaguely suggest to Plaintiff and the Class Members that the Sprint project would conclude at the end of March 2018. No other details were given at the time of original notification.

18. Two weeks before the Sprint project ended, Defendant had the Facility supervisors send an email stating that no more compensation would be paid to Plaintiff and the Class Members after March 31, 2018, terminating their employment.

19. The terminations in March of 2018 of Plaintiff and the Class Members resulted in the loss of employment for at least 50 employees excluding Part-Time Employees.

20. Plaintiff and the Class Members worked for the employer more than 6 months in the 12 months preceding the March of 2018 mass layoff. They also worked, on average, more than 20 hours a week.

21. The mass layoff resulted in closing of the Facility, and resulted in the loss of employment for approximately 200 employees who made up more than 33% of the Defendant's active workforce at the facility.

22. Prior to the terminations, the Plaintiff and the Class members did not receive written notice at least 60 days in advance of the termination of their employment.

23. The Plaintiff and the Class members constitute a Class within the meaning of Rules 23(a) and (b)(3) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure.

#### Case 0:18-cv-60875-WPD Document 1 Entered on FLSD Docket 04/18/2018 Page 5 of 8

24. Each of the other Class members is similarly situated to the Plaintiff with respect to his or her rights under the WARN Act.

25. Common questions of law and fact are applicable to all members of the Class.

26. The common questions of law and fact arise from and concern the following facts, among others: that all Class members enjoyed the protection of the WARN Act; that all Class members were employees of the Defendant who worked at the Facility; that the Defendant terminated the employment of all the members of the Class without cause on their part; that the Defendant terminated the employment of the members of the Class without giving them at least 60 days' prior written notice as required by the WARN Act; that the Defendant failed to pay the Class members wages and to provide other employee benefits for a 60-day period following their respective terminations; and, the issues raised by any affirmative defenses that may be asserted by the Defendant.

27. The Plaintiff's claims are typical of the claims of the other members of the Class in that for each of the several acts of Defendant described above, and the Plaintiff and the Class members are each injured parties with respect to his/her rights under the WARN Act.

28. The Plaintiff will fairly and adequately protect and represent the interests of the Class as she has no interests adverse to the Class.

29. The Plaintiff and her counsel have the time and resources to prosecute this action.

30. The Plaintiff has retained the undersigned counsel who possess extensive class action experience, including experience with litigation of WARN Act claims, employee rights' claims, and other claims in Federal court.

31. The Class is so numerous as to render joinder of all members impracticable in that there are approximately 200 or more members of the Class.

32. The questions of law and fact common to the members of the Class predominate over any questions affecting only individual members.

33. A class action is superior to other available methods for the fair and efficient adjudication of the controversy.

34. No Class member has an interest in individually controlling the prosecution of a separate action under the WARN Act.

35. As far as Plaintiff and her counsel know, to date no other litigation concerning the WARN Act rights of any Class member has been commenced against Defendant.

36. Concentrating all the potential litigation concerning the WARN Act rights of the Class members in this Court will avoid a multiplicity of suits, will conserve judicial resources and the resources of the parties, and is the most efficient means of resolving the WARN Act rights of all the Class members.

37. The names of all the Class members are contained in Defendant's records and are easily ascertainable.

38. The rate of pay and the benefits that were being paid or provided by Defendant to each Class member at the time of his or her termination are contained in Defendant's records.

39. As a result of Defendant's violation of the WARN Act, each Class member is entitled to recover an amount equal to the sum of: (a) his/her respective wages, salaries, commissions, bonuses and accrued pay for vacation and personal days for the work days in the 60 calendar days prior to their respective terminations and fringe benefits for 60 calendar days prior to their respective terminations; and (b) his/her medical expenses incurred during the 60-day period following their respective terminations that would have been covered and paid under the Defendant's health insurance plan had that plan provided coverage for such period.

#### JURY TRIAL DEMAND

40. Plaintiff hereby demands a jury trial of all issues that may be so tried.

#### PRAYER FOR RELIEF

WHEREFORE, the Plaintiff demands judgment against Defendant as follows:

A. In favor of the Plaintiff and each other Class member against the Defendant equal to the sum of: (a) wages, salary, commissions, bonuses, accrued pay for vacation and personal days, for 60 days; (b) pension, 401(k) contributions, health and medical insurance and other fringe benefits for 60 days; and (c) medical expenses incurred during the 60 day period following their respective terminations that would have been covered and paid under the Defendant's health insurance plans had coverage under that plan continued for such period, all determined in accordance with the WARN Act, 29 U.S.C. § 2104 (a)(1)(A).

B. Appointment of the Plaintiff and as Class Representative;

C. Appointment of the undersigned as Class Counsel;

D. In favor of the Plaintiff and the Class Members for the reasonable attorneys' fees and the costs and disbursements of prosecuting this action, as authorized by the WARN Act, 29 U.S.C. § 2104 (a)(6).

E. Interest allowed by law; and

F. Such other and further relief as this Court deems just and proper.

Case 0:18-cv-60875-WPD Document 1 Entered on FLSD Docket 04/18/2018 Page 8 of 8

Dated this \_\_\_\_ day of April, 2018.

Respectfully submitted.

BRANDON J. HILL Florida Bar Number: 37061 MATTHEW K. FENTON Florida Bar Number: 0002089 WENZEL FENTON CABASSA, P.A. 1110 North Florida Ave., Suite 300 Tampa, Florida 33602 Main No.: 813-224-0431 Facsimile: 813-229-8712 Email: bhill@wfclaw.com Email: mkfenton@wfclaw.com Email: twells@wfclaw.com Attorneys for Plaintiffs

and

RICHARD CELLER Florida Bar Number: 0173370 NOAH E. STORCH Florida Bar Number: 0085476 RICHARD CELLER LEGAL, P.A. 7450 Griffin Road, Suite 230 Davie, Florida 33314 Main No.: (866) 344-9243 Facsimile: (954) 337-2771 Email: richard@floridaovertimelawyer.com Email: noah@floridaovertimelawyer.com Attorneys for Plaintiffs

#### Case 0:18-cv-60875-WPD Document 1-1 Entered on FLSD Docket 04/18/2018 Page 1 of 1 **CIVIL COVER SHEET** JS 44 (Rev. 06/17) FLSD Revised 06/01/2017

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.)* NOTICE: Attorneys MUST Indicate All Re-filed Cases Below.

#### I. (a) PLAINTIFFS MELISSA JOHNSON, on behalf of herself and on behalf of all other similarly situated persons,

(EXCEPT IN U.S. PLAINTIFF CASES)

(b) County of Residence of First Listed Plaintiff Broward

County of Residence of First Listed Defendant (IN U.S. PLAINTIFF CASES ONLY)

**DEFENDANTS** CENTERFIELD MEDIA HOLDING COMPANY

(c) Attorneys (Firm Name, A Brandon J. Hill, Wenze Suite 300, Tampa, FL 3	l Fenton Cabassa, P.A	., 1110 N. Florida Av	NOTE: Attorneys (If Know Ve.,	THE TRAC	ONDEMNATION CASES, USE T OF LAND INVOLVED.	THE LOCATION OF
(d) Check County Where Actic	on Arose: 🗖 MIAMI-DADE	MONROE BROWARD	□ PALM BEACH □ MARTIN □ ST	T. LUCIE 🔲 INDL	AN RIVER 🗖 OKEECHOBEE 🗖 HIG	HLANDS
II. BASIS OF JURISDI	CTION (Place an "X" i	n One Box Only)	I. CITIZENSHIP OF	PRINCIPA	L PARTIES (Place an "X"	in One Box for Plaintiff)
1 U.S. Government	□ 3 Fed	eral Question	(For Diversity Cases Only	y) PTF DEF	and One B	ox for Defendant) PTF DEF
Plaintiff	(U.S. Government		Citizen of This State		Incorporated or Principal Place of Business In This State	
2 U.S. Government Defendant	LIN SEC. ON ANY SEC.	ersity ip of Parties in Item III)	Citizen of Another State	□ 2 □ 2	Incorporated and Principal Place of Business In Another State	e 🗆 5 🗆 5
			Citizen or Subject of a Foreign Country	3 3	Foreign Nation	
IV. NATURE OF SUIT CONTRACT		ily) RTS	Click here for: Nature of Suit Co FORFEITURE/PENALTY	sector and the sector of the sector sec	KRUPTCY OTH	IER STATUTES
<ul> <li>110 Insurance</li> <li>120 Marine</li> <li>130 Miller Act</li> <li>140 Negotiable Instrument</li> <li>150 Recovery of Overpayment &amp; Enforcement of Judgment</li> <li>151 Medicare Act</li> <li>152 Recovery of Defaulted Student Loans (Excl. Veterans)</li> <li>153 Recovery of Overpayment of Veteran's Benefits</li> <li>160 Stockholders' Suits</li> <li>190 Other Contract</li> <li>195 Contract Product Liability</li> <li>196 Franchise</li> </ul> <b>REAL PROPERTY</b> <ul> <li>210 Land Condemnation</li> <li>220 Forcelosure</li> <li>230 Rent Lease &amp; Ejectment</li> <li>245 Tort Product Liability</li> <li>290 All Other Real Property</li> </ul> <b>V. ORIGIN</b> (Place of the property)	PERSONAL INJURY  310 Airplane 315 Airplane Product Liability 320 Assault, Libel & Slander 330 Federal Employers' Liability 340 Marine 345 Marine Product Liability 350 Motor Vehicle 355 Motor Vehicle 360 Other Personal Injury 360 Personal Injury - Med. Malpractice CIVIL RIGHTS 441 Voting 442 Employment 443 Housing/ Accommodations 445 Amer. w/Disabilities - Employment 446 Amer. w/Disabilities - Other 448 Education	<ul> <li>370 Other Fraud</li> <li>371 Truth in Lending</li> <li>380 Other Personal Property Damage</li> <li>385 Property Damage Product Liability</li> <li>PRISONER PETITIONS</li> <li>Habeas Corpus:</li> <li>463 Alien Detaince</li> <li>510 Motions to Vacat Sentence</li> <li>Other:</li> <li>530 General</li> <li>535 Death Penalty</li> </ul>	IMMIGRATION	423 With         28 U         PROPI         830 Pater         830 Pater         830 Pater         840 Train         840 Train         861 HIA         862 Blac         863 DIW         864 SSIE         865 RS10         FEDER         870 Taxe         0 rD         871 IRS         USC 760	cal 28 USC 158       375 Fall         ddrawal       376 Qu         JSC 157       400 Sta         gRTY RIGHTS       400 Ata         wrights       410 Ata         nt       450 Co         at Abbreviated       460 De         gApplication       470 Ra         c/L SECURITY       Corrup         (1395ff)       480 Co         c/DIWW (405(g))       850 Sec         D Title XVI       Exchan         (405(g))       891 Ag         s (U.S. Plaintiff       896 Art         efendamit       896 Art         9       Act Rev         9       Agency	se Claims Act i Tam (31 USC (a)) te Reapportionment titrust nks and Banking mmerce portation cketeer Influenced and L Organizations nsumer Credit ble/Sat TV curities/Commodities/ ge her Statutory Actions ricultural Matters redom of Information bitration ministrative Procedure view or Appeal of r Decision onstitutionality of State
I Original Proceeding I Original Proceeding I 2 Remove from S Court	ved 3 Re-filed 4	or another Reopened (specify	v) Transfer	from	cal to 8 Multidistrict rict Judge Litigation Magistrate – Direct rment File	9 Remanded from Appellate Court
VI. RELATED/ RE-FILED CASE(S)	(See instructions): a) JUDO	An	✓ NO b) Related		ES 🖬 NO CKET NUMBER:	
VII. CAUSE OF ACTIO	Cite the U.S. Civil Sta N Worker Adjustmer LENGTH OF TRIAL	it and Retraining Not	filing and Write a Brief Stater ification Act, 29 U.S.C. (for both sides to try entire ca	Statue 210	(Do not cite jurisdictional statute. 1 et. seq. (WARN ACT)	s unless diversity):
VIII. REQUESTED IN COMPLAINT:	CHECK IF THIS UNDER F.R.C.P.	IS A CLASS ACTION 23	DEMAND \$		HECK YES only if demanded	•
ABOVE INFORMATION IS T DATE	TRUE & CORRECT TO	THE BEST OF MY KNO SIGNATIVE OF	WLEDGE TTOFNEY OF RECORD	JUI	RY DEMAND: 4 Yes	□ No

ny

JU DGE

AMOUNT

## UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF FLORIDA FT. LAUDERDALE DIVISION

#### MELISSA JOHNSON, on behalf of herself and on behalf of all other similarly situated persons,

Plaintiff,

v.

#### CASE NO.:

#### CENTERFIELD MEDIA HOLDING COMPANY,

Defendant.

1

## SUMMONS IN A CIVIL ACTION

# TO: Centerfield Media Holding Company c/o: CT Corporation System, As Registered Agent 1200 South Pine Island Road Plantation, FL 33324

A lawsuit has been filed against you.

Within 21 days after service of this summons on you (not counting the day you received it) - or 60 days if you are the United State or a United States agency, or an office or employee of the United State described in Fed. R. Civ. P. 12 (a)(2) or (3) – you must serve on the plaintiff an answer to the attached complaint or a motion under Rule 12 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure. The answer or motion must be served on the plaintiff or plaintiff's attorney, whose name and address are:

Brandon J. Hill Wenzel Fenton Cabassa, P.A. 1110 N. Florida Ave., Suite 300 Tampa, FL 33602

If you fail to respond, judgment by default will be entered against you for the relief demanded in the complaint. You also must file your answer or motion with the court.

Case 0:18-cv-60875-WPD Document 1-2 Entered on FLSD Docket 04/18/2018 Page 2 of 2

# CLERK OF THE COURT

Date: \_\_\_\_\_

Signature of Clerk or Deputy Clerk

# **ClassAction.org**

This complaint is part of ClassAction.org's searchable class action lawsuit database and can be found in this post: <u>Centerfield Media Holding Company Hit with WARN Act Suit After March 2018 Layoffs</u>