UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF FLORIDA

CASE NO.: 16-25039-CIV-JLK

ROBERTO CALIMANO RODRIGUEZ, and all others similarly situated under 29 U.S.C.)
216(b),)
Plaintiffs,)
VS.)
RCH LAWN MAINTENANCE LLC, SETH HOROWYTZ,)))
Defendants.)))

COMPLAINT UNDER 29 U.S.C. 201- 216 OVERTIME WAGE VIOLATIONS

Plaintiff, ROBERTO CALIMANO RODRIGUEZ on behalf of himself and all others similarly situated under 29 U.S.C. 216(b), through undersigned counsel, files this Complaint against Defendants, RCH LAWN MAINTENANCE LLC, and SETH HOROWYTZ, and allege:

- 1. This is an action arising under the Fair Labor Standards Act 29 U.S.C. §§ 201-216.
- 2. The Plaintiffs were residents of Dade County, Florida at the time that this dispute arose.
- 3. The Defendant RCH LAWN MAINTENANCE LLC, is a limited liability company that regularly transacts business within Dade County. Upon information and belief, the Defendant Corporation was the FLSA employer for Plaintiffs' respective period of employment ("the relevant time period").
- 4. The individual Defendant SETH HOROWYTZ is a corporate officer and/or owner and/or manager of the Defendant Corporation who ran the day-to-day operations of the Corporate Defendant for the relevant time period and was responsible for paying Plaintiffs' wages for the relevant time period and controlled Plaintiffs' work and schedule and was therefore Plaintiffs' employer as defined by 29 U.S.C. 203 (d).

5. All acts or omissions giving rise to this dispute took place in Dade County.

COUNT I. SUCCESSOR LIABILITY

- 6. This Court has jurisdiction to continue to hear this case under the theory of successor liability pursuant to *Steinbach v. Hubbard*, 51 F.3d 843, 844 (9th Cir. Wash. 1995) (Successorship liability exists under the Fair Labor Standards Act).
- On or about October 2013 through until June 1, 2015 Plaintiff ROBERTO CALIMANO RODRIGUEZ worked for L.G. PROPERTY MAINTENANCE, INC.
- 8. On or about June 15, 2015, Plaintiff continued the same work, however, the company name they worked for was now RCH LAWN MAINTENANCE LLC.
- 9. RCH LAWN MAINTENANCE LLC was created to continue business of L.G. PROPERTY MAINTENANCE, INC.
- 10. RCH LAWN MAINTENANCE LLC is a successor company of L.G. PROPERTY MAINTENANCE, INC, that operates as a mere continuation of the predecessor, as upon information and belief RCH LAWN MAINTENANCE LLC has the same management, same ownership, same business module, same employees, same equipment, and was only created after Defendants dissolved L.G. PROPERTY MAINTENANCE, INC and began paying employees under the name of RCH LAWN MAINTENANCE LLC.
- 11. Defendants created RCH LAWN MAINTENANCE LLC. in order to avoid the liabilities of L.G. PROPERTY MAINTENANCE, INC.
- 12. As such, RCH LAWN MAINTENANCE LLC is a successor corporation of L.G. PROPERTY MAINTENANCE, INC. In particular, RCH LAWN MAINTENANCE LLC doing business is a "mere continuation" of its predecessor L.G. PROPERTY MAINTENANCE, INC.

13. Therefore, principles of equity require that RCH LAWN MAINTENANCE LLC be held liable for the overtime wage violations of L.G. PROPERTY MAINTENANCE, INC.

COUNT II. FEDERAL OVERTIME WAGE VIOLATION

- 14. This action arises under the laws of the United States. This case is brought as a collective action under 29 USC 216(b). It is believed that the Defendants have employed several other similarly situated employees like Plaintiffs who have not been paid overtime and/or minimum wages for work performed in excess of 40 hours weekly from the filing of this complaint back three years.
- 15. This Court has jurisdiction pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1331 as this case is brought pursuant to The Fair Labor Standards Act, 29 U.S.C. §§ 201-219 (section #216 for jurisdictional placement).
- 16. 29 U.S.C. § 207 (a) (1) states, "Except as otherwise provided in this section, no employer shall employ any of his employees who in any workweek is engaged in commerce or in the production of goods for commerce, or is employed in an enterprise engaged in commerce or in the production of goods for commerce, for a workweek longer than forty hours unless such employee receives compensation for his employment in excess of the hours above specified at a rate not less than one and one-half times the regular rate at which he is employed."
- 17. Plaintiff ROBERTO CALIMANO RODRIGUEZ worked for L.G. PROPERTY MAINTENANCE, INC as a lawn maintenance worker from on or about October 22, 2013 through on or about June 1, 2015.
- 18. Plaintiff ROBERTO CALIMANO RODRIGUEZ worked for Defendants as a lawn maintenance worker from on or about June 1, 2015 through on or about May 24, 2017 under the now assumed name of RCH LAWN MAINTENANCE LLC.

- 19. Defendant RCH LAWN MAINTENANCE LLC's business activities involve those to which the Fair Labor Standards Act applies. Both the Defendant RCH LAWN MAINTENANCE LLC affected interstate commerce for the relevant time period. Plaintiff's work for Defendant RCH LAWN MAINTENANCE LLC affected interstate commerce for the relevant time period because the materials and goods that Plaintiffs used on a constant and/or continual basis and/or that were supplied to him by the Defendant RCH LAWN MAINTENANCE LLC to use on the job moved through interstate commerce prior to and/or subsequent to Plaintiff's use of the same. The Plaintiff's work for Defendant RCH LAWN MAINTENANCE LLC was actually in and/or so closely related to the movement of commerce while he worked for Defendant RCH LAWN MAINTENANCE LLC that the Fair Labor Standards Act applies to Plaintiffs' work for Defendant RCH LAWN MAINTENANCE LLC.
- 20. Additionally, Defendant RCH LAWN MAINTENANCE LLC regularly employed two or more employees for the relevant time period who handled goods or materials that travelled through interstate commerce, or used instrumentalities of interstate commerce, thus making Defendant RCH LAWN MAINTENANCE LLC's business an enterprise covered under the Fair Labor Standards Act.
- 21. Upon information and belief, Defendant and Successor Corporation, RCH LAWN MAINTENANCE LLC had gross sales or business done in excess of \$500,000 annually for the years 2013, 2014, 2015, and 2016.
- 22. Upon information and belief, the Defendant and Successor Corporation, RCH LAWN MAINTENANCE LLC's gross sales or business done is expected to exceed \$500,000 for the

year 2017.

- 23. Upon information and belief, Defendants own approximately two (2) other lawn service and maintenance companies throughout South Florida and are joint enterprises as defined by 29 U.S.C. 203(r) as the related activities between Defendants and approximately two (2) other lawn service and maintenance companies throughout South Florida are performed through unified operation and/or common control, are being done for a common business purpose and there is cross-utilization of employees during the same work weeks simultaneously benefiting all Companies which are operated by the same company officers for a common business purpose.
- 24. Individual Defendant SETH HOROWYTZ was Plaintiffs' individual employer pursuant to 29 U.S.C. §203(d) as set forth above.
- 25. Between the period of on or about March 2006 through until June 1, 2015, Plaintiff ROBERTO CALIMANO RODRIGUEZ worked an average of 45 hours a week for L.G. PROPERTY MAINTENANCE, INC, of which an average of 5 overtime hours a week were spent travelling to and from Defendants' jobsites and to and from Defendants' place of business, and was paid an average of \$13.00 per hour. Plaintiff was never paid the half time overtime rate for an average of 5 overtime hours a week travelling to and from Defendants' jobsites and to and from Defendants' place of business as required by the Fair Labor Standards Act. Plaintiff therefore claims the half time overtime rate for an average of 5 overtime hours that he worked above 40 in a week spent travelling to and from Defendants' jobsites and to and from Defendants' place of business.
- 26. Between the period of on or about June 1, 2015 through on or about December 31, 2016, Plaintiff ROBERTO CALIMANO RODRIGUEZ worked an average of 57.5 hours a week

for successor Defendants, RCH LAWN MAINTENANCE LLC, RCH LAWN MAINTENANCE LLC, of which an average of 17.5 overtime hours a week were spent travelling to and from Defendants' jobsites and to and from Defendants' place of business, and was paid an average of \$13.50 per hour. Plaintiff was never paid anything at all for an average of 12.5 overtime hours a week spent travelling to and from Defendants' jobsites and to and from Defendants' place of business as required by the Fair Labor Standards Act. Plaintiff therefore claims the time-and-a-half overtime rate for an average of 12.5 overtime hours that he worked above 40 in a week.

- 27. Between the period of on or about June 1, 2015 through on or about December 31, 2016, Plaintiff ROBERTO CALIMANO RODRIGUEZ worked an average of 57.5 hours a week for successor Defendants, RCH LAWN MAINTENANCE LLC, of which an average of 17.5 overtime hours a week travelling to and from Defendants' jobsites and to and from Defendants' place of business, and was paid an average of \$13.50 per hour (except with respect to the above-referenced 12.5 hours). Plaintiff was never paid the half time overtime for an average of 5 overtime hours a week spent travelling to and from Defendants' jobsites and to and from Defendants' place of business as required by the Fair Labor Standards Act. Plaintiff therefore claims the half-time overtime rate for an average of 5 overtime hours that he worked above 40 in a week.
- 28. Between the period of on or about January 1, 2017 through on or about May 24, 2017, Plaintiff ROBERTO CALIMANO RODRIGUEZ worked an average of 63.5 hours a week for successor Defendants, RCH LAWN MAINTENANCE LLC, of which an average of 23.5 overtime hours a week travelling to and from Defendants' jobsites and to and from Defendants' place of business, and was paid an average of \$13.50 per hour. Plaintiff was

- never paid anything at all for an average of 12.5 overtime hours a week spent travelling to and from Defendants' jobsites and to and from Defendants' place of business as required by the Fair Labor Standards Act. Plaintiff therefore claims the time-and-a-half overtime rate for an average of 12.5 overtime hours that he worked above 40 in a week.
- 29. Between the period of on or about January 1, 2017 through on or about May 24, 2017, Plaintiff ROBERTO CALIMANO RODRIGUEZ worked an average of 63.5 hours a week for successor Defendants, RCH LAWN MAINTENANCE LLC s, of which an average of 23.5 overtime hours a week were spent travelling to and from Defendants' jobsites and to and from Defendants' place of business, and was paid an average of \$13.50 per hour (except with respect to the above-referenced 12.5 hours). Plaintiff was never paid the half time overtime for an average of 11 overtime hours a week spent travelling to and from Defendants' jobsites and to and from Defendants' place of business on as required by the Fair Labor Standards Act. Plaintiff therefore claims the half-time overtime rate for an average of 11 overtime hours that he worked above 40 in a week.
- 30. Defendants RCH LAWN MAINTENANCE LLC, and SETH HOROWYTZ willfully and intentionally refused to pay Plaintiff's overtime wages as required by the Fair Labor Standards Act as Defendant RCH LAWN MAINTENANCE LLC, and SETH HOROWYTZ knew of the overtime requirements of the Fair Labor Standards Act and recklessly failed to investigate whether Defendants' RCH LAWN MAINTENANCE LLC and SETH HOROWYTZ's payroll practices were in accordance with the Fair Labor Standards Act. Defendants RCH LAWN MAINTENANCE LLC, and SETH HOROWYTZ remain owing Plaintiff these wages since the commencement of Plaintiff's employment with Defendants RCH LAWN MAINTENANCE LLC, and SETH HOROWYTZ for the time period specified

above.

Wherefore, the Plaintiffs request double damages and reasonable attorney fees from Defendants, RCH LAWN MAINTENANCE LLC, and SETH HOROWYTZ, jointly and severally, pursuant to the Fair Labor Standards Act as cited above, to be proven at the time of trial for all overtime wages still owing from Plaintiffs' entire employment period with Defendants RCH LAWN MAINTENANCE LLC, and SETH HOROWYTZ or as much as allowed by the Fair Labor Standards Act along with court costs, interest, and any other relief that this Court finds reasonable under the circumstances. *The Plaintiffs request a trial by jury*.

Respectfully Submitted,

J.H. Zidell, Esq. J.H. Zidell, P.A. Attorney For Plaintiff 300 71st Street, Suite 605 Miami Beach, Florida 33141

Tel: (305) 865-6766 Fax: (305) 865-7167

Email: ZABOGADO@AOL.COM

By:__/s/ J.H. Zidell_____ J.H. Zidell, Esq. Florida Bar Number: 0010121

United States District Court

for the Southern District of Florida

ROBERTO CALIMANO RODRIGUEZ, and all others similarly situated under 29 U.S.C. 216(b),	1)
Plaintiffs, vs.)))
RCH LAWN MAINTENANCE LLC, SETH HOROWYTZ,)))
Defendants.)))

SUMMONS IN A CIVIL ACTION

To: (Defendant's name and address) RCH LAWN MAINTENANCE LLC Registered Agent: Seth Horowytz 9858 Glades Road, #163 Boca Raton, FL 33434

A lawsuit has been filed against you.

Within 21 days after service of this summons on you (not counting the day you received it) — or 60 days if you are the United States or a United States agency, or an officer or employee of the United States described in Fed. R. Civ. P. 12 (a)(2) or (3) — you must serve on the plaintiff an answer to the attached complaint or a motion under Rule 12 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure. The answer or motion must be served on the plaintiff or plaintiff's attorney, whose name and address are:

J.H. Zidell, Esq. J.H. Zidell P.A. 300 71ST Street, Suite 605 Miami Beach, Florida 33141

If you fail to respond, judgment by default will be entered against you for the relief demanded in the complaint. You also must file your answer or motion with the court.

CLERK OF COURT

Date:		

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

for the Southern District of Florida

ROBERTO CALIMANO RODRIGUEZ, and all others similarly situated under 29 U.S.C. 216(b),)
Plaintiffs, vs.)))
RCH LAWN MAINTENANCE LLC, SETH HOROWYTZ,)
Defendants.)))

SUMMONS IN A CIVIL ACTION

To: (Defendant's name and address) SETH HOROWYTZ 9858 Glades Road, #163 Boca Raton, FL 33434

A lawsuit has been filed against you.

Within 21 days after service of this summons on you (not counting the day you received it) — or 60 days if you are the United States or a United States agency, or an officer or employee of the United States described in Fed. R. Civ. P. 12 (a)(2) or (3) — you must serve on the plaintiff an answer to the attached complaint or a motion under Rule 12 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure. The answer or motion must be served on the plaintiff or plaintiff's attorney, whose name and address are:

J.H. Zidell, Esq. J.H. Zidell P.A. 300 71ST Street, Suite 605 Miami Beach, Florida 33141

If you fail to respond, judgment by default will be entered against you for the relief demanded in the complaint. You also must file your answer or motion with the court.

CLERK OF COURT

Date:		

$_{ m JS~44~(Rev.~1)}$ Case 1:17-cv-23012-JEM Document 1-2 Entered by Fig. (Rev. 1) Decime 1:17-cv-23012-JEM Document 1-2 Entered by Fig. (Rev. 1) Decime 1:17-cv-23012-JEM Document 1-2 Entered by Fig. (Rev. 1) Decime 1:17-cv-23012-JEM Document 1-2 Entered by Fig. (Rev. 1) Decime 1:17-cv-23012-JEM Document 1-2 Entered by Fig. (Rev. 1) Decime 1:17-cv-23012-JEM Document 1-2 Entered by Fig. (Rev. 1) Decime 1:17-cv-23012-JEM Document 1-2 Entered by Fig. (Rev. 1) Decime 1:17-cv-23012-JEM Document 1-2 Entered by Fig. (Rev. 1) Decime 1:17-cv-23012-JEM Document 1-2 Entered by Fig. (Rev. 1) Decime 1:17-cv-23012-JEM Document 1:17-cv-23012-JEM D

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.) NOTICE: Attorneys MUST Indicate All Re-filed Cases Below

of initiating the civil docket shee	et. (SEE INSTRUCTIONS ON	NEXT PAGE OF THIS FORM.	NOTICE: Attorneys MUST	Indicate All Re-filed Cases E	selow.
(a) PLAINTIFFS Rodriguez, Roberto Calimano, and all others similarly situated under 29 USC 216(b)					
	•	SES)	NOTE: Attorneys (If Known)	of First Listed Defendant (IN U.S. PLAINTIFF CASES O IN LAND CONDEMNATION C. THE TRACT OF LAND INVOL [®]	ASES, USE THE LOCATION OF
(d) Check County Where Action	n Arose: 🏿 MIAMI- DADE	☐ MONROE ☐ BROWARD ☐] PALM BEACH ☐ MARTIN ☐ ST. LU	JCIE INDIAN RIVER OKEECHO	OBEE HIGHLANDS
II. BASIS OF JURISDI	CTION (Place an "X" in	One Box Only)	. CITIZENSHIP OF PI	RINCIPAL PARTIES	Place an "X" in One Box for Plaintiff)
☐ 1 U.S. Government Plaintiff	(U.S. Government N	ral Question Not a Party)	(For Diversity Cases Only) PT Citizen of This State		
2 U.S. Government Defendant		ersity p of Parties in Item III)	Citizen of Another State	2	
			Citizen or Subject of a Foreign Country	3 Soreign Nation	□ 6 □ 6
IV. NATURE OF SUIT CONTRACT	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	ly) RTS	FORFEITURE/PENALTY	BANKRUPTCY	OTHER STATUTES
☐ 110 Insurance ☐ 120 Marine ☐ 130 Miller Act ☐ 140 Negotiable Instrument	PERSONAL INJURY ☐ 310 Airplane ☐ 315 Airplane Product Liability	PERSONAL INJURY ☐ 365 Personal Injury - Product Liability ☐ 367 Health Care/	☐ 625 Drug Related Seizure of Property 21 USC 881 ☐ 690 Other	☐ 422 Appeal 28 USC 158 ☐ 423 Withdrawal 28 USC 157	☐ 375 False Claims Act ☐ 400 State Reapportionment ☐ 410 Antitrust ☐ 430 Banks and Banking
☐ 150 Recovery of Overpayment & Enforcement of Judgment ☐ 151 Medicare Act ☐ 152 Recovery of Defaulted Student Loans	□ 320 Assault, Libel & Slander □ 330 Federal Employers' Liability □ 340 Marine	Pharmaceutical Personal Injury Product Liability 368 Asbestos Personal Injury Product		PROPERTY RIGHTS 820 Copyrights 830 Patent 840 Trademark	☐ 450 Commerce ☐ 460 Deportation ☐ 470 Racketeer Influenced and Corrupt Organizations ☐ 480 Consumer Credit
(Excl. Veterans) 153 Recovery of Overpayment of Veteran's Benefits 160 Stockholders' Suits 190 Other Contract 195 Contract Product Liability 196 Franchise	□ 345 Marine Product Liability □ 350 Motor Vehicle □ 355 Motor Vehicle Product Liability □ 360 Other Personal Injury	Liability PERSONAL PROPERTY 370 Other Fraud 371 Truth in Lending 380 Other Personal Property Damage 385 Property Damage	LABOR ▼ 710 Fair Labor Standards	SOCIAL SECURITY 861 HIA (1395ff) 862 Black Lung (923) 863 DIWC/DIWW (405(g)) 864 SSID Title XVI 865 RSI (405(g))	□ 490 Cable/Sat TV □ 850 Securities/Commodities/Exchange □ 890 Other Statutory Actions □ 891 Agricultural Acts □ 893 Environmental Matters □ 895 Freedom of Information
	☐ 362 Personal Injury - Med. Malpractice	Product Liability	☐ 790 Other Labor Litigation ☐ 791 Empl. Ret. Inc.	EPPER A TAN OVER	Act 896 Arbitration
REAL PROPERTY 210 Land Condemnation 220 Foreclosure 230 Rent Lease & Ejectment 240 Torts to Land	CIVIL RIGHTS 440 Other Civil Rights 441 Voting 442 Employment 443 Housing/ Accommodations	PRISONER PETITIONS Habeas Corpus: 463 Alien Detainee 510 Motions to Vacate Sentence Other:	Security Act	FEDERAL TAX SUITS 870 Taxes (U.S. Plaintiff or Defendant) 871 IRS—Third Party 26 USC 7609	■ 899 Administrative Procedure Act/Review or Appeal of Agency Decision ■ 950 Constitutionality of State Statutes
☐ 245 Tort Product Liability☐ 290 All Other Real Property	□ 445 Amer. w/Disabilities - Employment □ 446 Amer. w/Disabilities - Other □ 448 Education	☐ 530 General ☐ 535 Death Penalty ☐ 540 Mandamus & Other ☐ 550 Civil Rights ☐ 555 Prison Condition 560 Civil Detainee – ☐ Conditions of Confinement	IMMIGRATION ☐ 462 Naturalization Application ☐ 465 Other Immigration Actions		Appeal to
1 Original 2 Rem	un "X" in One Box Only) noved from 3 Re-file e Court VI belo	d (See	or 5 Transferred from another district (specify)	6 Multidistrict Litigation 7	District Judge from Magistrate Judgment Remanded from Appellate Court
VI. RELATED/	,	led Case □YES ☑N	O b) Related Cases	✓YES □ NO	
RE-FILED CASE(S)	(See instructions): JUDGE			DOCKET NUMBER 16-2:	539-CIV-KING
VII. CAUSE OF ACTIO	Cite the U.S. Civil Sta	•	ling and Write a Brief Statement for both sides to try entire case)	nt of Cause (Do not cite jurisdict	
VIII. REQUESTED IN COMPLAINT:		IS A CLASS ACTION	DEMAND \$		if demanded in complaint:
ABOVE INFORMATION IS TO DATE	FRUE & CORRECT TO T		WLEDGE TORNEY OF RECORD		
August 8, 2017					
FOR OFFICE USE ONLY RECEIPT #	AMOUNT	IFP	IUDGE	MAG IUDGE	

Save As...

Reset

JS 44 Reverse (Rev. 12/12)

INSTRUCTIONS FOR ATTORNEYS COMPLETING CIVIL COVER SHEET FORM JS 44

Authority For Civil Cover Sheet

The JS 44 civil cover sheet and the information contained herein neither replaces nor supplements the filings and service of pleading 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. Consequently, a civil cover sheet is submitted to the Clerk of Court for each civil complaint filed. The attorney filing a case should complete the form as follows:

- I. (a) Plaintiffs-Defendants. Enter names (last, first, middle initial) of plaintiff and defendant. If the plaintiff or defendant is a government agency, use only the full name or standard abbreviations. If the plaintiff or defendant is an official within a government agency, identify first the agency and then the official, giving both name and title.
- (b) County of Residence. For each civil case filed, except U.S. plaintiff cases, enter the name of the county where the first listed plaintiff resides at the time of filing. In U.S. plaintiff cases, enter the name of the county in which the first listed defendant resides at the time of filing. (NOTE: In land condemnation cases, the county of residence of the "defendant" is the location of the tract of land involved.)
- (c) Attorneys. Enter the firm name, address, telephone number, and attorney of record. If there are several attorneys, list them on an attachment, noting in this section "(see attachment)".
- **II. Jurisdiction**. The basis of jurisdiction is set forth under Rule 8(a), F.R.C.P., which requires that jurisdictions be shown in pleadings. Place an "X" in one of the boxes. If there is more than one basis of jurisdiction, precedence is given in the order shown below.

United States plaintiff. (1) Jurisdiction based on 28 U.S.C. 1345 and 1348. Suits by agencies and officers of the United States are included here.

United States defendant. (2) When the plaintiff is suing the United States, its officers or agencies, place an "X" in this box.

Federal question. (3) This refers to suits under 28 U.S.C. 1331, where jurisdiction arises under the Constitution of the United States, an amendment to the Constitution, an act of Congress or a treaty of the United States. In cases where the U.S. is a party, the U.S. plaintiff or defendant code takes precedence, and box 1 or 2 should be marked.

Diversity of citizenship. (4) This refers to suits under 28 U.S.C. 1332, where parties are citizens of different states. When Box 4 is checked, the citizenship of the different parties must be checked. (See Section III below; federal question actions take precedence over diversity cases.)

- III. Residence (citizenship) of Principal Parties. This section of the JS 44 is to be completed if diversity of citizenship was indicated above. Mark this section for each principal party.
- IV. Nature of Suit. Place an "X" in the appropriate box. If the nature of suit cannot be determined, be sure the cause of action, in Section VI below, is sufficient to enable the deputy clerk or the statistical clerks in the Administrative Office to determine the nature of suit. If the cause fits more than one nature of suit, select the most definitive.
- V. Origin. Place an "X" in one of the seven boxes.

Original Proceedings. (1) Cases which originate in the United States district courts.

Removed from State Court. (2) Proceedings initiated in state courts may be removed to the district courts under Title 28 U.S.C., Section 1441. When the petition for removal is granted, check this box.

Refiled (3) Attach copy of Order for Dismissal of Previous case. Also complete VI.

Reinstated or Reopened. (4) Check this box for cases reinstated or reopened in the district court. Use the reopening date as the filing date.

Transferred from Another District. (5) For cases transferred under Title 28 U.S.C. Section 1404(a). Do not use this for within district transfers or multidistrict litigation transfers.

Multidistrict Litigation. (6) Check this box when a multidistrict case is transferred into the district under authority of Title 28 U.S.C. Section 1407. When this box is checked, do not check (5) above.

Appeal to District Judge from Magistrate Judgment. (7) Check this box for an appeal from a magistrate judge's decision.

Remanded from Appellate Court. (8) Check this box if remanded from Appellate Court.

- VI. Related/Refiled Cases. This section of the JS 44 is used to reference related pending cases or re-filed cases. Insert the docket numbers and the corresponding judges name for such cases.
- VII. Cause of Action. Report the civil statute directly related to the cause of action and give a brief description of the cause. Do not cite jurisdictional statutes unless diversity. Example: U.S. Civil Statute: 47 USC 553

Brief Description: Unauthorized reception of cable service

VIII. Requested in Complaint. Class Action. Place an "X" in this box if you are filing a class action under Rule 23, F.R.Cv.P.

Demand. In this space enter the dollar amount (in thousands of dollars) being demanded or indicate other demand such as a preliminary injunction.

Jury Demand. Check the appropriate box to indicate whether or not a jury is being demanded.

Date and Attorney Signature. Date and sign the civil cover sheet.

ClassAction.org

This complaint is part of ClassAction.org's searchable class action lawsuit database and can be found in this post: RCH Lawn Maintenance Fails to Pay Travel Time Wages, Suit Says