

Ysa Santana Reynoso (“Plaintiff”) brings this class action lawsuit against Hatfield Quality Meats, Inc. (“Hatfield”), seeking all available relief under the Pennsylvania Minimum Wage Act (“PMWA”), 43 P.S. §§ 333.101, *et seq.* She alleges the following:

JURISDICTION AND VENUE

1. This Court has personal jurisdiction over Hatfield.
2. Venue in this Court is proper under Pennsylvania Rules of Civil Procedure 1006 and 2179 because Hatfield regularly conducts business in Philadelphia County. *See Lugo v. Farmers Pride, Inc.*, 967 A.2d 963, 971 (Pa. Super. Ct. 2009). This includes, *inter alia*, the continuous and regular sale of product and/or merchandise to customers located in Philadelphia County.

PARTIES

3. Plaintiff is an individual residing in Reading, Pennsylvania.
4. Defendant Hatfield Quality Meats, Inc. (“Hatfield”) is a corporation headquartered in Hatfield, Pennsylvania and registered to do business in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania. Hatfield is a division of Clemens Family Corporation, and is one of the largest pork processors in the United States.

FACTS

5. There have been more than 40 million confirmed cases of Coronavirus (“COVID”) in the United States, causing the death of more than 700,000 Americans. In Pennsylvania alone, there are more than 1.4 million confirmed cases and more than 29,500 deaths due to COVID. (*See* <https://coronavirus.jhu.edu/map.html>, last visited October 4, 2021).
6. The COVID pandemic has caused a particularly negative impact on the meatpacking industry, where employers require workers in these facilities to stand close together

on processing lines in order to perform their jobs, preventing workers from engaging in meaningful social distancing.

7. COVID outbreaks in meatpacking plants have negatively impacted the profitability of such companies, and have caused plant closures and the shutdown of production.

8. On April 28, 2020, former President Trump issued an executive order designating meat and poultry processing facilities as critical infrastructure under the Defense Production Act, stating as follows:

It is important that processors of beef, pork, and poultry (“meat and poultry”) in the food supply chain continue operating and fulfilling orders to ensure a continued supply of protein for Americans. However, outbreaks of COVID-19 among workers at some processing facilities have led to the reduction in some of those facilities’ production capacity. In addition, recent actions in some States have led to the complete closure of some large processing facilities. ...

Such closures threaten the continued functioning of the national meat and poultry supply chain, undermining critical infrastructure during the national emergency. Given the high volume of meat and poultry processed by many facilities, any unnecessary closures can quickly have a large effect on the food supply chain. For example, closure of a single large beef processing facility can result in the loss of over 10 million individual servings of beef in a single day. Similarly, under established supply chains, closure of a single meat or poultry processing facility can severely disrupt the supply of protein to an entire grocery store chain.

Accordingly, I find that meat and poultry in the food supply chain meet the criteria specified in section 101(b) of the Act (50 U.S.C. 4511(b)). Under the delegation of authority provided in this order, the Secretary of Agriculture shall take all appropriate action under that section to ensure that meat and poultry processors continue operations consistent with the guidance for their operations jointly issued by the CDC and OSHA.

See Executive Order 13917 of April 28, 2020, 85 Fed. Reg. 85 (May 1, 2020).

9. Clemens Food Group LLC (“Clemens”) is a vertically coordinated company that directly oversees the entire production chain of its product, from the farm all the way to the retail and foodservice customers.

10. Clemens is a pork production company whose operations include hog farming, food production, and logistical services and transportation.

11. Clemens owns and operates Defendant Hatfield Quality Meats, Inc. (“Hatfield”) as one of its brands.

12. Hatfield owns and operates several meat processing, packaging, and shipping plants in Pennsylvania, including a plant in Hatfield Township, Pennsylvania, from which Hatfield processes and distributes meat products to various business operations throughout the United States, including in the County of Philadelphia.

13. Hatfield’s Pennsylvania plants employ hundreds of production workers, who perform manual labor associated with Hatfield’s meat processing and packing operations. These workers are referred to throughout as “Production Workers.”

14. Production Workers are employed by Hatfield, are paid an hourly wage, and are not exempt from the wage and hour requirements set forth in the Pennsylvania Minimum Wage Act.

15. Following the outbreak of the COVID, Hatfield implemented a company-wide policy requiring each of its Production Workers to undergo a COVID screening process for symptoms of Coronavirus on premises prior to each shift.

16. Production Workers were required to arrive at the facility to undergo a COVID screening process conducted by Hatfield.

17. Production Workers were required to wait in line to undergo the COVID screening process.

18. Production Workers could be subject to discipline if they did not arrive ready at the work station in time for their production work to start. Accordingly, the addition of the COVID screening process required Production Workers to arrive at work earlier than they had before the implementation of the examinations. Such time was uncompensated.

19. The COVID screening process was imposed by Hatfield as a requirement to work each shift.

20. The COVID screening process was conducted, and was required to be conducted, on the premises of Hatfield.

21. The COVID screening process was necessary for the safe and effective operations of Hatfield's business.

22. The COVID screening process was not implemented for the convenience of the Production Workers.

23. Plaintiff and Production Workers were not paid for significant amounts of time between the start of the required COVID screening process, and when they were clocked in for pay purposes.

24. Hatfield failed to pay for all hours the Production Workers worked, beginning with the time Production Workers were required to be on its premises to undergo the COVID screening process until they were clocked in, in violation of Pennsylvania law.

25. Plaintiff worked for Hatfield as a Production Worker from approximately January 29, 2020 through approximately February 2021.

26. Plaintiff typically worked six days per week, and was paid for approximately 45 to 50 hours or more hours per week, depending on the work week.

27. Plaintiff and Production Workers routinely worked 40 or more hours per week. For example, Plaintiff estimates that she often worked at least 50 hours or more per week.

28. Hatfield failed to pay Production Workers for all hours worked as defined in the PMWA. *See Heimbach v. Amazon.com, Inc.*, 255 A.3d 191, 209 (Pa. 2021).

CLASS ALLEGATIONS

29. Plaintiff brings this lawsuit as a class action. She sues on behalf of production workers who reside in Pennsylvania, and who, during any week within the past three years (and/or the implementation of the COVID screening process at the onset of the COVID pandemic), were employed by Hatfield (or any affiliated entity) at a Pennsylvania facility and paid an hourly wage.

30. This action may be properly maintained as a class action pursuant to Pennsylvania Rules of Civil Procedure 1702, 1708, and 1709. Class action treatment of Plaintiff's PMWA claim is appropriate because, as alleged below, all of Pennsylvania class action requisites are satisfied.

31. The class, upon information and belief, includes thousands of individuals, all of whom are readily ascertainable based on Hatfield's business records and are so numerous that joinder of all class members is impracticable.

32. Plaintiff is a class member, her claims are typical of the claims of other class members, and she has no interests that are antagonistic to or in conflict with the interests of other class members.

33. Plaintiff and her lawyers will fairly and adequately represent the class members and their interests because, *inter alia*, (a) Plaintiff is represented by experienced class action counsel who are well-prepared to vigorously and competently litigate this action on behalf of the class; (b) Plaintiff and her counsel are free of any conflicts of interest that prevent them from pursuing this action on behalf of the class; and (c) Plaintiff and her counsel have adequate financial resources to assure that the interests of the class will not be harmed.

34. Questions of law and fact are common to all class members, because, *inter alia*,

this action concerns Hatfield's common timekeeping, payroll, and compensation policies, as described herein. The legality of these policies will be determined through the application of generally applicable legal principles to common facts.

35. A class action provides a fair and efficient method for adjudication of the controversy because, *inter alia*, the previously mentioned common questions of law and fact predominate over any questions affecting Plaintiff or any individual class member; the monetary damages sought are readily calculatable and attributable to class members; maintenance of the instant litigation protects against the risk of inconsistent or varying adjudications that might result if individual class members were to commence independent actions in various courthouses throughout the Commonwealth.

36. Because Hatfield conducts a substantial amount of business in Philadelphia County, this Court is an appropriate forum for the litigation of the claims of the entire class.

37. The complexities of the issues and the expense of litigating separate claims of individual class members weigh in favor of class certification. For example, in the instant action, Plaintiff will seek and present evidence concerning Defendant's common timekeeping, compensation, and payroll practices. The gathering and presentation of such evidence in multiple proceedings would be inefficient, redundant, and unjustifiably expensive. The class action device, when compared to multiple proceedings, presents far fewer management difficulties and provides the benefits of unitary adjudication, economies of scale, and comprehensive supervision by a single court. Concentrating this litigation in one forum promotes judicial economy and efficiency and promotes parity among the claims of individual class members as well as judicial consistency. Thus, the conduct of this action as a class action conserves the resources of the parties and the court system, protects the rights of each class member, and meets all due process

requirements as to fairness to Hatfield

COUNT I

38. All previous paragraphs are incorporated as though fully set forth herein.

39. Hatfield is an employer covered by the PMWA's mandates.

40. Plaintiff and the class members are employees entitled to the PMWA's protections.

41. The PMWA entitles employees to compensation for "all hours worked" in a workweek. *See* 43 P.S. § 333.104(a). Such compensable time includes, *inter alia*, all "time during which an employee is required by the employer to be on the premises of the employer," *id.*, and must be paid "regardless of whether the employee is actually performing job-related duties while on the premises." *Heimbach*, 255 A.3d at 204.

42. The PMWA requires that employees receive overtime compensation "not less than one and one-half times" the employee's regular rate of pay for all hours worked over 40 in a workweek. *See* 43 P.S. § 333.104(c).

43. Hatfield violated the PMWA by failing to pay Plaintiff and other class members overtime premium compensation for time during which Plaintiff and other class members were, and continue to be, required to be at the facility without receiving payroll credit. Such time includes the time accrued between the commencement of the COVID screening process and the time at which the class members start being paid.

JURY DEMAND

Plaintiff demands a jury trial.

PRAYER FOR RELIEF

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff, on behalf of herself and the class, seeks the following relief:

(i) unpaid wages (including overtime wages); (ii) prejudgment interest; (iii) litigation costs, expenses, and attorney's fees; and (iv) any other and further relief this Court deems just and proper.

Date: October 18, 2021

Respectfully submitted,



Sarah R. Schalman-Bergen
(Pa Bar No. 206211)
Krysten Connon
(Pa Bar No. 314190)
LICHTEN & LISS-RIORDAN, P.C.
729 Boylston Street, Suite 2000
Boston, MA 02116
(267) 256-9973
ssb@llrlaw.com
kconnon@llrlaw.com

Peter Winebrake (Pa Bar No. 80496)
WINEBRAKE & SANTILLO, LLC
715 Twining Road, Suite 211
Dresher, PA 19025
(215) 884-2491
pwinebrake@winebrakelaw.com

Marielle Macher (Pa Bar No. 318142)
DeJonna Bates (Pa Bar No. 328299)
Daniel Cortes (Pa Bar No. 327300)
Community Justice Project
118 Locust Street
Harrisburg, PA 17101
717-236-9486, ext. 214
mmacher@cjplaw.org
dbates@cjplaw.org
dcortes@cjplaw.org

VERIFICATION

I, Ysa Santana Reynoso, hereby state:

1. I am a plaintiff in this action;
2. I verify that the statements made in the accompanying complaint are true and correct to the best of my knowledge, information and belief; and
3. I understand that the statements in the complaint are subject to the penalties of 18 Pa. C.S. § 4904 relating to unsworn falsifications to authorities.

Dated: 10/14/2021

Ysa Santana Reynoso

ClassAction.org

This complaint is part of ClassAction.org's searchable class action lawsuit database and can be found in this post: [Lawsuit Claims Hatfield Production Workers Owed Wages for Time Spent in COVID-19 Screenings](#)
