# IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS MARSHALL DIVISION

MARLENE KLOTZ, On Behalf of Herself and All Others Similarly					
	Plaintiff,				
V.					
RAJESH PATEL and	d GILMER				
LODGING, INC.,					
	Defendants.				

Civil Action No.

**Jury Demanded** 

# **PLAINTIFF'S ORIGINAL COMPLAINT**

\$\$ \$\$ \$\$ \$\$ \$\$ \$\$ \$\$ \$\$ \$\$ \$\$ \$\$ \$\$

Plaintiff MARLENE KLOTZ, on behalf of herself and all others similarly situated ("Plaintiff" and "Class Members" herein) brings this Fair Labor Standards Act ("FLSA") suit against RAJESH PATEL and GILMER LODGING, INC. ("Defendants" herein), and in support thereof would respectfully show the Court as follows:

# I. NATURE OF SUIT

1. The FLSA was passed by Congress in 1938 in an attempt to eliminate low wages and long hours and to correct conditions that were detrimental to the health and well-being of workers. To achieve its humanitarian goals, the FLSA requires employers to pay employees engaged in commerce a minimum of \$7.25 per hour. 29 U.S.C. 206(a)(1)(C). Further, the FLSA "limits to 40 a week the number of hours that an employer may employ any of his employees subject to the Act, unless the employee receives compensation for his employment in excess of 40 hours at a rate not less than one and one-half times the regular rate at which he is employed." *Walling v. Helmerich & Payne,* 323 U.S. 37, 40 (1944) (discussing the requirements of 29 U.S.C. § 207(a)).

#### Case 2:17-cv-00512-JRG Document 1 Filed 06/20/17 Page 2 of 7 PageID #: 2

2. Plaintiff worked for Defendants as a desk clerk at the Executive Inn in Gilmer, Texas from early 2014 until March 8, 2017. Plaintiff worked between 40 and 48 hours per week throughout her employment with Defendants. Plaintiff was paid \$100 per week in cash at all times.

3. Plaintiff's compensation was, at all times, less than the minimum wage required by the FLSA, and was never paid overtime compensation for any hours worked in excess of 40 hours per week as required by the FLSA.

4. Defendants have other employees who were compensated similarly to Plaintiff: they were not paid the required minimum wage for the number of hours that they worked and were not paid overtime compensation.

5. Defendants violated the FLSA by failing to pay Plaintiff, and those similarly situated, for all hours of work at the rates required by the FLSA. Plaintiff files this suit on behalf of herself and all other similarly-situated former and current employees for Defendants. Plaintiff brings this action as a collective action pursuant to 29 U.S.C. § 216(b).

### II. PARTIES

6. Plaintiff MARLENE KLOTZ is an individual who has been employed by Defendants within the meaning of the FLSA. Plaintiff hereby consents to be a party in this action and her consent form is attached as "Exhibit A."

7. Plaintiff and "Class Members" are Defendants' current and former employees who were not paid their full minimum wage and overtime compensation.

8. Defendant RAJESH PATEL is an individual who resides in Gregg County, Texas, which is in this judicial district. Defendant can be served with process at his residence at 3410 Oak Hill Trail, Longview, Texas 75605, or wherever he may be found.

9. Defendant GILMER LODGING, INC. is a Texas corporation with a principal place of business in Upshur County, Texas, which is in this judicial district. Defendant can be served with process through its registered agent: Rajesh K. Patel, 920 Highway 271 South, Gilmer, Texas 75644.

### III. JURISDICTION AND VENUE

10. This Court has jurisdiction over the claim because Plaintiff is asserting a claim that arises under federal law. 28 U.S.C. § 1331.

11. Venue is proper in the Eastern District of Texas because the events forming the basis of the suit occurred in this District. 28 U.S.C. 1391.

# IV. COVERAGE

12. At all material times, Defendants acted, directly or indirectly, as an employer with respect to Plaintiff and Class Members.

13. At all times hereinafter mentioned, Defendants were employers within the meaning of the FLSA. 29 U.S.C. § 203(d).

14. At all times hereinafter mentioned, Defendants were part of an enterprise within the meaning of the FLSA. 29 U.S.C. § 203(r).

15. At all times hereinafter mentioned, Defendants were part of an enterprise engaged in commerce or in the production of goods for commerce within the meaning of the FLSA. 29 U.S.C. § 203(s)(1). That is, said enterprise has had employees engaged in commerce or in the production of goods for commerce, or employees handling, selling, or otherwise working on goods or materials that have been moved in or produced for commerce by any person and said enterprise has had and has an annual gross volume of sales made or business done of not less than \$500,000.00.

16. Additionally, at all times hereinafter mentioned, Plaintiff and Class Members were individual employees who were engaged in commerce or in the production of goods for commerce within the meaning of the FLSA, as they routinely received phone calls and processed credit card payments for Defendants. 29 U.S.C. §§ 206-207.

# V. FACTUAL ALLEGATIONS

17. Defendants own and operate hotels, motels, inns, and other lodging facilities around Texas in interstate commerce, including the Executive Inn, the Gilmer Inn, and other facilities.

18. Plaintiff MARLENE KLOTZ was employed by Defendants as a desk clerk at the Executive Inn in Gilmer, Texas, from early 2014 until March 8, 2017.

19. Plaintiff's duties included taking reservations over the phone, checking in overnight guests, and processing credit card payments.

20. Plaintiff and Class Members were (or are) responsible for executing the daily activities necessary for Defendants to accommodate their clients and were (or are) subject the direct supervision and control of Defendants.

21. Plaintiff worked 48 hours per week for Defendants from the beginning of her employment until January 4, 2016, at which time she began working 40 hours per week.

22. Plaintiff was paid \$100.00 per week, regardless of the number of hours actually worked.

23. Plaintiff's compensation was, at all times, less than the minimum wage required by the FLSA for the number of hours she worked.

24. Defendants have employed and are employing other individuals who work(ed) under the same or similar pay provisions as Plaintiff's.

25. Plaintiff and Class Members routinely 40 hours per week or more and were not paid minimum wage or overtime compensation as is required by the FLSA. 29 U.S.C. §§ 206-207.

26. As a result of Defendants' failure to pay Plaintiff and Class Members at least the federal minimum wage and time-and-a-half for hours worked over 40 per week, Plaintiff and Class Members were not compensated for all hours worked at the rates required by the FLSA.

27. Defendants were aware of their obligation to pay minimum wage and, when applicable, overtime compensation to Plaintiff and Class Members and failed to do so. Defendants carried out their illegal pattern or practice of failing to pay minimum wage and overtime compensation with respect to Plaintiff and Class Members willfully within the meaning of the FLSA.

# VI. COLLECTIVE ACTION ALLEGATIONS

28. Plaintiff and Class Members worked for Defendants at the Executive Inn, the Gilmer Inn, or other facilities owned, operated, or managed by Defendants. All of said facilities are part of a single enterprise as the term is defined in the FLSA.

29. Plaintiff and Class Members perform(ed) work for Defendants under the same or similar pay provisions: that is, they were paid less than the required minimum wage and were not paid the required compensation for overtime hours worked.

30. Plaintiff and Class Members were not exempt employees under the FLSA. Thus, Class Members are owed unpaid minimum wage and unpaid overtime compensation for the same reasons as Plaintiff and are, therefore, similarly situated.

31. Defendants' failure to pay employees the minimum wage and overtime compensation required by the FLSA results from a policy or practice of paying less than the minimum wage and overtime compensation required by the FLSA. This policy or practice is/was applicable to Plaintiff and Class Members. Application of this policy or practice does not depend on the personal circumstances of Plaintiff or those joining this lawsuit. Rather, the same policy or

practice which resulted in the non-payment of minimum wage and overtime compensation to Plaintiff applied to all Class Members.

32. Plaintiff accordingly brings this action on behalf of herself and others similarly situated.29 U.S.C. 216(b).

# VII. CAUSE OF ACTION: FAILURE TO PAY WAGES IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE FAIR LABOR STANDARDS ACT

33. During the relevant period, Defendants violated and are violating the provisions of the FLSA by employing employees in an enterprise engaged in commerce or in the production of goods for commerce within the meaning of the FLSA as aforesaid, but failing to pay them the required minimum wage or overtime compensation for workweeks longer than 40 hours. *See* 29 U.S.C. §§ 206-207, 215(a)(2), 216(b). Defendants were required to comply with the requirements of the FLSA because they were (are) part of an enterprise engaged in commerce and Plaintiff and Class Members were employees engaged in commerce as defined by the FLSA. Defendants acted willfully in failing to pay Plaintiff and Class Members in accordance with the law.

# VIII. RELIEF SOUGHT

34. WHEREFORE, cause having been shown, Plaintiff prays for judgment against Defendants as follows:

a. For an Order pursuant to Section 16(b) of the FLSA finding Defendants liable for unpaid minimum wage and overtime compensation due to Plaintiff (and those who may join in the suit) and for liquidated damages equal in amount to the unpaid compensation found due to Plaintiff (and those who may join the suit); and

b. For an Order awarding Plaintiff (and those who may join in the suit) the costs of this action;

c. For an Order awarding Plaintiff (and those who may join in the suit) attorneys' fees; and

d. For an Order awarding Plaintiff (and those who may join in the suit) pre-judgment and post-judgment interest at the highest rates allowed by law; and

e. For an Order granting such other and further relief as may be necessary and appropriate.

Respectfully submitted,

/s/ Shane McGuire

SHANE MCGUIRE State Bar No. 24055940 THE MCGUIRE FIRM, PC 102 N. College Street, Suite 301 Tyler, Texas 75702 Phone: 903-630-7154 Fax: 903-630-7173 shane@mcguirefirm.com ATTORNEY FOR PLAINTIFF

# Case 2:17-cv-00512-JRG Document 1-1 Filed 06/20/17 Page 1 of 1 PageID #: 8

JS 44 (Rev. 12/12)

#### **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			DEFENDANT	ſS		
Marlene Klotz, On Beha	alf of Herself and All O	thers Similarly Situ	ated, Rajesh Patel a	and Gilmer Lodging, Inc.		
(b) County of Residence of First Listed Plaintiff Upshur			County of Residence of First Listed Defendant			
(EXCEPT IN U.S. PLAINTIFF CASES)				(IN U.S. PLAINTIFF CASES ONLY)		
			NOTE: IN LAND THE TRAC	CONDEMNATION CASES, USE T CT OF LAND INVOLVED	THE LOCATION OF	
(c) Attorneys (Firm Name, A	Address, and Telephone Number	r)	Attorneys (If Know	n)		
Shane McGuire, THE 102 N. College Ave., S		\$ 75702				
Ph: 903-630-7154; Fa		5,1070E				
II. BASIS OF JURISDI	CTION (Place an "X" in O	ne Box Only)			(Place an "X" in One Box for Plaintiff	
□ 1 U.S. Government ⊠ 3 Federal Question		(For Diversity Cases Only	9 PTF DEF	and One Box for Defendant) PTF DEF		
Plaintiff	(U.S. Government)	Not a Party)	Citizen of This State	I I Incorporated or Pr of Business In I		
□ 2 U <sub>*</sub> S <sub>*</sub> Government Defendant	□ 4 Diversity (Indicate Citizensh	ip of Parties in Item III)	Citizen of Another State	2      2 Incorporated and of Business In		
			Citizen or Subject of a Foreign Country	3      3 Foreign Nation	0606	
IV. NATURE OF SUIT			PARTICIPATION AND A 11 11	D 4 MIZ DU DEC SV	CONTROL OF LANDING	
CONTRACT	PERSONAL INJURY	RTS PERSONAL INJUR	Y 0 625 Drug Related Seizure	BANKRUPTCY	OTHER STATUTES     375 False Claims Act	
🗇 120 Marine	310 Airplane	🗇 365 Personal Injury -	of Property 21 USC 88	1 🗇 423 Withdrawal	400 State Reapportionment	
<ul> <li>130 Miller Act</li> <li>140 Negotiable Instrument</li> </ul>	315 Airplane Product Liability	Product Liability 367 Health Care/	690 Other	28 USC 157	<ul> <li>410 Antitrust</li> <li>430 Banks and Banking</li> </ul>	
□ 150 Recovery of Overpayment	□ 320 Assault, Libel &	Pharmaceutical		PROPERTY RIGHTS	1 450 Commerce	
& Enforcement of Judgment I 151 Medicare Act	Slander 330 Federal Employers'	Personal Injury Product Liability		820 Copyrights     830 Patent	<ul> <li>460 Deportation</li> <li>470 Racketeer Influenced and</li> </ul>	
152 Recovery of Defaulted	Liability	368 Asbestos Personal		840 Trademark	Compt Organizations	
Student Loans (Excludes Veteraus)	<ul> <li>340 Marine</li> <li>345 Marine Product</li> </ul>	Injury Product Liability	LABOR	SOCIAL SECURITY	480 Consumer Credit     490 Cable/Sat TV	
I 153 Recovery of Overpayment	Liability	PERSONAL PROPER	TY 🛛 710 Fair Labor Standards	861 HIA (1395ff)	850 Securities/Commodifies/	
of Veteran's Benefits 160 Stockholders' Suits	<ul> <li>350 Motor Vehicle</li> <li>355 Motor Vehicle</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>370 Other Fraud</li> <li>371 Truth in Lending</li> </ul>	Act 720 Labor/Management	<ul> <li>862 Black Lung (923)</li> <li>863 DIWC/DIWW (405(g))</li> </ul>	Exchange      890 Other Statutory Actions	
□ 190 Other Contract	Product Liability	□ 380 Other Personal	Relations	□ 864 SSID Title XVI	891 Agricultural Acts	
<ul> <li>195 Contract Product Liability</li> <li>196 Franchise</li> </ul>	□ 360 Other Personal	Property Damage 385 Property Damage	<ul> <li>740 Railway Labor Act</li> <li>751 Family and Medical</li> </ul>	865 RSI (405(g))	<ul> <li>893 Environmental Matters</li> <li>895 Freedom of Information</li> </ul>	
_J 190 Flaticitise	Injury 362 Personal Injury -	Product Liability	Leave Act		Act	
DELL PROPERTY	Medical Malpractice	DBICOMED DETITION	790 Other Labor Litigation	PEDEDAL TAY OUTO	896 Arbitration     899 Administrative Procedure	
REAL PROPERTY     210 Land Condemnation	☐ 440 Other Civil Rights	PRISONER PETITION Habeas Corpus:	NS 791 Employee Retirement Income Security Act	FEDERAL TAX SUITS	Act/Review or Appeal of	
220 Foreclosure	441 Voting	463 Alien Detainee	-	or Defendant)	Agency Decision	
<ul> <li>230 Rent Lease &amp; Ejectment</li> <li>240 Torts to Land</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>442 Employment</li> <li>443 Honsing/</li> </ul>	510 Motions to Vacate Sentence		871 IRS—Third Party 26 USC 7609	950 Constitutionality of State Statutes	
245 Tort Product Liability	Accommodations	530 General		20 000 1000	Since Sundies	
290 All Other Real Property	445 Amer_w/Disabilities = Employment	535 Death Penalty Other:	IMMIGRATION  462 Naturalization Application	ion		
	446 Amer. w/Disabilities -	540 Mandamus & Other		ion		
	Other 448 Education	<ul> <li>550 Civil Rights</li> <li>555 Prison Condition</li> </ul>	Actions			
	D 440 Editember	☐ 560 Civil Detainee -				
		Conditions of Confinement				
V. ORIGIN (Place an "X" in	n One Box Only)					
🕱 1 Original 🛛 2 Res		Remanded from Appellate Court		sferred from 🗇 6 Multidist ther District Litigation		
	Cite the U.S. Civil Sta	atute under which you ar ards Act; 28 and 29	re filing (Do not cite jurisdictional			
VI. CAUSE OF ACTIO	DN Brief description of ca		0.3.0.			
VII. REQUESTED IN COMPLAINT:	CHECK IF THIS UNDER RULE 2	IS A CLASS ACTION 3, F.R.Cv.P.	N DEMAND \$	CHECK YES only JURY DEMAND	/ if demanded in complaint: : X Yes □ No	
VIII. RELATED CASI IF ANY	E(S) (See instructions):	JUDGE		DOCKET NUMBER		
DATE 06/20/2017		SIGNATURE OF AT	TORNEY OF RECORD			
FOR OFFICE USE ONLY		107 Onland Mo	Galio			
	MOUNT	APPLYING IFP	JUDGE	MAG, JU	IDGF	
AN AN	MOONT	APPLYING IFP	JUDGE	MAG, JU	apote	

# **ClassAction.org**

This complaint is part of ClassAction.org's searchable class action lawsuit database and can be found in this post: <u>Former Employee Lodges Claims Against TX Hotel Company</u>