UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF FLORIDA FORT LAUDERDALE DIVISION

MARIO MORALES, on behalf of himself and on behalf of all others similarly situated,

Plaintiff,

v.	Case No.:
PUBLIX SUPER MARKETS, INC.,	
Defendant.	1

CLASS ACTION COMPLAINT AND DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL

Plaintiff, MARIO MORALES ("Plaintiff"), files the following Class Action Complaint as against Defendant, PUBLIX SUPER MARKETS, INC. ("Defendant" or "Publix"), under the Fair Credit Reporting Act of 1970, as amended ("FCRA"), 15 U.S.C. § 1681 et seq.

PRELIMINARY STATEMENT

- 1. Defendant operates a large national supermarket chain.
- 2. Defendant routinely obtains and uses information in consumer reports to conduct background checks on prospective and existing employees, and frequently relies on such information, in whole or in part, as a basis for adverse employment action, such as termination, reduction of hours, change in position, failure to hire, and failure to promote.
- 3. While the use of consumer report information for employment purposes is not per se unlawful, it is subject to strict disclosure and authorization requirements under the FCRA.
- 4. Defendant willfully violated these requirements in systematic violation of Plaintiff's rights and the rights of other putative class members. Specifically, Defendant violated 15 U.S.C. § 1681b(b)(3)(A) of the Fair Credit Reporting Act ("FCRA") by taking adverse

employment action against Plaintiff and other putative class members based on undisclosed consumer report information without first providing Plaintiff and other affected class members with a copy of the pertinent consumer report, and without first providing them a reasonable opportunity to respond to the information in the report and discuss it with Defendant.

5. Based on the foregoing violations, Plaintiff asserts FCRA claims against Defendant on behalf of a putative Class consisting of Defendant's employees and prospective employees. In Count I Plaintiff asserts a FCRA claim under 15 U.S.C. § 1681b(b)(3)(A) on behalf of an "Adverse Action Class" consisting of:

All Publix employees and job applicants in the United States against whom adverse employment action was taken, based, in whole or in part, on information contained in a consumer report obtained within five years of the filing of this complaint through the date of final judgment in this action, who were not provided the proper preadverse notice as required by the FCRA.

- 6. On behalf of himself and the Putative Classes, Plaintiff seeks statutory damages, costs and attorneys' fees, equitable relief, and other appropriate relief under the FCRA.
- 7. The Named Plaintiff also seeks damages in the form of back pay to which he is entitled under the FCRA.

THE PARTIES

- 8. Individual and representative Plaintiff Mario Morales is a former applicant/employee of Defendant, and is a member of the Putative Class defined herein.
- 9. Defendant is authorized to do business and doing business in the State of Florida, including within this Court's jurisdiction.
- 10. Notably, Publix is a repeat FCRA offender having just settled a \$6 million dollar FCRA case for failing to provide the proper FCRA disclosures. That case was styled *Knight v. Publix Super Markets, Inc.*, Case No.: :14-cv-00720, a class action which received final approval

in the United States District Court for the Middle District of Tennessee on November 12, 2014. Thus, in terms of FCRA compliance, Publix should have and still should be on "high alert" having just paid out millions of dollars on a very similar claim arising under the same law (albeit a different sub-section), making its FCRA violations particularly willful here.

JURISDICTION AND VENUE

- 11. This is a class action for damages in excess of \$15,000, exclusive of interest, fees, and costs, for violations of the Fair Credit Reporting Act, 15 U.S.C. § 1681 et seq.
- 12. Venue is proper in Miami-Dade County, Florida, because all of the events giving rise to these claims arose in this County.

ALLEGATIONS REGARDING DEFENDANT'S BUSINESS PRACTICES

Background Checks and Failure to Provide and Pre and Post Adverse Notice

- 13. Defendant conducts background checks on many of its job applicants as part of a standard screening process which constitute "consumer reports" under the FCRA. In addition, Defendant also conducts background checks on existing employees from time to time during the course of their employment.
- 14. Defendant does not perform these background checks in-house. Rather, Defendant relies on outside consumer reporting firms, like "Sterling Talen Solutions" in this case, to obtain this information and report it.
 - 15. Such reports constitute "consumer reports" for purposes of the FCRA.
- 16. The FCRA provides that "in using a consumer report for employment purposes, before taking any adverse action based in whole or in part on the report, the person intending to take such adverse action shall provide to the consumer to whom the report relates . . . a copy of the report[.]" 15 U.S.C. § 1681b(b)(3)(A)(i).

- 17. Defendant typically does not provide job applicants or employees with a copy of their consumer reports when it takes adverse action against them based on the information in such reports. By way of example, Plaintiff's employment was terminated due to information obtained by Defendant contained in the consumer report.
- 18. This practice violates one of the most fundamental protections afforded to employees under the FCRA, and also runs counter to longstanding regulatory guidance. ("[15 U.S.C. § 1681b(b)(3)(A)] requires that all employers who use consumer reports provide a copy of the report to the affected consumer before any adverse action is taken. Employers must comply with this provision even where the information contained in the report (such as a criminal record) would automatically disqualify the individual from employment or lead to an adverse employment action. Indeed, this is precisely the situation where it is important that the consumer be informed of the negative information....")
- 19. By failing to provide Plaintiff and other Putative Class members with copies of their consumer reports prior to taking adverse employment action against them based on such reports, Defendant willfully disregarded this regulatory guidance and the plain language of the statute in violation of 15 U.S.C. §§ 1681b(b)(3)(A).

ALLEGATIONS SPECIFIC TO PLAINTIFF

- 20. 15 U.S.C. § 1681b(b)(3)(A) is designed to allow people to explain to employers extenuating circumstance when people make; mistakes that, hopefully do not haunt them forever.
- 21. Here, Plaintiff admitted at his initial screening at a Publix warehouse that he had a criminal record. The conversation was recorded and should be in Publix's possession.

- 22. Plaintiff admitted and explained during his initial screen what had happened to him (he was in the wrong place at the wrong time and, ultimately, admitted he was convicted of felonies).
- 23. Nonetheless, despite his admissions, the woman conducting the interview over the phone continued the interview and asked him if he had any convictions within the last 12 months. He stated no, his convictions dated back approximately 6+ years ago and he had turned his life around. Defendant then hired Plaintiff and he started work the very next day in the meat department at one its Miami stores. This was in early November of 2016.
- 24. Plaintiff began to excel at his job, and was, at times, running the meat department unsupervised because of his hard work and dedication.
- 25. On November 9, 2016, Publix requested from Sterling a copy of Plaintiff's background check, i.e., his consumer report. The report was completed by Sterling on November 10, 2016.
- 26. Despite the fact that the report was complete and showed his felony convictions, Publix continued to allow Plaintiff to work in the meat department.
- 27. Then, in late November of 2016, without the benefit of the mandatory pre-adverse notice as required by the FCRA, Plaintiff was fired immediately right around Thanksgiving. In violation of 15 U.S.C. § 1681b(b)(3)(A), rather than giving Plaintiff a to explain his background, Defendant fired Plaintiff immediately. He was given no pre-adverse notice as required by the FCRA.
- 28. This was particularly harmful to Plaintiff because he had given up other job opportunities to work for Publix, causing him to lose income that was critical for his family—especially around the Christmas Holiday season.

- 29. In fact, as indicated by his work schedule, it was not until *after* he was fired did Publix provide to Plaintiff with a copy of the FCRA-mandated "pre-adverse" notice from Sterling dated December 2, 2016 (keeping in mind that at this point he had been fired for several days already). Then, seven days later, long after he had already been terminated, Plaintiff finally received the FCRA required "adverse action" notice, informing him that he was terminated effective December 9, 2016. Simply put, Publix's timeline of Plaintiff's termination violates 15 U.S.C. § 1681b(b)(3)(A).
- 30. In doing so, Defendant violated 15 U.S.C. § 1681b(b)(3)(A) by taking adverse employment action against Plaintiff and other putative class members, based on undisclosed consumer report information without first providing Plaintiff and other affected class members with a copy of the pertinent consumer report, and without providing them a reasonable opportunity to respond to the information in the report and discuss it with Defendant.
- 31. The FCRA requires employers to provide notice at three different periods: (1) before an employer requests and/or procures a consumer report, it must provide notice to the employee in a "stand-alone" document and must also receive written authorization from the employee (referred to as "Disclosure and Authorization"); (2) once an employer obtains a consumer report, before an employer can take adverse action against the employee it must first provide the employee with a copy of the report and provide a description of their rights under the FCRA (referred to as "Pre-Adverse Action Notice"); and (3) once an employer takes adverse action, it must notify the employee that (i) it is taking adverse action based on the information in the consumer report, (ii) the name, address, and telephone number of the consumer reporting agency that furnished the report to the person, (iii) a statement that the consumer reporting agency did not make the decision to take the adverse action and is unable to provide the consumer the

specific reasons why the adverse action was taken, (iv) notice of the consumer's rights to obtain...a free copy of the consumer report on the consumer from the consumer reporting agency...[within] the 60-day period, and (v) notice of the consumer's right to dispute...with a consumer reporting agency the accuracy or completeness of any information in a consumer report furnished by the agency (referred to "Post-Adverse Action Notice"). See 15 U.S.C. § 1681b and § 1681m.

- 32. The FCRA required Defendant to provide Plaintiff with a copy of his consumer report and a summary of his rights before taking any adverse action based in whole or in part on the report. See § 1681b(b)(3). When it did not do so, Defendant failed to provide Plaintiff with the type of information the statute required be disclosed. And, under Supreme Court precedent expressly reaffirmed in Spokeo, see slip op. at 10, Plaintiff thus suffer[ed] an injury in fact. The Court reiterated that in Public Citizen in which it previously held that "when the plaintiff fails to obtain information which must be publicly disclosed pursuant to a statute," the plaintiff does suffer an injury in fact. 524 U.S. at 21. That is, the deprivation of information that Plaintiff suffered—constitutes a sufficiently distinct injury to provide standing to sue. Public Citizen, 491 U.S. at 449. He suffered back pay damages as a result. He also gave up other job opportunities and a chance to earn income from those jobs.
- 33. Defendant's process for failing to properly provide pre and post adverse is ripe for class treatment as "bb3" classes, like the one identified here, are commonly certified by courts throughout the country. For example, the undersigned was recently involved in a bb3 class against a major retailed in the Northern District of North Carolina with thousands of members, and the facts were fairly similar to those here: applicants were never given a chance to explain information contained in their reports before Defendant made the decision to either not hire, or to fire them,

altogether. This is a classic example of a § 1681b(b)(3), making this case and Defendant's business practices ripe for class treatment.

CLASS ACTION ALLEGATIONS

- 34. Numerosity: The Classes are so numerous that joinder of all members is impracticable. At this time, Plaintiff does not know the exact size of the Class. Based on information and belief, the Class is comprised of at least hundreds (it not more) of members and is geographically dispersed throughout the country as to render joinder of all Class Members impracticable. The names and addresses of the Class members are identifiable through documents maintained by the Defendant, and the Class members may be notified of the pendency of this action by published and/or mailed notices.
- 35. Typicality: Plaintiff's claims are typical of the other Class Members' claims. As described above, Defendant uses common practices and automated systems in committing the conduct that Plaintiff alleges damaged him and the Class. On behalf of the putative Plaintiff seeks only statutory and punitive damages for their class-wide claims, while the Named Plaintiff seeks and is entitled to back pay. Defendant uniformly breached the FCRA by engaging in the conduct described above, and these violations had the same effect on each member of the Classes.
- 36. Adequacy: Plaintiff will fairly and adequately protect the interests of the Putative Classes, and has retained counsel experienced in complex class action litigation.
- 37. Commonality: Common questions of law and fact exist as to all members of each Class. Without limitation, the total focus of the litigation will be Defendant's uniform conduct and procedures, whether Defendant provided the required notices, when it did so, and whether Defendant acted willfully in its failure to design and implement procedures to assure compliant delivery and/or timing of these notices. Even the appropriate amount of uniform statutory under

15 U.S.C. § 1681n is a common question for members of each of the Classes.

- 38. This case is maintainable as a class action because prosecution of actions by or against individual members of the Putative Class would result in inconsistent or varying adjudications and create the risk of incompatible standards of conduct for Defendant. Further, adjudication of each individual Class member's claim as separate action would potentially be dispositive of the interest of other individuals not a party to such action, impeding their ability to protect their interests.
- 39. This case is also maintainable as a class action because Defendant has acted or refused to act on grounds that apply generally to the Putative Class, so that final injunctive relief or corresponding declaratory relief is appropriate respecting the Class as a whole.
- the Putative Class predominate over any questions affecting only individual members of the Putative Class, and because a class action is superior to other available methods for the fair and efficient adjudication of this litigation. Defendant's conduct described in this Complaint stems from common and uniform policies and practices, resulting in common violations of the FCRA. Members of the Putative Class do not have an interest in pursuing separate actions against Defendant, as the amount of each Class member's individual claims is small compared to the expense and burden of individual prosecution. Class certification also will obviate the need for unduly duplicative litigation that might result in inconsistent judgments concerning Defendant's practices. Moreover, management of this action as a class action will not present any likely difficulties. In the interests of justice and judicial efficiency, it would be desirable to concentrate the litigation of all Putative Class members' claims in a single action brought in a single forum.
 - 41. Plaintiff intends to send notice to all members of the Putative Classes to the extent

required. The names and addresses of the Putative Class members are available from Defendant's records.

FIRST CLAIM FOR RELIEF Failure to Provide Copy of Consumer Report in Violation of FCRA 15 U.S.C. § 1681b(b)(3)(A)

- 42. Defendant used a "consumer report," as defined by the FCRA, to take adverse employment action against Plaintiff and other members of the Adverse Action Class.
- 43. Defendant violated the FCRA by failing to provide Plaintiff and other Adverse Action Class members with a copy of the consumer report that may have been used to take adverse employment action against them. See 15 U.S.C. § 1681b(b)(3)(A).
- 44. The foregoing violations were willful. At the time Defendant violated 15 U.S.C. § 1681b(b)(3) Defendant knew that before taking adverse employment action against Plaintiff and other putative class members based on consumer report information it was required to first provide a copy of the pertinent consumer report and a reasonable opportunity to respond to the information in the report. Besides the plain language of the FCRA itself on pre-adverse notice requirements, at that time a plethora of authority existed at the time that Defendant either knew about or should have known about. See e.g., Kelchner v. Sycamore Manor Health Ctr., 305 F. Supp. 2d 429, 436 (M.D. Pa. 2004) aff'd, 135 F. App'x 499 (3d Cir. 2005); Singleton v. Domino's Pizza, LLC, No. 2012 WL 245965 (D. Md. Jan. 25, 2012); Reardon v. Closetmaid Corp., No. 2:08-cv-1730, 2013 WL 6231606 (W.D.Pa. Dec. 2, 2013).
- 45. Defendant's willful conduct is also reflected by, among other things, the following facts:
 - a. Defendant had just settled a \$6 million dollar FCRA lawsuit brought under 15 U.S.C. § 1681b(b)(2);

- b. Defendant is a large corporation with access to legal advice through its own general counsel's office and outside employment counsel, and there is no contemporaneous evidence that it determined that its conduct was lawful;
- c. Defendant voluntarily ran a risk of violating the law substantially greater than the risk associated with a reading that was merely careless.
- d. Defendant is a large corporation with access to legal advice through its own general counsel's office and outside employment counsel, and there is no contemporaneous evidence that it determined that its conduct was lawful;
- e. Defendant knew or had reason to know that its conduct was inconsistent with published FTC guidance interpreting the FCRA and the plain language of the statute; and
- f. Defendant voluntarily ran a risk of violating the law substantially greater than the risk associated with a reading that was merely careless.
- 46. Alternatively, and at a minimum, Defendant's actions were negligent.

PRAYER FOR RELIEF

- 47. **WHEREFORE**, Plaintiff, on behalf of himself and the Putative Class, prays for relief as follows:
 - A. Determining that this action may proceed as a class action;
 - B. Designating Plaintiff as class representative and designating Plaintiff's counsel as counsel for the Putative Classes;
 - C. Issuing proper notice to the Putative Classes at Defendant's expense;
 - D. Declaring that Defendant committed violations of the FCRA;
 - E. Declaring that Defendant acted willfully in deliberate or reckless disregard of Plaintiff's rights and its obligations under the FCRA;
 - F. Awarding statutory damages as provided by the FCRA, including
 - G. Actual damage in the form of lost pay;
 - H. Punitive damages;

- Awarding reasonable attorneys' fees and costs as provided by the FCRA;
- J. Granting other and further relief, in law or equity, as this Court may deem appropriate and just.

DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL

Plaintiff and the Putative Class demand a trial by jury for all issues so triable.

Dated this day of February, 2017.

Respectfully submitted,

LUISA. CABASSA

Florida Bar Number: 0053643 Direct No.: 813-379-2565 BRANDON J. HILL

Florida Bar Number: 37061 Direct No.: 813-337-7992

WENZEL FENTON CABASSA, P.A.

1110 North Florida Avenue

Suite 300

Tampa, FL 33602

Main No.: 813-224-0431
Facsimile: 813-229-8712
Email: lcabassa@wfclaw.com
Email: bhill@wfclaw.com
Email: mk@wfclaw.com
Co-Counsel for Plaintiff

/s/Chad A. Justice

CHAD A. JUSTICE

Florida Bar Number: 121559 Direct No. 813-254-1777x106

BLACK ROCK TRIAL LAWYERS

201 S Westland Avenue Tampa, Florida 33606 Main No.: 813-254-1777 Facsimile: 813-254-3999

E-mail: chadjustice@blackrocklaw.com E-mail: prelitigation@blackrocklaw.com

Attorneys for Plaintiff

Case 0:17-cv-60300-WPD Document 1-1 Entered on FLSD Docket 02/08/2017 Page 1 of 1

JS 44 (Rev. 11/15)

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			_	DEFENDANTS				
MARIO MORALES				PUBLIX SUPER N		INC		
				. OZEN OOI ZIVI	••\c\\\\C10,	INO.		
(b) County of Residence o	f First Listed Plaintiff XCEPT IN U.S. PLAINTIFF C	Miami-Dade 45ES)		County of Residence NOTE: IN LAND COUNTER TRACT	(IN U.S. P.	LAINTIFF CASES O	ONLY) HE LOCATION OF	
(c) Attorneys (Firm Name,	Address, and Telephone Numbe	?r)		Attorneys (If Known)				
Brandon J. Hill, Wenzel I Ste. 300, Tampa, FL 336	Fenton Cabassa, P.A.		/e.,	, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,				
II. BASIS OF JURISDI	ICTION (Place an "X" in C	One Box Only)	III. CI	TIZENSHIP OF P	PRINCIPA	I. PARTIES	(Place on "V" in One D.	on Con Diningia
1 U.S. Government Plaintiff	Federal Question (U.S. Government	·		(For Diversity Cases Only) P	TF DEF	Incorporated or Pri	and One Box for Defe PTF Incipal Place	ndant) DEF
☐ 2 U.S. Government Defendant	O 4 Diversity (Indicate Citizensh	ip of Parties in Item III)	Citizo	en of Another State	12 0 2	Incorporated and P	rincipal Place	5 0 5
				en or Subject of a Greign Country	3 🗇 3	Foreign Nation	9 .	6 □ 6
IV. NATURE OF SUIT	(Place an "X" in One Box Oi	ıly)		eign County			-	
☐ 110 Insurance				RESTRUCTOR	BAN	KRUPTCY	8 OTHER STAT	JTES
 □ 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 □ 210 Land Condemnation □ 220 Forcelosure □ 230 Rent Lease & Ejectment 	PERSONAL INJURY 310 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 CAMITY (CALS) 440 Other Civil Rights 441 Voting 442 Employment	PERSONAL INJUR' 365 Personal Injury - Product Liability 367 Health Care/ Pharmaceutical Personal Injury Product Liability 368 Asbestos Personal Injury Product Liability PERSONAL PROPER 370 Other Fraud 371 Truth in Lending 380 Other Personal Property Damage Product Liability PERSONAL PROPER 385 Property Damage Product Liability PRISONERPETTION Habeas Corpus: 463 Alien Detaince 510 Motions to Vacate	79:	5 Drug Related Scizure of Property 21 USC 881 0 Other 0 Fair Labor Standards Act 1 Labor/Management Relations 0 Railway Labor Act 1 Family and Medical Leave Act 0 Other Labor Litigation 1 Employee Retirement Income Security Act	423 Withte	SC 157 TYARIGHTS rights t mark SECURITY 1395ff) Lung (923) TOJIWW (405(g)) Title XVI 405(g)) U.S. Plaintiff fendant)	☐ 375 False Claims A ☐ 376 Qui Tam (31 U ☐ 3729(a)) ☐ 400 State Reapport ☐ 410 Antitrust ☐ 430 Banks and Ban ☐ 450 Commerce ☐ 460 Deportation ☐ 470 Racketeer Influ Corrupt Organi ※ 480 Consumer Cree ☐ 490 Cable/Sat TV ☐ 850 Securities/Corr Exchange ☐ 890 Other Statutory ☐ 991 Agricultural Ad ☐ 893 Environmental ☐ 895 Freedom of Inf Act ☐ 896 Arbitration ☐ 899 Administrative Act/Review or	ionment king teneed and zations dit amodities/ Actions ts Matters formation
☐ 240 Torts to Land ☐ 245 Tort Product Liability ☐ 290 All Other Real Property	☐ 443 Housing/ Accommodations ☐ 445 Amer. w/Disabilities - Employment ☐ 446 Amer. w/Disabilities - Other ☐ 448 Education	Sentence 530 General 535 Death Penalty Other: 540 Mandamus & Othe 550 Civil Rights 555 Prison Condition 560 Civil Detainee - Conditions of Confinement	O 462	IMMIGRATION Naturalization Application Other Immigration Actions	26 US	SC 7609	Agency Decisic 950 Constitutionalit State Statutes	n
	noved from 🔲 3	Remanded from Appellate Court	J 4 Reins Reope		erred from	☐ 6 Multidistric	ct	
VI. CAUSE OF ACTIO	Cite the U.S. Civil Sta	tute under which you are		(specify) o not cite jurisdictional stati		_		_ _
VII. REQUESTED IN COMPLAINT:		IS A CLASS ACTION	DE	MAND \$			f demanded in comple	
VIII. RELATED CASE IF ANY	(See instructions):	JUDGE				RY DEMAND:	Ø Yes _ □ N	<u> </u>
DATE 2817		SIGNATURE OF ATTO	ORNEY OF	FRECORD	DOCKET	NUMBER		·-
FOR OFFICE USE ONLY		—— 44	~/ 					
RECEIPT # AM	OUNT	APPLYING IFP	•	MDGE		MAG HIDA	ae.	

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

for the

	tor the
Southern D	sistrict of Florida
MARIO MORALES, on behalf of himself and on behalf of all others similarly situated,)))
Plaintiff(s))
v.	Civil Action No.
PUBLIX SUPER MARKETS, INC.	
— · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·)))
Defendant(s))
SUMMONS IN	A CIVIL ACTION
To: (Defendant's name and address) PUBLIX SUPER MARKET C/O JOHN A. ATTAWAY, 3300 PUBLIX CORPORA LAKELAND, FL 33811	JR.
A lawsuit has been filed against you.	
are the United States or a United States agency, or an office	
If you fail to respond, judgment by default will be You also must file your answer or motion with the court.	entered against you for the relief demanded in the complaint.
	CLERK OF COURT
Date:	
	Signature of Clerk or Deputy Clerk

Civil Action No.

PROOF OF SERVICE

(This section should not be filed with the court unless required by Fed. R. Civ. P. 4 (1))

i ins summons for (name	e of individual and title, if any)		
eceived by me on (date)			
☐ I personally served t	he summons on the individual at	(place)	
		on (date)	; or
I left the summons a	t the individual's residence or us	ual place of abode with (name)	
		of suitable age and discretion who res	sides there,
on (date)		e individual's last known address; or	
☐ I served the summon	S On (name of individual)		, who
designated by law to ac	cept service of process on behalf	f of (name of organization)	,,,,,,,
		on (date)	; or
☐ I returned the summe	ons unexecuted because		· ; (
Other (specify):			, ,
My fees are \$	for travel and \$	for services, for a total of \$	0.00
I declare under nonelte.			
r declare under penalty (of perjury that this information is	s true.	
		Server's signature	
		Printed name and title	
		Printed name and title	

Additional information regarding attempted service, etc:

ClassAction.org

This complaint is part of ClassAction.org's searchable class action lawsuit database and can be found in this post: <u>Publix Pegged with Class Action Over FCRA Problems</u>