## IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT EASTERN DISTRICT OF ARKANSAS WESTERN DIVISION

SEP 26 2018

JAMES W. M. ORMACK, CLERK
By:

PLAINTIFFS

KINYATTA RINGO and AYONNA PENNINGTON, Each Individually and on Behalf of All Others Similarly Situated

VS.

No. 4:18-cv- 7/5- DPM

CHECKERS DRIVE-IN RESTAURANTS, INC.

This case assigned to District Judge

marshall DEFENDANT

ORIGINAL COMPLAINT - CLASS AND COLLECTIVE ACTION

COME NOW Plaintiffs Kinyatta Ringo and Ayonna Pennington ("Plaintiffs"), each individually and on behalf of all others similarly situated, by and through their attorneys Chris Burks and Josh Sanford of the Sanford Law Firm, PLLC, and for their Original Complaint—Class and Collective Action against Defendant Checkers Drive-In Restaurants, Inc. ("Defendant"), they do hereby state and allege as follows:

#### I. PRELIMINARY STATEMENTS

- This is a class and collective action brought by Plaintiffs Kinyatta Ringo and Ayonna Pennington, each individually and on behalf of all hourly-paid shift leaders employed by Defendant at any time within a three-year period preceding the filing of this Complaint.
- 2. Plaintiffs bring this action under the Fair Labor Standards Act, 29 U.S.C. § 201, et seq. ("FLSA") and the Arkansas Minimum Wage Act, Ark. Code Ann. § 11-4-201, et seq. ("AMWA"), for declaratory judgment, monetary damages, liquidated damages, prejudgment interest, and costs, including reasonable attorneys' fees, as a result of

Page 1 of 15
Kinyatta Ringo, et al. v. Checkers Drive-In Restaurants, Inc.
U.S.D.C. (E.D. Ark.) Case No. 4:18-cv-\_\_\_
Original Complaint – Class and Collective Action

Defendant's failure to pay Plaintiffs and other hourly-paid shift leaders lawful overtime

compensation for hours worked in excess of forty (40) hours per week.

3. Upon information and belief, for at least three (3) years prior to the filing of

this Complaint, Defendant has willfully and intentionally committed violations of the

FLSA and the AMWA as described, infra.

II. JURISDICTION AND VENUE

4. The United States District Court for the Eastern District of Arkansas has

subject matter jurisdiction over this suit under the provisions of 28 U.S.C. § 1331

because this suit raises federal questions under the FLSA.

5. This complaint also alleges AMWA violations, which arise out of the same

set of operative facts as the federal cause of action herein alleged; accordingly, this

state cause of action would be expected to be tried with the federal claim in a single

judicial proceeding. Therefore, this Court has supplemental jurisdiction over Plaintiffs'

AMWA claims pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1367(a).

6. The acts alleged in this Complaint had their principal effect within the

Jonesboro Division of the Eastern District of Arkansas, and venue is proper in this Court

pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1391.

7. Defendant does business in this District and a substantial part of the

events alleged herein occurred in this District.

The witnesses to the overtime wage violations alleged in the Complaint

reside in this District.

III. THE PARTIES

9. Plaintiffs repeat and re-allege all the preceding paragraphs of this

Complaint as if fully set forth in this section.

10. Plaintiffs are each residents and citizens of Pulaski County.

11. Within the past three (3) years, Plaintiffs were employed by Defendant as

hourly-paid shift leaders at Defendant's eateries in Little Rock.

12. At all times material herein, Plaintiffs and those similarly situated have

been entitled to the rights, protections and benefits provided under the FLSA.

13. At all times relevant herein, Plaintiffs and those similarly situated who

worked in Arkansas have been entitled to the rights, protections and benefits provided

under the AMWA.

14. Defendant is an "employer" within the meanings set forth in the FLSA and

the AMWA, and was, at all times relevant to the allegations in this Complaint, Plaintiffs'

employer, as well as the employer of the members of the class and collective.

15. Defendant is foreign, for-profit corporation, registered and licensed to do

business in the State of Arkansas.

16. Defendant's registered agent for service of process in Arkansas is

Corporation Service Company, 300 Spring Building, Suite 900, 300 South Spring Street,

Little Rock, Arkansas 72201.

17. During each of the three years preceding the filing of this Complaint,

Defendant employed at least two individuals who were engaged in interstate commerce

or in the production of goods for interstate commerce, or had employees handling,

selling, or otherwise working on goods or materials that have been moved in or

produced for commerce by any person.

18. At all relevant times, Defendant continuously employed at least four (4)

employees.

19. At all relevant times, Defendant's gross volume of sales made or business

done has exceeded \$500,000.00 per year.

IV. FACTUAL ALLEGATIONS

20. Plaintiffs repeat and re-allege all previous paragraphs of this Complaint as

if fully set forth in this section.

21. Defendant owns and operates several Checker's and Rally's restaurants

throughout Arkansas and the surrounding states.

22. Plaintiffs and other shift leaders were paid an hourly rate by Defendant.

23. Plaintiffs and other shift leaders worked more than forty (40) hours in most

workweeks.

24. Defendant routinely scheduled Plaintiffs and other shift leaders to work

more than forty (40) hours in a single workweek.

25. It was Defendant's commonly applied practice to not pay Plaintiffs and

other shift leaders for all of the hours during which they were performing labor for

Defendant.

26. Defendant had a practice of not paying Plaintiffs and other shift leaders

one and one-half (1.5) times their regular rate for all hours worked in excess of forty (40)

hours per workweek.

Page 4 of 15
Kinyatta Ringo, et al. v. Checkers Drive-In Restaurants, Inc.
U.S.D.C. (E.D. Ark.) Case No. 4:18-cv-\_\_\_
Original Complaint – Class and Collective Action

27. Plaintiffs and other shift leaders worked an average of ten to fifteen hours

of overtime in most workweeks for Defendant for which they were not lawfully

compensated.

28. At all relevant times herein, Defendant has deprived Plaintiffs and all

others similarly situated of a proper overtime premium for all of the hours they worked in

excess of forty (40) hours in a week.

29. Defendant knew, or showed reckless disregard for whether, the way it

paid Plaintiffs and all others similarly situated violated the FLSA and the AMWA.

#### V. REPRESENTATIVE ACTION ALLEGATIONS

#### FLSA § 216(b) Collective

30. Plaintiffs repeat and re-allege all the preceding paragraphs of this

Complaint as if fully set forth in this section.

31. Plaintiffs bring this claim for relief for violation of the FLSA as a collective

action pursuant to Section 16(b) of the FLSA, 29 U.S.C. § 216(b).

32. Plaintiffs brings their FLSA claim on behalf of all other shift leaders

employed by Defendant at any time within the applicable statute of limitations period.

who were denied a proper overtime premium of one and one-half (1.5) times their

regular rate for all hours worked in excess of forty (40) per week and who are entitled to

payment of the following types of damages:

A. Payment for all hours worked, including payment of a lawful overtime

premium for all hours worked for Defendant in excess of forty (40) hours in a workweek;

B. Liquidated damages; and

C. Attorneys' fees and costs.

Page 5 of 15
Kinyatta Ringo, et al. v. Checkers Drive-In Restaurants, Inc.
U.S.D.C. (E.D. Ark.) Case No. 4:18-cv-\_\_\_
Original Complaint – Class and Collective Action

33. In conformity with the requirements of FLSA Section 16(b), Plaintiffs have

attached hereto as Exhibit "A" their written Consent to Join this lawsuit.

34. The relevant time period dates back three (3) years from the date on

which Plaintiffs' Original Complaint—Class and Collective Action was filed and

continues forward through the date of judgment pursuant to 29 U.S.C. § 255(a).

35. The members of the proposed FLSA Collective are similarly situated in

that they share these traits:

A. They were paid hourly rates;

B. They recorded their time in the same manner; and

C. They were subject to Defendant's common practice not paying a lawful

overtime premium for all hours worked over forty (40) hours per work week.

36. Plaintiff is unable to state the exact number of the potential members of

the FLSA Collective but believes that the group exceeds 50 persons.

37. Defendant can readily identify the members of the Section 16(b)

Collective. The names, physical addresses, electronic mailing addresses and phone

numbers of the FLSA collective action members are available from Defendant, and a

Court-approved Notice should be provided to the FLSA collective action members via

first class mail, email and text message to their last known physical and electronic

mailing addresses and cell phone numbers as soon as possible, together with other

documents and information descriptive of Plaintiffs' FLSA claim.

B. <u>AMWA Rule 23 Class</u>

39. Plaintiffs bring this action on behalf of themselves and all other similarly

situated employees, former and present, who were and/or are affected by Defendant's

Case 4:18-cv-00715-DPM Document 1 Filed 09/26/18 Page 7 of 17

willful and intentional violation of the AMWA pursuant to Rule 23 of the Federal Rules of

Civil Procedure.

40. Plaintiffs propose to represent the class of hourly-paid shift leaders who

are/were employed by Defendant within the relevant time period within the State of

Arkansas.

41. Common questions of law and fact relate to all members of the proposed

class, such as whether Defendant paid the members of the proposed class for all hours

worked, including overtime in accordance with the AMWA.

42. Common questions of law and fact predominate over any questions

affecting only the individual named Plaintiffs, and a class action is superior to other

available methods for fairly and efficiently adjudicating the claims of the members of the

proposed AMWA class.

43. The class members have no interest in individually controlling the

prosecution of separate actions because the policy of the AMWA provides a bright-line

rule for protecting all non-exempt employees. To wit: "It is declared to be the public

policy of the State of Arkansas to establish minimum wages for workers in order to

safeguard their health, efficiency, and general well-being and to protect them as well as

their employers from the effects of serious and unfair competition resulting from wage

levels detrimental to their health, efficiency, and well-being." Ark. Code Ann. § 11-4-202.

44. Plaintiffs are unable to state the exact number of the potential members of

the AMWA class but believes that the class exceeds 50 persons. Therefore, the class is

so numerous that joinder of all members is impracticable.

Page 7 of 15
Kinyatta Ringo, et al. v. Checkers Drive-In Restaurants, Inc.
U.S.D.C. (E.D. Ark.) Case No. 4:18-cv-\_\_\_
Original Complaint – Class and Collective Action

45. At the time of the filing of this Complaint, neither Plaintiffs nor Plaintiffs'

counsel knows of any litigation already begun by any members of the proposed class

concerning the allegations in this Complaint.

46. Concentrating the litigation in this forum is highly desirable because

Defendant does business in the Eastern District of Arkansas and because Plaintiffs and

all proposed class members work or worked in Arkansas.

47. No difficulties are likely to be encountered in the management of the class.

The claims of Plaintiffs are typical of the claims of the proposed class in 48.

that Plaintiffs worked as a shift leader and were paid an hourly wage for Defendant and

experienced the same violations of the AMWA that all other class members suffered.

Plaintiffs and their counsel will fairly and adequately protect the interests 49.

of the class.

Plaintiffs' counsel is competent to litigate Rule 23 class actions and other 50.

complex litigation matters, including wage and hour cases like this one, and to the

extent, if any, that they find that they are not, they are able and willing to associate

additional counsel.

51. Prosecution of separate actions by individual members of the class would

create the risk of inconsistent or varying adjudications with respect to individual

members of the class, establishing incompatible standards of conduct for Defendant.

FIRST CLAIM FOR RELIEF (Individual Claims for Violations of the FLSA)

Plaintiffs repeat and re-allege all previous paragraphs of this Complaint as 52.

if fully set forth in this section.

Page 8 of 15 Kinyatta Ringo, et al. v. Checkers Drive-In Restaurants, Inc. U.S.D.C. (E.D. Ark.) Case No. 4:18-cv-Original Complaint - Class and Collective Action

53. Plaintiffs assert this claim for damages and declaratory relief pursuant to

the FLSA.

54. At all relevant times, Defendant has been, and continues to be, an

enterprise engaged in commerce within the meaning of the FLSA, 29 U.S.C. § 203.

55. At all relevant times, Defendant was Plaintiffs' "employer" within the

meaning of the FLSA, 29. U.S.C. § 203.

56. 29 U.S.C. § 207 requires any enterprise engaged in commerce to pay all

employees one and one-half (1.5) times their regular wage for all hours worked over

forty (40) hours in a week, unless an employee meets certain exemption requirements

of 29 U.S.C. § 213 and all accompanying Department of Labor regulations.

57. Despite the entitlement of Plaintiffs to overtime payments under the FLSA,

Defendant failed to pay Plaintiffs an overtime rate of one and one-half (1.5) times their

regular rate of pay for all hours worked over forty (40) in each one-week period.

58. Defendant's failure to pay Plaintiffs overtime wages owed was willful,

intentional, unreasonable, arbitrary and in bad faith.

59. By reason of the unlawful acts alleged herein, Defendant is liable to

Plaintiffs for monetary damages, liquidated damages, and costs, including reasonable

attorneys' fees, for all violations that occurred within the past three (3) years.

60. Alternatively, should the Court find that Defendant acted in good faith in

failing to pay Plaintiffs as provided by the FLSA, Plaintiffs are entitled to an award of

prejudgment interest at the applicable legal rate.

VII. SECOND CLAIM FOR RELIEF (Collective Action Claim for Violation of FLSA)

61. Plaintiffs repeat and re-allege all the preceding paragraphs of this Original

Complaint as if fully set forth in this section.

62. Plaintiffs brings this collective action on behalf of all other shift leaders

employed by Defendant to recover monetary damages owed by Defendant to Plaintiffs

and members of the putative collective for unpaid overtime compensation for all the

hours they worked in excess of forty (40) each week.

63. Plaintiffs bring this action on behalf of themselves and all other shift

leaders, former and present, who were and/or are affected by Defendant's willful and

intentional violation of the FLSA.

64. 29 U.S.C. § 207 requires employers to pay employees one and one-half

(1.5) times the employee's regular rate for all hours that the employee works in excess

of forty (40) per week.

65. Like Plaintiffs, other shift leaders regularly worked more than forty (40)

hours in a week.

66. Defendant failed to pay these shift leaders at the proper overtime rate for

all hours worked in excess of forty (40) hours in a week, despite their entitlement

thereto.

67. Because these employees are similarly situated to Plaintiffs, and are owed

overtime for the same reasons, the opt-in collective may be properly defined as:

All hourly-paid shift leads within the past three (3) years.

68. Defendant's conduct and practice, as described above, has been and is

willful, intentional, unreasonable, arbitrary and in bad faith.

Page 10 of 15
Kinyatta Ringo, et al. v. Checkers Drive-In Restaurants, Inc.
U.S.D.C. (E.D. Ark.) Case No. 4:18-cv-\_\_\_
Original Complaint – Class and Collective Action

69. By reason of the unlawful acts alleged in this Complaint, Defendant is

liable to Plaintiffs and all those similarly situated for, and Plaintiffs and all those similarly

situated seek, unpaid overtime wages, liquidated damages, and costs, including

reasonable attorney's fees as provided by the FLSA.

70. Alternatively, should the Court find that Defendant acted in good faith in

failing to pay Plaintiffs and all those similarly situated as provided by the FLSA, Plaintiffs

and all those similarly situated are entitled to an award of prejudgment interest at the

applicable legal rate.

VIII. THIRD CLAIM FOR RELIEF (Individual Claims for Violations of the AMWA)

71. Plaintiffs repeat and re-allege all previous paragraphs of this Complaint as

if fully set forth in this section.

72. Plaintiffs assert this claim for damages and declaratory relief pursuant to

the AMWA.

73. At all times relevant herein, Defendant was Plaintiffs' "employer" within the

meaning of the AMWA, Ark. Code Ann. § 11-4-203(4).

74. Arkansas Code Annotated § 11-4-211 requires employers to pay all

employees one and one-half (1.5) times regular wages for all hours worked over forty

(40) hours in a week, unless an employee meets the exemption requirements of 29

U.S.C. § 213 and accompanying Department of Labor regulations.

75. Defendant failed to pay Plaintiffs a proper overtime premium for all hours

worked in excess of forty (40) hours in a week as required under the AMWA.

Page 11 of 15

Kinyatta Ringo, et al. v. Checkers Drive-In Restaurants, Inc.
U.S.D.C. (E.D. Ark.) Case No. 4:18-cv-\_\_\_

Original Complaint – Class and Collective Action

76. Despite the entitlement of Plaintiffs to payment of lawful overtime

payments under the AMWA, Defendant failed to pay Plaintiffs a lawful overtime

premium.

77. Defendant's conduct and practices, as described above, was willful,

intentional, unreasonable, arbitrary and in bad faith.

78. By reason of the unlawful acts alleged herein, Defendant is liable to

Plaintiffs for, and Plaintiffs seek, monetary damages, liquidated damages, prejudgment

interest, civil penalties and costs, including reasonable attorney's fees as provided by

the AMWA.

79. Alternatively, should the Court find the Defendant acted in good faith in

failing to pay Plaintiffs as provided by the AMWA, Plaintiffs are entitled to an award of

prejudgment interest at the applicable legal rate.

IX. FOURTH CLAIM FOR RELIEF (Class Action Claim for Violation of the AMWA)

80. Plaintiffs repeat and re-allege all previous paragraphs of this Complaint as

though fully incorporated in this section.

81. Plaintiffs, each individually and on behalf of the members of the proposed

class, assert this claim for damages and declaratory relief pursuant to the AMWA.

82. At all relevant times, Defendant has been an "employer" of Plaintiffs and

the members of the proposed class within the meaning of the AMWA, Arkansas Code

Annotated § 11-4-203(4).

83. Arkansas Code Annotated §§ 11-4-210 and 211 require employers to pay

all employees a minimum wage for all hours worked up to forty (40) in one week and to

pay one and one-half (1.5) times regular wages for all hours worked over forty (40)

Page 12 of 15
Kinyatta Ringo, et al. v. Checkers Drive-In Restaurants, Inc.
U.S.D.C. (E.D. Ark.) Case No. 4:18-cv-\_\_\_
Original Complaint – Class and Collective Action

Case 4:18-cv-00715-DPM Document 1 Filed 09/26/18 Page 13 of 17

hours in a week, unless an employee meets the exemption requirements of 29 U.S.C. §

213 and accompanying Department of Labor regulations.

84. Defendant classified Plaintiffs and members of the proposed class as non-

exempt from the overtime requirements of the AMWA.

85. Despite the entitlement of Plaintiffs and the members of the proposed

class to overtime payments under the AMWA, Defendant failed to pay Plaintiffs and the

members of the proposed class an overtime rate of one and one-half (1.5) times their

regular rates of pay for all hours worked over forty (40) per workweek.

86. Plaintiffs propose to represent the AMWA liability class of individuals

defined as follows:

All hourly-paid shift leaders in Arkansas within the past three years.

87. Defendant's conduct and practices, as described above, were willful,

intentional, unreasonable, arbitrary and in bad faith.

88. By reason of the unlawful acts alleged herein, Defendant is liable to

Plaintiffs and the proposed class for monetary damages, liquidated damages, costs,

and a reasonable attorney's fee provided by the AMWA for all violations which occurred

within the three (3) years prior to the filing of this Complaint, plus periods of equitable

tolling.

89. Alternatively, should the Court find that Defendant acted in good faith in

failing to pay Plaintiffs and members of the proposed class as provided by the AMWA,

Plaintiffs and members of the proposed class are entitled to an award of prejudgment

interest at the applicable legal rate.

Page 13 of 15
Kinyatta Ringo, et al. v. Checkers Drive-In Restaurants, Inc.
U.S.D.C. (E.D. Ark.) Case No. 4:18-cv-\_\_\_
Original Complaint – Class and Collective Action

X. PRAYER FOR RELIEF

WHEREFORE, premises considered, Plaintiffs Kinyatta Ringo and Ayonna

Pennington, each individually and on behalf of all others similarly situated, respectfully

pray that Defendant be summoned to appear and to answer herein and for the following

relief:

• • •

A. That Defendant be required to account to Plaintiffs, the collective and

class members, and the Court for all of the hours worked by Plaintiffs and the collective

and class members and all monies paid to them;

B. A declaratory judgment that Defendant's practices alleged herein violate

the FLSA and attendant regulations at 29 C.F.R. § 516 et seq.;

C. A declaratory judgment that Defendant's practices alleged herein violate

the AMWA and the related regulations;

D. Certification of, and proper notice to, together with an opportunity to

participate in the litigation, all qualifying current and former employees;

E. Judgment for damages for all unpaid overtime compensation under the

FLSA and attendant regulations at 29 C.F.R. §516 et seg.;

F. Judgment for damages for all unpaid overtime compensation under the

AMWA and the related regulations;

G. Judgment for liquidated damages pursuant to the FLSA and attendant

regulations at 29 C.F.R. §516 et seq., in an amount equal to all unpaid overtime

compensation owed to Plaintiffs and members of the collective and class members

during the applicable statutory period;

Page 14 of 15
Kinyatta Ringo, et al. v. Checkers Drive-In Restaurants, Inc.
U.S.D.C. (E.D. Ark.) Case No. 4:18-cv-\_\_\_
Original Complaint – Class and Collective Action

H. Judgment for liquidated damages pursuant to the AMWA and the relating regulations;

I. An order directing Defendant to pay Plaintiffs and members of the collective and class pre-judgment interest, reasonable attorney's fees and all costs connected with this action; and

J. Such other and further relief as this Court may deem necessary, just and proper.

Respectfully submitted,

KINYATTA RINGO and AYONNA PENNINGTON, Each Individually and on Behalf of All Others Similarly Situated, PLAINTIFFS

SANFORD LAW FIRM, PLLC One Financial Center 650 South Shackleford, Suite 411 Little Rock, Arkansas 72211 Telephone: (501) 221-0088 Facsimile: (888) 787-2040

Chris Burks

Ark Bar No. 2010207 chris@sanfordlawfirm\_com

Jo∕sh*≴*anfþø

Ark. Bar No. 2001037

josh@sanfordlawfirm.com

## IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT EASTERN DISTRICT OF ARKANSAS WESTERN DIVISION

KINYATTA RINGO and AYONNA PENNINGTON, Each Individually and on Behalf of All Others Similarly Situated **PLAINTIFFS** 

VS.

No. 4:18-cv-7/5

CHECKERS DRIVE-IN RESTAURANTS, INC.

**DEFENDANT** 

## **CONSENT TO JOIN COLLECTIVE ACTION**

I have been employed as an hourly-paid shift leader for Defendant Checkers Drive-In Restaurants, Inc., on or after September 26, 2015. I understand this lawsuit is being brought under the Fair Labor Standards Act for unpaid wages and other relief. I consent to becoming a party-plaintiff in this lawsuit, to be represented by Sanford Law Firm, PLLC, and to be bound by any settlement of this action or adjudication by the Court.

I declare under penalty of perjury that the foregoing is true and correct.

AYONNA PENNINGTON

Date: September 25, 2018

/s/ Josh Sanford

Josh Sanford, Esq.
SANFORD LAW FIRM, PLLC
One Financial Center
650 South Shackleford Road, Suite 411
Little Rock, Arkansas 72211
Telephone: (501) 221-0088

Facsimile: (888) 787-2040 iosh@sanfordlawfirm.com

## IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT EASTERN DISTRICT OF ARKANSAS WESTERN DIVISION

KINYATTA RINGO and AYONNA PENNINGTON, Each Individually and on Behalf of All Others Similarly Situated **PLAINTIFFS** 

VS.

No. 4:18-cv- 7/5

CHECKERS DRIVE-IN RESTAURANTS, INC.

**DEFENDANT** 

### **CONSENT TO JOIN COLLECTIVE ACTION**

I have been employed as an hourly-paid shift leader for Defendant Checkers Drive-In Restaurants, Inc., on or after September 26, 2015. I understand this lawsuit is being brought under the Fair Labor Standards Act for unpaid wages and other relief. I consent to becoming a party-plaintiff in this lawsuit, to be represented by Sanford Law Firm, PLLC, and to be bound by any settlement of this action or adjudication by the Court.

I declare under penalty of perjury that the foregoing is true and correct.

KINYATTA RINGO

Date: September 25, 2018

/s/ Josh Sanford
Josh Sanford, Esq.
SANFORD LAW FIRM, PLLC
One Financial Center
650 South Shackleford Road, Suite 411
Little Rock, Arkansas 72211
Telephone: (501) 221-0088
Facsimile: (888) 787-2040
josh@sanfordlawfirm.com

JS 44 (Rev. 06/17)

#### **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 decket sheet.

purpose of initiating the civil do	ocket sheet. (SEE INSTRUC	TIONS ON NEXT PAGE O	OF THIS FO	PRM.)	,	4:182V	715-DPM								
I. (a) PLAINTIFFS				DEFENDANTS											
KINYATTA RINGO and AYONNA PENNINGTON, Each Individually and on Behalf of All Others Similarly Situated				CHECKERS DRIVE-IN RESTAURANTS, INC.											
(b) County of Residence of First Listed Plaintiff Pulaski (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 Josh Sanford, SANFORD 650 South Shackleford, S 501-221-0088; josh@sar	D LAW FIRM, PLLC, C Suite 411, Little Rock,	ne Financial Cente	er,	Attorneys (If Known)			
								II. BASIS OF JURISDI	CTION (Place an "X" in G	ne Box Only)			RINCIPA	L PARTIES	Place an "X" in One Box for Plaintiff
☐ 1 U.S. Government			(For Diversity Cases Only)  P	rf def		and One Box for Defendant) PTF DEF									
Plaintiff	(U.S. Government Not a Party)		Citize	zen of This State											
☐ 2 U.S. Government Defendant	☐ 4 Diversity (Indicate Citizenship of Parties in Item III)		Citizo	itizen of Another State											
				Citizen or Subject of a 3 3 Foreign N Foreign Country			Nation								
IV. NATURE OF SUIT							of Suit Code Descriptions.								
CONTRACT		RTS		DRFEITURE/PENALTY	1	KRUPTCY	OTHER STATUTES								
☐ 110 Insurance ☐ 120 Marine	PERSONAL INJURY  310 Airplane	PERSONAL INJUR  365 Personal Injury -	X   🗖 62	25 Drug Related Seizure of Property 21 USC 881	☐ 422 Appe ☐ 423 With	eal 28 USC 158	☐ 375 False Claims Act ☐ 376 Qui Tam (31 USC								
☐ 130 Miller Act	☐ 315 Airplane Product	Product Liability	□ 69	00 Other		JSC 157	3729(a))								
☐ 140 Negotiable Instrument	Liability	□ 367 Health Care/	1				☐ 400 State Reapportionment								
☐ 150 Recovery of Overpayment & Enforcement of Judgment	320 Assault, Libel & Slander	Pharmaceutical Personal Injury			<b>PROPEI</b> ☐ 820 Copy	RTY RIGHTS	☐ 410 Antitrust☐ 430 Banks and Banking								
☐ 151 Medicare Act	☐ 330 Federal Employers'	Product Liability			□ 830 Paten		☐ 450 Commerce								
☐ 152 Recovery of Defaulted	Liability	☐ 368 Asbestos Persona	1			nt - Abbreviated	☐ 460 Deportation								
Student Loans (Excludes Veterans)	☐ 340 Marine ☐ 345 Marine Product	Injury Product Liability	l		New  ☐ 840 Trade	Drug Application	☐ 470 Racketeer Influenced and Corrupt Organizations								
☐ 153 Recovery of Overpayment	Liability	PERSONAL PROPEI	RTY 🗀	LABOR		SECURITY	☐ 480 Consumer Credit								
of Veteran's Benefits	☐ 350 Motor Vehicle	370 Other Fraud	<b>3</b> 71	0 Fair Labor Standards	☐ 861 HIA		☐ 490 Cable/Sat TV								
☐ 160 Stockholders' Suits ☐ 190 Other Contract	☐ 355 Motor Vehicle Product Liability	☐ 371 Truth in Lending ☐ 380 Other Personal	l⊓ 72	Act 20 Labor/Management		k Lung (923) C/DIWW (405(g))	☐ 850 Securities/Commodities/ Exchange								
☐ 195 Contract Product Liability	☐ 360 Other Personal	Property Damage		Relations	☐ 864 SSID		☐ 890 Other Statutory Actions								
☐ 196 Franchise	Injury	□ 385 Property Damage		10 Railway Labor Act	□ 865 RSI (	(405(g))	891 Agricultural Acts								
	☐ 362 Personal Injury - Medical Malpractice	Product Liability	13 /3	I Family and Medical Leave Act			☐ 893 Environmental Matters ☐ 895 Freedom of Information								
REAL PROPERTY	CIVIL RIGHTS	PRISONER PETITIO		00 Other Labor Litigation	FEDER.	AL TAX SUITS	Act								
210 Land Condemnation	☐ 440 Other Civil Rights☐ 441 Voting	Habeas Corpus:	<b>17</b> 79	1 Employee Retirement	I .	s (U.S. Plaintiff	□ 896 Arbitration								
☐ 220 Foreclosure ☐ 230 Rent Lease & Ejectment	☐ 441 Voting ☐ 442 Employment	☐ 463 Alien Detainee ☐ 510 Motions to Vacate	.	Income Security Act		efendant) —Third Party	☐ 899 Administrative Procedure Act/Review or Appeal of								
☐ 240 Torts to Land	443 Housing/	Sentence	Ĭ			JSC 7609	Agency Decision								
☐ 245 Tort Product Liability	Accommodations	530 General	<u> </u>	INDICON ATTION	₹		□ 950 Constitutionality of								
☐ 290 All Other Real Property	☐ 445 Amer. w/Disabilities - Employment	Other:	□ 46	immigration 2 Naturalization Application	:		State Statutes								
	446 Amer. w/Disabilities -	540 Mandamus & Oth		5 Other Immigration	1										
	Other  448 Education	☐ 550 Civil Rights ☐ 555 Prison Condition		Actions											
	1 446 Education	560 Civil Detainee -													
		Conditions of													
V ODICIN as		Confinement			1	<del></del>									
V. ORIGIN (Place an "X" in	• •	D 116	<b>a</b> 4 D :	7		<b>5</b> 4 <b>3</b> 4 10 10 1	7 0 M 1:11								
	moved from 3 tte Court	Remanded from Appellate Court	☐ 4 Rein Reo <sub>l</sub>		r District	☐ 6 Multidistr Litigation Transfer									
			re filing (I	Do not cite jurisdictional sta	tutes unless di	versity):									
VI. CAUSE OF ACTIO	DN 29 U.S.C. 201, et Brief description of ca Unpaid Overtime	iuse:	·												
VII. REQUESTED IN		IS A CLASS ACTIO	y D	EMAND \$		HECK VES only	if demanded in complaint:								
COMPLAINT:	UNDER RULE 2			EMAND \$		URY DEMAND:	*								
VIII. RELATED CASI IF ANY	E(S) (See instructions):	JUDGE			DOCKE	ET NUMBER									
DATE		SIGNATURE OF AT	TORNEY (	OF RECORD	<del></del>										
09/26/2018	$\times$														
FOR OFFICE USE ONLY	<del>//</del>	$\overline{}$													
RECEIPT # AN	MOUNT	APPI VING IFP		ILIDGE		MAG ILID	nGE								

# **ClassAction.org**

This complaint is part of ClassAction.org's searchable class action lawsuit database and can be found in this post: Checkers and Rally's Restaurants Hit with Shift Leaders' Unpaid Overtime Lawsuit