UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT DISTRICT OF CONNECTICUT

Melissa McArthur, individually and	:	
on behalf of other similarly situated	:	CIVIL ACTION NO.:
individuals,	:	
Plaintiff	:	
	:	
V.	:	
	:	
Edge Fitness, LLC.,	:	SEPTEMBER 15, 2017
Defendant	:	

COLLECTIVE AND CLASS ACTION COMPLAINT

I. INTRODUCTION

1. This action is brought on behalf of all Membership Advisors, employed by Defendant during the three years immediately preceding this lawsuit. Defendant failed to pay Plaintiff Melissa McArthur (hereinafter "Plaintiff"), and other similarly situated employees overtime pay for hours above 40 in a workweek in violation of state and federal laws.

2. Plaintiff alleges, on behalf of herself and other similarly situated current and former Membership Advisors of Defendant who elect to opt into this action, (the "Collective Action Class"), that they are: (i) entitled to unpaid wages from Defendant for all overtime hours worked by them, as required by law, and (ii) entitled to liquidated damages, pursuant to the Fair Labor Standards Act ("FLSA"), 29 U.S.C. § 216(b).

3. Plaintiff McArthur further alleges, pursuant to Rule 23 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, on behalf of herself and a class of other similarly situated current and former Membership Advisors of Defendant employed within the State of Connecticut (the "Rule 23 Class") that they are entitled to back wages from Defendant for all overtime work for which they did not receive overtime premium pay and an award of penalty damages, plus the cost of

Case 3:17-cv-01554 Document 1 Filed 09/15/17 Page 2 of 10

litigation and reasonable attorneys' fees as required by the Connecticut Wage Act ("CWA"), Conn. Gen. Stat. §§ 31-58, *et seq*.

II. JURISDICTION AND VENUE

This Court has jurisdiction over Plaintiff's FLSA claims pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §
 1331 and 29 U.S.C. § 216(b).

This Court has jurisdiction over Plaintiff's state law claims pursuant to 28 U.S.C.
 § 1367 since it is so related to her FLSA claims that it forms part of the same case or controversy.

6. Venue is proper in this district under 28 U.S.C. § 1391(b)-(c) because the acts or omissions giving rise to claims in this Complaint took place in this judicial district.

7. This court has personal jurisdiction over Defendant because it is a Connecticut LLC transacting business in the State of Connecticut.

III. THE PARTIES

Plaintiff Melissa McArthur is an individual presently residing in Wallingford,
 Connecticut. Plaintiff worked as Membership Advisor in Connecticut for Defendant from
 October 26, 2015 until October 19, 2016 and again from April 11, 2017 until June 5, 2017.

9. Defendant Edge Fitness, LLC., is a corporation organized and existing under the laws of the State of Connecticut. Its principal office is located at 50 Boston Post Road, Orange, Connecticut.

Defendant operates thirteen (13) fitness locations in Connecticut and employs
 Membership Advisors like Plaintiff and others at each of these locations.

11. Plaintiff is an employee within the meaning of the FLSA, 29 U.S.C. § 203(e) and

the CWA, Conn. Gen. Stat. § 31-58(e).

12. Defendant is an employer within the meaning of the FLSA, 29 U.S.C. § 203(d) and the CWA, Conn. Gen. Stat. § 31-58(d).

13. Defendant was the employer of Plaintiff McArthur and all other Membership Advisors.

III. STATEMENT OF FACTS

14. At all relevant times, Plaintiff worked as a Membership Advisor for Defendant in Defendant's Meriden location. Plaintiff and the other Membership Advisors were scheduled for forty-five (45) hours per week, but frequently worked more than forty-five (45) hours.

15. Plaintiff and Membership Advisors were paid pursuant to a common pay plan which did not include overtime premiums in violation of state and federal law. They were scheduled to work forty-five (45) hours per week and frequently worked longer hours, sometimes over fifty (50) especially at the end of the month, but were not paid overtime premiums for those extra hours.

16. Plaintiff's regularly scheduled work hours varied between twelve (12) pm to nine (9) pm or one (1) pm to ten (10) pm and she worked Monday through Wednesday, Fridays and Saturdays. Plaintiff was off on Thursdays and Sundays. This scheduled totaled nine (9) hours per day and five (5) days per week for a total of forty-five (45) hours.

17. This pay plan included a base salary (\$25,000) along with other income in the form of bonuses and commissions.

18. The commissions were less than one-half of Membership Advisors' total annual compensation during a representative period of at least a month, thereby failing to satisfy the requirements of the FLSA's inside sales exemption. Furthermore, this plan contained no

Case 3:17-cv-01554 Document 1 Filed 09/15/17 Page 4 of 10

provision to retroactively pay overtime in the event that a given Membership Advisor failed to earn sufficient commission during a representative period to qualify for the exemption.

19. For example, during the month of November 2015, Defendant paid Plaintiff one thousand nine hundred and twenty-three dollars and six cents (\$1,923.06) in salary and one hundred seventy dollars and fifty cents (\$170.50) in commissions.

20. Additionally, in September 2016, Defendant paid Plaintiff one thousand nine hundred and twenty-three dollars and six cents (\$1,923.06) and five hundred and eight dollars and twenty-seven cents (\$508.27) in commissions.

21. At the beginning of 2017, Defendant changed the classification of Membership Advisors from exempt to non-exempt. It changed their pay plan from salary /commission to hourly /commission.

22. After this change in their compensation, Defendant began paying Membership Advisors overtime but failed to include their commissions in the calculation of their overtime pay in violation of state and federal law. Conn. Gen. Stat. § 31-76b(1); 29 U.S.C. § 207(e).

23. For example, for the pay period ending May 11, 2017, Defendant paid Plaintiff nine hundred and sixty dollars (\$960.00) in hourly wages at a rate of twelve dollars (\$12.00) per hour, three hundred and six dollars (\$306.00) in overtime at a rate of eighteen dollars (18.00) per hour and commissions of three hundred and sixty-three dollars and twenty cents (\$363.20). Defendant calculated her overtime pay by multiplying her hourly rate by 1.5 and did not include her commission in the calculation.

A. THE FLSA COLLECTIVE ACTION

24. Plaintiff McArthur brings the first cause of action on behalf of herself and on

behalf of two separate classes:

- i. All persons who have worked for Defendant as Membership Advisors in Connecticut September 13, 2014 and December 31, 2016, who were classified as "exempt" and paid a salary and commissions but no overtime pay in violation of state and federal laws.
- ii. All persons who have worked for Defendant as Membership Advisors in Connecticut from January 1, 2017 to the date of final judgment in this action, who were classified as non-exempt but who were not paid overtime on their commissions in violation of state and federal laws.
- 25. Plaintiff McArthur brings this count under 29 U.S.C. § 216(b) of the Fair Labor

Standards Act. Plaintiff McArthur and the other Membership Advisors are similarly situated in that they are all subject to Defendant's common plan or practice of paying them according to one common pay plan, which includes a base salary, bonuses and commissions, but no overtime, and which fails to satisfy any exemption under the FLSA.

B. THE CONNECTICUT RULE 23 CLASS

26. Plaintiff McArthur brings the second cause of action under the Connecticut Wage

Act and Rule 23 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, for herself and on behalf of two

separate classes:

- i. All persons who have worked for Defendant as Membership Advisors in Connecticut September 13, 2014 and December 31, 2016, who were classified as "exempt" and paid a salary and commissions but no overtime pay in violation of state and federal laws.
- All persons who have worked for Defendant as Membership Advisors in Connecticut from January 1, 2017 to the date of final judgment in this action, who were classified as non-exempt but who were not paid overtime on their commissions in violation of state and federal laws.

Case 3:17-cv-01554 Document 1 Filed 09/15/17 Page 6 of 10

27. As to Plaintiff's claims for money damages, pursuant to Conn. Gen. Stat. §§ 31-58 *et seq.*, Plaintiff sues on behalf of herself and all other members of the above-defined class. Class certification for these Connecticut claims is appropriate under Rule 23(a) and Rule 23(b)(3) because all the requirements of the Rules are met.

28. The class is so numerous that joinder of all members is impracticable. Upon information and belief, there are over 50 members of the class as defined.

29. There are questions of law and fact common to the class, including whether the putative class members' common compensation plan violates Connecticut law, including the requirement that commissions be more than one-half of the total compensation, along with other requirements.

30. The claims of the named Plaintiff are typical of those of the class members. Plaintiff's claims encompass the challenged practices and course of conduct of Defendant. Furthermore, Plaintiff's legal claims are based on the same legal theories as the claims of the putative class members. The legal issues as to which laws were violated by such conduct apply equally to Plaintiff and to the class.

31. The named Plaintiff will fairly and adequately protect the interests of the class. Plaintiff's claims are not antagonistic to those of the putative class and she has hired counsel skilled in the prosecution of class actions.

32. Common questions of law and fact predominate over questions affecting only individuals, and a class action is superior to other available methods for the fair and efficient adjudication of this controversy. This proposed class action under Fed. R. Civ. P. 23 presents few management difficulties, conserves the resources of the parties and the court system,

Case 3:17-cv-01554 Document 1 Filed 09/15/17 Page 7 of 10

protects the rights of each class member and maximizes recovery to them.

IV. LEGAL CLAIMS

COUNT ONE: VIOLATION OF THE FAIR LABOR STANDARDS ACT, 29 U.S.C. § 216(b)

33. Based on the foregoing, Defendant violated the FLSA as to Plaintiff and the classof Membership Advisors who worked for Defendant from September 14, 2014 to December 31,2016.

34. Plaintiff and all other similarly situated individuals who opt into this litigation are entitled to overtime compensation for all overtime hours worked, liquidated damages, attorneys' fees and court costs.

COUNT TWO: VIOLATION OF THE FAIR LABOR STANDARDS ACT, 29 U.S.C. § 216(b)

35. Based on the foregoing, Defendant violated the FLSA as to Plaintiff and the class of Membership Advisors who worked for Defendant from January 1, 2017 until the date of final judgment in this matter.

36. Plaintiff and all other similarly situated individuals who opt into this litigation are entitled to overtime compensation for all overtime hours worked, liquidated damages, attorneys' fees and court costs.

COUNT THREE: VIOLATION OF THE CONNECTICUT WAGE ACT, Conn. Gen. Stat. §§ 31-58 *et. seq.*

37. Based on the foregoing, Defendant violated the CWA as to Plaintiff and the classof Membership Advisors who worked for Defendant from September 14, 2014 to December 31,2016.

38. Plaintiff and all other similarly situated individuals are entitled to overtime

Case 3:17-cv-01554 Document 1 Filed 09/15/17 Page 8 of 10

compensation for all overtime hours worked, liquidated damages, attorneys' fees and court costs.

COUNT FOUR: VIOLATION OF THE CONNECTICUT WAGE ACT, Conn. Gen. Stat. §§ 31-58 *et. seq.*

39. Based on the foregoing, Defendant violated the CWA as to Plaintiff and the class of Membership Advisors who worked for Defendant from January 1, 2017 to the date of final judgment in this matter.

40. Plaintiff and all other similarly situated individuals are entitled to overtime

compensation for all overtime hours worked, liquidated damages, attorneys' fees and court costs.

DEMAND FOR RELIEF

Plaintiff claims:

1. Designation of this action as a collective action pursuant to the FLSA, and prompt issuance of notice pursuant to 29 U.S.C. § 216(b);

2. Certification of this as class action pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 23(b)(2) and (3)

and the appointment of Plaintiff and their counsel to represent that class;

- 3. An award of unpaid overtime wages under FLSA, 29 U.S.C. § 216(b);
- 4. An award of unpaid overtime wages under the CWA, Conn. Gen. Stat. § 31-68;
- 5. An award of liquidated damages under FLSA, 29 U.S.C. § 216(b);
- 6. An award of penalty damages under the CWA, Conn. Gen. Stat. § 31-68;
- 7. Attorneys' fees under FLSA, 29 U.S.C. § 216(b);
- 8. Attorneys' fees under the CWA, Conn. Gen. Stat. § 31-68;
- 9. Interest and costs; and
- 10. Such other relief as in law or equity may pertain.

JURY DEMAND

Plaintiff demands a trial by jury by all issues so triable.

Melissa McArthur individually and on behalf of other similarly situated individuals

By: <u>/s/ Deborah McKenna</u> Deborah McKenna Hayber Law Firm, LLC 221 Main Street, Suite 502 Hartford, CT 06106 Fed No.: ct17326 Ph: (203)691-6491 Facsimile: (860) 218-9555 <u>dmckenna@hayberlawfirm.com</u> Attorney for the Plaintiffs

Case 3:17-cv-01554 Document 1-1 Filed 09/15/17 Page 1 of 1 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.)*

JS 44 (Rev. 06/17)

1-1											
I. (a) PLAINTIFFS Melissa McArthur, individu individuals	ually and on behalf of	other similarly situa	ated	DEFENDAN Edge Fitness, I	ITS						
(b) County of Residence of First Listed Plaintiff <u>New Haven</u> (EXCEPT IN U.S. PLAINTIFF CASES)				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.							
(c) Attorneys (Firm Name, A The Hayber Law Firm, LL CT 06510 (203) 691-6491			aven,	Attorneys (If Kne	own)						
II. BASIS OF JURISDI	CTION (Place an "X" in O	ne Box Only)		TIZENSHIP O		INCI	PAL PARTIES				
□ 1 U.S. Government Plaintiff (U.S. Government Not a Party)				(For Diversity Cases O	PTF				PTF	DEF	
2 U.S. Government Defendant	4 Diversity (Indicate Citizenshi)	p of Parties in Item 111)	Citiz	zen of Another State		2 🗇	2 Incorporated and of Business In		□ 5	□ 5	
				en or Subject of a preign Country	0:		3 Foreign Nation		1 6	0 6	
IV. NATURE OF SUIT		ly) RTS	F	ORFEITURE/PENAL	TY		ick here for: Nature BANKRUPTCY	A COMPANY OF THE OWNER OF	escription STATUT	ing in the second se	
 110 Insurance 120 Marine 130 Miller Act 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 245 Tort Product Liability 290 All Other Real 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 Product Liability 360 Other Personal Injury 362 Personal Injury - Medical Malpractice CIVIL RIGHTS 441 Voting 442 Employment 445 Amer. w/Disabilities - Employment 446 Education 448 Education	PERSONAL INJUR 365 Personal Injury - Product Liability 367 Health Care/ Pharmaceutical Personal Injury Product Liability 368 Asbestos Persona Injury Product Liability 368 Asbestos Persona Injury Product Liability PERSONAL PROPEI 370 Other Fraud 371 Truth in Lending 380 Other Personal Property Damage 385 Property Damage PRISONER PETITIO Habeas Corpus: 463 Alien Detainee 510 Motions to Vacat Sentence 530 General 535 Death Penalty Other: 540 Mandamus & Otl 550 Civil Rights 550 Civil Detainee - Conditions of 560 Civil Detainee - Conditions of Conditions of	IV I 6 I I 6 I I I RTY I 7 I I 7 I I 7 I I 7 I I 7 I I 7 I I 7 I I I I I I I I I I I I I I I I I I I I I	□ 625 Drug Related Seizure of Property 21 USC 881 □ 690 Other ☑ 710 Fair Labor Standards Act □ 720 Labor/Management Relations □ 740 Railway Labor Act □ 751 Family and Medical Leave Act □ 790 Other Labor Litigation □ 791 Employee Retirement Income Security Act ■ 462 Naturalization Application □ 465 Other Immigration Actions			service of the servic	 375 False Claims Act 375 Gui 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 			
	moved from \Box 3 the Court	Appellate Court	Rec	(s)	nother pecify)	District	t Litigatio Transfer	on -	Multidis Litigatio Direct F	on -	
VI. CAUSE OF ACTIO	ON Fair Labor Stands Brief description of ca	atute under which you a ards Act, 29 U.S.C ause: artime and regular r	. 216(b))	al statu	tes unles	ss diversity):				
VII. REQUESTED IN COMPLAINT:		IS A CLASS ACTIO		DEMAND \$			CHECK YES onl JURY DEMANI	-	n complai □No		
VIII. RELATED CASI IF ANY	E(S) (See instructions):	JUDGE				DOC	CKET NUMBER				
DATE 09/15/2017		SIGNATURE OF A	TORNEY	OF RECORD							
FOR OFFICE USE ONLY RECEIPT # AI	MOUNT	APPLYING IFP	0	JUD	GE		MAG. JU	JDGE			

ClassAction.org

This complaint is part of ClassAction.org's searchable class action lawsuit database and can be found in this post: Lawsuit: Edge Fitness Failed to Properly Work Out OT Calculations