FILZE

UNITED STATES DISCTRICT COURT MIDDLE DISTRICT OF FLORIDA TAMPA DIVISION

RASHAN JOSEPH, on his own behalf and others similarly situated,

Plaintiff,

Case Number: 817-CV-1976-T-23 TGW

v.

KANE'S	FURNITUE	E CORI	PORATION.
--------	----------	--------	-----------

Defendant		D	ef	en	d	a	11	t
-----------	--	---	----	----	---	---	----	---

COMPLAINT AND DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL

- 1. Plaintiff, was an employee of Defendant's, and brings this action for unpaid wages, and other relief under the Fair Labor Standards Act, as amended, 29 U.S.C. § 201-216 (the "FLSA").
- 2. Plaintiff worked as a laborer for Defendant and performed related, non-exempt activities for Defendant in Hillsborough County, Florida.
- 3. Plaintiff was not paid overtime for all of the hours he worked beyond 40 in a single work week.
- 4. Plaintiff was engaged by Defendant to work as a laborer from approximately June 24, 2014 through April 18, 2017.
- 5. Plaintiff was to be paid an hourly wage. Plaintiff is not subject to any exemptions under the FLSA.
 - 6. Plaintiff did not supervise any subservient employees.
 - 7. Plaintiff worked for Defendant in Hillsborough County, Florida.

TPA045413

- 8. Instead of paying overtime wages, Defendant circumvented the FLSA by failing to pay Plaintiff proper wages, including but not limited to Defendant automatically deducted lunch and other breaks even though Plaintiff often worked through said breaks.
- 9. Plaintiff was not always paid time and a half for all hours worked over forty in any given week. Plaintiff asserts that the majority of the hours he worked but was not paid would have constituted overtime wages. On weeks that Plaintiff did not work at least forty hours, Plaintiff would have still worked time for which the Defendant did not properly account or pay Plaintiff and, to the extent that any such weeks exists, such would constituted straight-time wage violations under the law that would be calculated at the minimum wage.
- 10. As of this date, Plaintiff has still not been paid the entirety of his wages and has not been compensated for the full extent of his damages and wage loss under the FLSA.
- 11. It is believed that there are similarly situated employees who were also not paid the full extent of their overtime at the correct rate of pay and who were also subject to the exact same unlawful pay practices, i.e. automatically deducting time for lunch even though employees often worked through lunch.
- 12. Plaintiff seeks full compensation, including liquidated damages because Defendant's conduct in automatically deducting for breaks each day was a calculated attempt to extract more additional work out of Plaintiff for the benefit of Defendant's, as the expense of Plaintiff, who was being paid less than premium wages under the FLSA. Plaintiff believes that approximately 2-3 similarly situated employees were subjected to the very same pay practices at this specific location of Defendant's 6222 North Dale Mabry Highway, Tampa, Florida.
- 13. Defendant is a for profit corporation that operates and conducts business in, among others, Hillsborough County, Florida, and is therefore, within the jurisdiction of the Court.

- 14. Defendant, at all relevant times to this amended complaint, was Plaintiff's employer as defined by 29 U.S.C. § 203(d). Plaintiff performed duties and responsibilities that involved commerce and/or the production of goods for commerce, particularly furniture. This also would include using materials and other resources that do not originate within the State of Florida to operate a facility that is designed to both residents of Florida as well as those who are domiciled outside the State of Florida.
- 15. This action is brought under the FLSA to recover from Defendant, unpaid wages in the form of overtime wages, liquidated damages, and reasonable attorneys' fees and costs. This action is intended to include each and every hourly employee who worked for Defendant at any time within the past three (3) years.
- 16. The Court has jurisdiction over Plaintiff's claims as all material events transpired in Pinellas County, including those brought pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1337 and the FLSA.
- 17. At all material times relevant to this action, Defendant was an enterprise covered by the FLSA, and as defined by 29 U.S.C. § 203(r) and 203(s). Upon information and belief, including Plaintiff's experience with Defendant as well as the sheer size of Defendant's organization suggest that the Defendant are a multi-million-dollar operation. Accordingly, Plaintiff alleges that enterprise coverage is present in this case because Defendant has an annual volume of at least \$500,000.00 in revenue and has two or more employees that handle goods in commerce, including materials and supplies, whom also use telephones, fax machines and other instrumentalities of commerce.
- 18. At all material times relevant to this action, Plaintiff in his capacity as an employee was individually covered by the FLSA. This would include to doing hourly work as a laborer, without managerial responsibility. Plaintiff did not bear supervisory responsibility for any other

employees. Plaintiff did not direct the hiring and firing of any employees. Plaintiff did not participate in the creation of budgets or maintain the production of sales nor did Plaintiff plan or control the budget of the Defendant's in any way. Plaintiff did not implement legal compliance measures.

- 19. At all times relevant to this action, Defendant failed to comply with 29 U.S.C. §§ 201-209, because Plaintiff performed services for Defendant for which no provisions was made by Defendant to properly pay Plaintiff for all hours worked during his employment. Plaintiff worked over 40 hours per nearly every week during his employment with Defendant. The off the clock work that Plaintiff was directed to do was intentional and was designed to extract additional hours of labor out of Plaintiff for the benefit of the Defendant, who then refused to pay Plaintiff and those similarly situated premium wages. Notably, Defendant is in exclusive possession of the majority of relevant records in this case, including payroll records and schedules and other documentation that might reasonably assist Plaintiff with providing even greater specificity regarding the precise weeks that Plaintiff worked more than 40 hours. Plaintiff alleges that he routinely worked in excess of 40 hours per week, including time for which Defendant made no provisions to properly record. Plaintiff wrote to Defendant on July 5, 2017 and made a lawful request for wages, but Defendant did not respond nor did Defendant deny owing Plaintiff the wages that Plaintiff is seeking, which are reasonably believed to be in excess of \$1,575.00.
- 20. Defendant failed, refused and/or neglected to keep accurate time records pursuant to 29 U.S.C. § 211(c) of Plaintiff's, and others similarly situated to him, true hours of work.

COUNT I – RECOVERY OVERTIME WAGES COMPENSATION

21. Plaintiff reincorporates and readopts all allegations contained within Paragraphs 1-20, above.

22. Plaintiff, and those similarly situated to him, are/were entitled to be paid their regular

rate of pay for each hour worked per work week as well as premium wages for those hours worked

over forty. During his employment with Defendant, Plaintiff, and those similarly situated to his,

regularly worked hours for each week in which they were not paid at the correct rate of pay. In

Plaintiff's case, he routinely performed labor, at Defendant's specific request for the sole benefit

of Defendant, and was not paid for the hours he worked.

23. As a result of Defendant's intentional, willful, and unlawful acts in refusing to pay

Plaintiff, and those similarly situated to him, their correct premium rate of pay for each hour

worked beyond 40 in one or more work weeks, Plaintiff, and those similarly situated to his, have

suffered damages plus incurring reasonable attorneys' fees and costs.

24. As a result of Defendant's willful violation of the FLSA, Plaintiff, and those similarly

situated to him, are entitled to payment of the unpaid wages under Florida law, as well as liquidated

damages under the FLSA.

25. Plaintiff demands a trial by jury.

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff demands judgment against Defendant, including, but not limited

to, reimbursement of an amount equal to the loss of wages and liquidated damages, together with

costs and attorney's fees pursuant to the FLSA, and such other further relief as this Court deems

just and proper.

DATED this 21st day of August, 2017

/s/ W. John Gadd

W. John Gadd

Fl Bar Number 463061

Bank of America Building

2727 Ulmerton Rd. Ste. 250

Clearwater, FL 33762

5

Tel - (727)524-6300

Email - wjg@mazgadd.com

/S/ Kyle J. Lee Kyle J. Lee, Esq.

FLBN: 105321 LEE LAW, PLLC

P.O. Box 4476

Brandon, FL 33509-4476

Telephone: (813) 343-2813 Kyle@KyleLeeLaw.com

JS 44 (Rev. 11/15)

CIVIL COVER SHEET

The IS 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 rules of initiating the civil docket sheet. (SEE ACCEPT COURT OF THE FORM)

I. (a) PLAINTIFFS	docket sheet. ISEE INSTRUC	TRINS ON NEXT PAGE O	DEFENDANTS	<u> </u>	
Rashan 5. (b) County of Residence	Seph of First Listed Plaintiff (EXCEPT IN U.S. PLAINTIFF C	Pinellas ⁴⁸⁸⁸⁾	County of Residenc	Furniture Control of First Listed Defendant (IN U.S. PLAINTIFF CASES CONDEMNATION CASES, USE)	onen
(c) Attorneys (Firm Num	e, Address, and Telephone Numb	eri	Attorneys III Known	T OF LAND INVOLVED.	
II. BASIS OF JURIS	DICTION (Place an "X" in C	One Box Only)	III. CITIZENSHIP OF I	PRINCIPAL PARTIES	(Place an "X" in One Box for Plaining
J 1 U.S. Government Plaintiff	3 Federal Question (U.S Government	Not a Party)	(For Diversity Cases Only)		and One Box for Defendant) PTF DEF rincipal Place
□ 2 U.S. Government Defendant	J 4 Diversity (Indicate Cuizens)	up of Parties in Item III)	Citizen of Another State	7 2 3 2 Incorporated and of Business In	Principal Place 3 5 3 5 Another State
			Citizen or Subject of a Foreign Country	7 3 7 3 Foreign Nation	П 6 П 6
	IT (Place an "X" in One Box O				
CONTRACT 110 Insurance	PERSONAL INJURY	PERSONAL INJUR	Y 3 625 Drug Related Seizure	BANKRUPTCY ☐ 422 Appeal 28 USC 158	OTHER STATUTES
□ 120 Marine □ 130 Miller Act □ 140 Negottable Instrument □ 150 Recovery of Overpaymen & Enforcement of Judgm: □ 151 Medicare Act □ 152 Recovery of Defaulted Student Loans (Excludes Veterans) □ 153 Recovery of Overpaymen 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	□ 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 □ 7 360 Other Personal Injury □ 360 Other Personal Injury □ 362 Personal Injury Medical Malpractice ■ CIVIL RIGHTS □ 440 Other Civil Rights □ 441 Voting □ 442 Employment □ 443 Housing' Accommodations □ 445 Amer. w.Disabilities ■ Other □ 448 Education	□ 365 Personal Injury - Product Liability □ 367 Health Care/ Pharmaceutical Personal Injury Product Liability □ 368 Asbestos Personal Injury Product Liability ■ 370 Other Fraud □ 371 Truth in Lending □ 380 Other Personal Property Damage □ 385 Property Damage Product Liability ■ PRISONER PETITION ■ Habeas Corpus: □ 463 Alien Detainee □ 510 Motions to Vacate Sentence □ 530 General □ 535 Death Penalty Other:	of Property 21 USC 881 690 Other	□ 423 Withdrawal 28 USC 157 PROPERTY RIGHTS □ 820 Copyrights □ 830 Patent □ 840 Trademark SOCIAL SECURITY □ 861 HIA (1395ft) □ 862 Black Lung (923) □ 863 DIWC/DIWW (405(gt)) □ 864 SSID Title XVI □ 865 RSI (405(gt)) FEDERAL TAX SUITS □ 870 Taxes (U.S. Plaintiff or Defendant) □ 871 IRS—Third Party 26 USC 7609	□ 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
	Removed from 3 3 state Court	Appellate Court		er District Litigatio	
VI. CAUSE OF ACT		LA USC 70	refiling (Do not cite jurisdictional sta	nuies uniess diversity):	
VII. REQUESTED II COMPLAINT:	UNDER RULE	IS A CLASS ACTION 3, F.R.Cv.P.	DEMAND S	CHECK YES only JURY DEMAND	y if demanded in complaint:
VIII. RELATED CAS	SE(S) (See instructions):	JUDGE		DOCKET NUMBER	
DATE 8/21/2 FOR OFFICE USE ONLY	017	SIGNATURE OF AT	TORNEY OF RECORD		

RECEIPT n

AMOUNT

APPLYING IFP

JUDGE

MAG. JUDGE

ClassAction.org

This complaint is part of ClassAction.org's searchable class action lawsuit database and can be found in this post: Kane's Furniture Corporation Sued Over Unpaid OT Claims