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

FILED
U.S. DISTRICT COURT
EASTERN DISTRICT ARKANSAS

NOV 09 2017

JAMES W. McCORMACK, CLERK

DEP CLERK

PLAINTIFF

BRI'YANA RUMPH, Individually and on Behalf of All Others Similarly Situated

vs.

No. 4:17-cv-740-BSM

STONEMARK MANAGEMENT, LLC

DEFENDANT

ORIGINAL COMPLAINT— CLASS AND COLLECTIVE ACTION

I. PRELIMINARY STATEMENTS

1. The purpose of this Original Complaint—Class and Collective Action (hereinafter "Complaint") is to make allegations of violations of the Fair Labor Standards Act, 29 U.S.C. § 201, et seq., and the Arkansas Minimum Wage Act, Ark. Code Ann. § 11-4-201, et seq., on behalf of Plaintiff Bri'Yana Rumph and the class she seeks to represent regarding unpaid overtime wages.

II. JURISDICTION AND VENUE

2. Plaintiff, individually and on behalf of all others similarly situated, brings this action under the Fair Labor Standards Act, 29 U.S.C. § 201, et seq. ("FLSA"), and

Page 1 of 15
Bri'Yana Rumph, et al., v. Stonemark Management, LLC
U.S.D.C. (E.D. Ark.) Case No. 4:17-cv-___
Original Complaint—Class and Collective Action

the Arkansas Minimum Wage Act, Ark. Code Ann. § 11-4-201, et seq. ("AMWA"), for

declaratory judgment, monetary damages, liquidated damages, prejudgment interest,

civil penalties and costs, including reasonable attorneys' fees as a result of Defendant's

failure to pay Plaintiff and all others similarly situated overtime compensation for all

hours that Plaintiff and all others similarly situated worked in excess of forty (40) per

workweek as required by the FLSA and AMWA.

3. 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.

4. Plaintiff's claims under the AMWA form part of the same case or

controversy and arise out of the same facts as the FLSA claims alleged in this

Complaint.

5. This Court has supplemental jurisdiction over Plaintiff's AMWA claims

pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1367(a).

6. Defendant conducts business within the State of Arkansas, operating or

managing apartment complexes.

7. Venue lies properly within this Court under 28 U.S.C. § 1391(b)(1) and

(c)(2), because the State of Arkansas has personal jurisdiction over Defendant, and

Defendant therefore "resides" in Arkansas.

Defendant employed Plaintiff at a location within the Eastern District of

Arkansas.

8.

9. The acts alleged in this Complaint had their principal effect within the Eastern District of Arkansas, and venue is proper in this Court pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1391.

III. THE PARTIES

- 10. Plaintiff is an individual and a resident and domiciliary of the State of Arkansas.
- 11. Defendant is a foreign limited liability company whose registered agent for service of process for the State of Arkansas is THE CORPORATION COMPANY, 124 WEST CAPITOL AVENUE, SUITE 1900, LITTLE ROCK, ARKANSAS 72201.
- 12. Defendant is a multi-family property management company headquartered in Atlanta, Georgia.

IV. FACTUAL ALLEGATIONS

- 13. Plaintiff repeats and re-alleges all previous paragraphs of this Complaint as though fully incorporated in this section.
- 14. Defendant has at least two employees that handle, sell, or otherwise work with goods or materials that have been moved in or produced for commerce.
- 15. Defendant's annual gross volume of sales or business done for each of the three years preceding the filing of the Original Complaint is not less than \$500,000.00.
- 16. Defendant has maintained more than four employees within the State of Arkansas at all times after three years preceding the Original Complaint.
- 17. Defendant operate in nine states, including Arkansas, Texas, Mississippi, Tennessee, Alabama, Georgia, Florida, South Carolina and Virginia.

18. Defendant employed Plaintiff as a leasing consultant at the McCain Park

Apartments, 3900 McCain Park Drive, North Little Rock, Arkansas 72116, from

approximately June of 2017 through October of 2017.

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

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

employer.

20. During the period relevant to this lawsuit, Defendant classified Plaintiff as

an hourly employee, non-exempt from the overtime requirements of the FLSA and the

AMWA.

21. Plaintiff worked more than forty hours per week in one or more weeks

during her tenure.

22. While Defendant employed Plaintiff as a leasing consultant, Defendant

paid Plaintiff non-discretionary monetary bonuses.

23. The bonuses Defendant paid to its Plaintiff were fixed amounts and were

based on Plaintiff's performance and ability to meet certain criteria set by Defendant.

24. Plaintiff worked as an hourly-paid leasing consultant and received non-

discretionary bonuses.

25. Defendant did not include Plaintiff's bonuses when calculating her regular

rates for overtime pay purposes.

26. Plaintiff worked more than forty hours in at least one week in which she

also earned a bonus, and her bonus was not included in the calculation of her overtime

pay rate.

Page 4 of 15
Bri'Yana Rumph, et al., v. Stonemark Management, LLC
U.S.D.C. (E.D. Ark.) Case No. 4:17-cv-____
Original Complaint—Class and Collective Action

27. Other hourly-paid employees also worked more than forty hours in at least

one week during the time period relevant to this Complaint in which they also earned a

bonus, and their bonuses were not included in the calculation of their overtime pay rate.

28. Defendant violated the FLSA and AMWA by not including the bonus of

Plaintiff into her regular rate when calculating her overtime pay.

V. FLSA § 216(b) COLLECTIVE ACTION ALLEGATIONS

29. Plaintiff repeats and re-alleges all previous paragraphs of this Complaint

as though fully incorporated in this section.

30. Plaintiff bring her claims 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).

31. At all relevant times, Defendant maintained one corporate office or

department responsible for developing or implementing Defendant's pay policies for all

of its locations, company-wide.

32. All leasing consultants who worked for Defendant were paid an hourly rate

and were eligible for non-discretionary monetary bonuses.

33. The bonuses Defendant paid to its leasing consultants were fixed amounts

and were based on the employee's performance and ability to meet certain criteria set

by Defendant.

34. At least some leasing consultants, other than Plaintiff, were paid an hourly

rate and were eligible for non-discretionary monetary bonuses.

35. At least some leasing consultants, other than Plaintiff, worked more than

forty hours per week during weeks in which they earned a bonus.

Page 5 of 15
Bri'Yana Rumph, et al., v. Stonemark Management, LLC
U.S.D.C. (E.D. Ark.) Case No. 4:17-cv-____
Original Complaint—Class and Collective Action

36. Defendant did not include leasing consultants' bonuses in the leasing

consultants' regular rate for purposes of calculating overtime pay.

37. All assistant managers who worked for Defendant were paid an hourly

rate and were eligible for non-discretionary monetary bonuses.

38. The bonuses Defendant paid to its assistant managers were fixed

amounts and were based on the employee's performance and ability to meet certain

criteria set by Defendant.

39. At least some assistant managers, other than Plaintiff, were paid an hourly

rate and were eligible for non-discretionary monetary bonuses.

40. At least some assistant managers, other than Plaintiff, worked more than

forty hours per week during weeks in which they earned a bonus.

41. Defendant did not include assistant managers' bonuses in the assistant

managers' regular rate for purposes of calculating overtime pay.

42. Other employees, other than leasing consultants and assistant managers,

were eligible for bonuses and were paid an hourly rate.

43. Other employees, other than leasing consultants and assistant managers,

who were eligible for bonuses and were paid an hourly rate, worked more than forty

hours per week in at least one workweek within the three years preceding the filing of

the Original Complaint.

44. Defendant did not include bonuses in other employees' regular rate for

purposes of calculating overtime pay.

45. Plaintiff proposes a collective class under the FLSA, which may be

preliminarily defined as follows:

Page 6 of 15
Bri'Yana Rumph, et al., v. Stonemark Management, LLC
U.S.D.C. (E.D. Ark.) Case No. 4:17-cv-____

Each hourly-paid employee who worked for Defendant within three years preceding the filing of the Original Complaint, and to whom Defendant paid a bonus pursuant to any bonus plan in at least one week in which the employee worked more than forty hours per week.

- 46. The relevant time period dates back three years from the date on which the Original Complaint was filed herein and continues forward through the date of judgment pursuant to 29 U.S.C. § 255(a).
- 47. The members of the proposed Bonus FLSA Class are similarly situated in that they share these traits:
- A. They were classified by Defendant as non-exempt from the minimum wage and overtime requirements of the FLSA;
- B. They were subject to Defendant's common policy of failing to include nondiscretionary bonuses in their regular rate of pay when calculating overtime pay;
- C. They were subject to Defendant's common policy of excluding bonuses when calculating hourly workers' overtime rates;
- 48. Plaintiff is unable to state the exact number of potential members of the Bonus FLSA Class but believes that the class exceeds one hundred (100) persons.
- 49. Defendant can readily identify the members of the Section 16(b) class, which encompass all hourly-plus-bonus employees at Defendant's locations.

VI. AMWA RULE 23 CLASS ACTION ALLEGATIONS

- 50. Plaintiff repeats and re-alleges all previous paragraphs of this Complaint as though fully incorporated in this section.
- 51. Plaintiff, individually and on behalf of all others similarly situated who were employed by Defendant within the State of Arkansas, bring this claim for relief for

violation of the AMWA as a class action pursuant to Rule 23 of the Federal Rules of

Civil Procedure.

52. Plaintiff proposes a collective class under the FLSA, which may be

preliminarily defined as follows:

Each hourly-paid employee who worked for Defendant in the State of

Arkansas within three years preceding the filing of the Original Complaint, and to whom Defendant paid a bonus pursuant to any bonus plan in at

least one week in which the employee worked more than forty hours per

week.

53. Upon information and belief, Defendant has employed more than forty (40)

hourly employees that also earn or earned bonuses within Arkansas. Therefore, the

proposed Bonus AMWA Class is so numerous that joinder of all members is

impracticable.

54. Common questions of law and fact relate to all of the proposed Bonus

AMWA Class members, such as:

A. Whether Defendant failed to include non-discretionary bonuses in class

members' regular rate of pay when calculating class members' overtime pay; and

B. Whether Defendant paid the members of the proposed class one and one-

half times their regular wages for hours worked over forty (40) in each week in

accordance with the AMWA.

55. The above common questions of law and fact for the class predominate

over any questions affecting only the individual named Plaintiff, and a class action is

superior to other available methods for fairly and efficiently adjudicating the claims of

the members of the AMWA Class.

Page 8 of 15 Bri'Yana Rumph, et al., v. Stonemark Management, LLC U.S.D.C. (E.D. Ark.) Case No. 4:17-cv-___ 56. 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 as a class. 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. To that end, all non-exempt employees must be paid for time worked over forty

(40) hours per week at a rate of one and one-half times their regular rate. Ark. Code

Ann. § 11-4-211.

57. At the time of the filing of this Complaint, neither Plaintiff nor Plaintiff's

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

concerning the allegations in this Complaint.

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

Plaintiff and all proposed Rule 23 class members work or worked within Arkansas.

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

action.

60. The claims of Plaintiff are typical of the claims of the proposed Bonus

AMWA class in that Plaintiff worked as an hourly-paid employee who also received

bonuses from Defendant and experienced the same violations of the AMWA that all

other class members suffered.

61. Plaintiff and their counsel will fairly and adequately protect the interests of

the class.

Page 9 of 15
Bri'Yana Rumph, et al., v. Stonemark Management, LLC
U.S.D.C. (E.D. Ark.) Case No. 4:17-cv-___
Original Complaint—Class and Collective Action

62. Plaintiff's attorneys are competent to litigate Rule 23 class actions and

other 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.

63. Prosecution of separate actions by individual members of the proposed

class would create the risk of inconsistent or varying adjudications with respect to

individual members of the proposed class that would establish incompatible standards

of conduct for Defendant.

VII. FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION

(Individual Claim for Violation of the FLSA)

64. Plaintiff repeats and re-alleges all previous paragraphs of this Complaint

as though fully incorporated in this section.

65. Plaintiff asserts this claim for damages and declaratory relief pursuant to

the FLSA, 29 U.S.C. § 201, et seq.

66. At all relevant times, Defendant was Plaintiff's "employer" within the

meaning of the FLSA, 29 U.S.C. § 203.

67. 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.

68. 29 U.S.C. §§ 206 and 207 requires any enterprise engaged in commerce

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

and to pay time and a half of regular wages 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.

Page 10 of 15 Bri'Yana Rumph, et al., v. Stonemark Management, LLC U.S.D.C. (E.D. Ark.) Case No. 4:17-cv-___ 69. Despite the entitlement of Plaintiff to minimum wage and overtime

payments under the FLSA, Defendant failed to pay Plaintiff an overtime rate of one and

one-half times her regular rate of pay for all hours worked over forty (40) in each one-

week period.

70. Defendant's failure to properly pay overtime wages to Plaintiff stems from

Defendant's failing to include bonuses paid to Plaintiff when calculating overtime wages.

71. Defendant's failure to pay Plaintiff all overtime wages owed was willful,

and Defendant knew, or showed reckless disregard for whether, the way it paid

Plaintiffs violated the FLSA.

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

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

attorneys' fees, for all violations that occurred within the three (3) years prior to the filing

of this Complaint.

VIII. SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION

(Individual Claim for Violation of the AMWA)

73. Plaintiff repeats and re-alleges all previous paragraphs of this Complaint

as though fully incorporated in this section.

74. Plaintiff asserts this claim for damages and declaratory relief pursuant to

the AMWA, Arkansas Code Annotated §§ 11-4-201 et seg.

75. At all relevant times, Defendant was Plaintiff's "employer" within the

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

76. Arkansas Code Annotated §§ 11-4-210 and 211 requires employers to

pay all employees a minimum wage for all hours worked up to forty in one week and to

Page 11 of 15
Bri'Yana Rumph, et al., v. Stonemark Management, LLC
U.S.D.C. (E.D. Ark.) Case No. 4:17-cv-___
Original Complaint—Class and Collective Action

pay one and one-half times regular wages for all hours worked over forty hours in a

week, unless an employee meets the exemption requirements of 29 U.S.C. § 213 and

accompanying Department of Labor regulations.

77. Despite the entitlement of Plaintiff to minimum wage and overtime

payments under the AMWA, Defendant failed to pay Plaintiff an overtime rate of one

and one-half times her regular rate of pay for all hours worked over forty (40) in each

one-week period.

78. Defendant's failure to properly pay overtime wages to Plaintiff stems from

Defendant's failing to include bonuses paid to Plaintiff when calculating overtime wages.

79. Defendant's failure to pay Plaintiff all overtime wages owed was willful,

and Defendant knew, or showed reckless disregard for whether, the way it paid Plaintiff

violated the AMWA.

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

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

attorneys' fees, for all violations that occurred within the three (3) years prior to the filing

of this Complaint pursuant to Arkansas Code Annotated § 11-4-218.

IX. THIRD CAUSE OF ACTION

(Collective Action Claim for Violation of the FLSA)

81. Plaintiff repeats and re-alleges all previous paragraphs of this Complaint

as though fully incorporated in this section.

82. Plaintiff, individually and on behalf of all others similarly situated, assert

this claim for damages and declaratory relief pursuant to the FLSA, 29 U.S.C. § 201, et

seq.

Page 12 of 15
Bri'Yana Rumph, et al., v. Stonemark Management, LLC
U.S.D.C. (E.D. Ark.) Case No. 4:17-cv-___
Original Complaint—Class and Collective Action

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

"employer" of Plaintiff and all those similarly situated within the meaning of the FLSA, 29

U.S.C. § 203.

84. Defendant classified Plaintiff and all similarly situated members of the

Bonus FLSA Class as non-exempt from the overtime requirements of the FLSA and

paid them non-discretionary bonuses.

85. Despite the entitlement of Plaintiff and those similarly situated to minimum

wage and overtime payments under the FLSA, Defendant failed to pay Plaintiff and all

those similarly situated members of the Bonus FLSA Class an overtime rate of one and

one-half times their regular rates of pay for all hours worked over forty (40) in each one-

week period.

86. Defendant's failure to pay Plaintiff and members of the FLSA Class all

overtime wages owed was willful, and Defendant knew, or showed reckless disregard

for whether, the way it paid Plaintiff and members of the FLSA Class violated the FLSA.

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

Plaintiff and members of the FLSA Class for monetary damages, liquidated damages,

and costs, including reasonable attorneys' fees, for all violations that occurred within the

three (3) years prior to the filing of this Complaint.

X. FOURTH CAUSE OF ACTION

(Class Action Claim for Violation of the AMWA)

88. Plaintiff repeats and re-alleges all previous paragraphs of this Complaint

as though fully incorporated in this section.

89. Plaintiff, individually and on behalf of the members of the proposed AMWA

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

Arkansas Code Annotated §§ 11-4-201 et seq.

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

"employer" of Plaintiff and the members of the proposed AMWA class within the

meaning of the AMWA, Arkansas Code Annotated § 11-4-203(4).

91. Despite the entitlement of Plaintiff and the members of the proposed

Bonus AMWA Class to minimum wage and overtime payments under the AMWA,

Defendant failed to pay Plaintiff and the members of the proposed class an overtime

rate of one and one-half times their regular rates of pay for all hours worked over forty

(40) in each one-week period.

92. Defendant's failure to pay Plaintiff and members of the AMWA Class all

overtime wages owed was willful, and Defendant knew, or showed reckless disregard

for whether, the way it paid Plaintiff and members of the AMWA Class violated the

AMWA.

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

Plaintiff and all members of the proposed AMWA Class for monetary damages,

liquidated damages, and costs, including reasonable attorneys' fees, for all violations

that occurred within the three (3) years prior to the filing of this Complaint.

XI. PRAYER FOR RELIEF

WHEREFORE, premises considered, Plaintiff Bri'Yana Rumph, individually and

on behalf of all others similarly situated and the members of the proposed Section 216

and Rule 23 classes, respectfully pray as follows:

Page 14 of 15
Bri'Yana Rumph, et al., v. Stonemark Management, LLC
U.S.D.C. (E.D. Ark.) Case No. 4:17-cv-____

A. That Defendant Stonemark Management, LLC, be summoned to appear and answer this Complaint;

B. For orders regarding certification of and notice to the proposed collective

and class members;

C. For an order of this Honorable Court entering judgment in their favor

against Defendant for their actual economic damages in an amount to be determined at

trial;

D. For liquidated damages as provided for under the FLSA and the AMWA;

E. For their attorneys' fees, costs, and pre-judgment interest; and

F. For such other and further relief as this Court deems necessary, just and

proper.

Respectfully submitted,

BRI'YANA RUMPH, 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

By:

and

∕Joshua West

Ark. Bar No. 2012121 west@sanfordlawfirm.com

Josh Sanford

Ark. Bar No. 2001037

josh@sanfordlawfirm.com

Is 44 (Rev. 06/17)

CIVIL COVER SHEET 4:17-cv-740-BSM

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)

purpose of initiating the civil de	ocket sneet. (SEE INSTRUC	HONS ON NEXT PAGE O	ir ihis fo	JKM.)					
L (a) PLAINTIFFS Bri Yana Rumph, Individually and on Behalf of All Others Similarly Situated				DEFENDANTS Stonemark Management, LLC					
(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, Josh Sanford; Sanford Lattle Rock, AR 722	aw Firm, PLLC; 650 S	. Shackleford Rd., S		Attorneys (If Known)					
II. BASIS OF JURISDI	ICTION (Place an "X" in O	ne Box Only)		TIZENSHIP OF P	RINCIPA	L PARTIES			
☐ 1 U.S. Government				(For Diversity Cases Only)	TF DEF		and One Box fo	or Defende PTF	ant) DEF
Plaintiff	`		Citiz	en of This State				1 4	
2 U.S. Government Defendant	☐ 4 Diversity (Indicate Citizensh	☐ 4 Diversity (Indicate Citizenship of Parties in Item III)		Citizen of Another State					
IV. NATURE OF SUIT	P			en or Subject of a reign Country		Foreign Nation	22 1 2 1 2	□ 6 · ·	□ 6
IV. NATURE OF SUIT		orts	Fr	ORFEITURE/PENALTY		nere for: Nature o		STATUT	
☐ 110 Insurance ☐ 120 Marine ☐ 130 Miller Act ☐ 140 Negotiable Instrument	PERSONAL INJURY 310 Airplane 315 Airplane Product Liability	PERSONAL INJUR 365 Personal Injury - Product Liability 367 Health Care/	Y 🗆 62			□ 422 Appeal 28 USC 158 □ 423 Withdrawal 28 USC 157 PROPERTY RIGHTS □ 820 Copyrights □ 830 Patent □ 835 Patent - Abbreviated New Drug Application □ 840 Trademark		□ 375 False Claims Act □ 376 Qui Tam (31 USC 3729(a)) □ 400 State Reapportionment	
☐ 150 Recovery of Overpayment & Enforcement of Judgment ☐ 151 Medicare Act ☐ 152 Recovery of Defaulted Student Loans	☐ 320 Assault, Libel &	Pharmaceutical Personal Injury Product Liability 368 Asbestos Personal Injury Product	1					☐ 410 Antitrust ☐ 430 Banks and Banking ☐ 450 Commerce ☐ 460 Deportation ☐ 470 Racketeer Influenced and Corrupt Organizations	
(Excludes Veterans) ☐ 153 Recovery of Overpayment	Liability	Liability PERSONAL PROPEI	RTY	LABOR		SECURITY	□ 480 Consum		ions
of Veteran's Benefits 160 Stockholders' Suits 190 Other Contract 195 Contract Product Liability 196 Franchise	☐ 350 Motor Vehicle ☐ 355 Motor Vehicle Product Liability ☐ 360 Other Personal Injury ☐ 362 Personal Injury -	☐ 370 Other Fraud ☐ 371 Truth in Lending ☐ 380 Other Personal Property Damage ☐ 385 Property Damage Product Liability	O 72	10 Fair Labor Standards Act 20 Labor/Management Relations 40 Railway Labor Act 51 Family and Medical	☐ 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 A gricultural Acts □ 893 Environmental Matters		
DELL PROPERTY	Medical Malpractice	<u> </u>		Leave Act			☐ 895 Freedom		
REAL PROPERTY 210 Land Condemnation 220 Foreclosure 230 Rent Lease & Ejectment 240 Torts to Land 245 Tort Product Liability	CIVIL RIGHTS 440 Other Civil Rights 441 Voting 442 Employment 443 Housing/ Accommodations	PRISONER PETITIO Habeas Corpus: 463 Alien Detainee 510 Motions to Vacate Sentence 530 General	- 79	90 Other Labor Litigation 91 Employee Retirement Income Security Act	FEDERAL TAX SUITS 870 Taxes (U.S. Plaintiff or Defendant) 871 IRS—Third Party 26 USC 7609		Act 896 Arbitration 899 Administrative Procedure Act/Review or Appeal of Agency Decision 950 Constitutionality of State Statutes		
☐ 290 All Other Real Property	□ 445 Amer. w/Disabilities - Employment □ 446 Amer. w/Disabilities - Other □ 448 Education	146 Amer. w/Disabilities -		IMMIGRATION 52 Naturalization Application 55 Other Immigration Actions					
		Remanded from Appellate Court	☐ 4 Rein Reo		r District	☐ 6 Multidistr Litigation Transfer		Multidis Litigatio Direct Fi	on -
VI. CAUSE OF ACTIO	20115 (2012)	seq.	re filing (Do not cite jurisdictional stat	tutes unless div	ersity):			
VII. REQUESTED IN COMPLAINT: CHECK IF THIS IS A CLASS ACTION UNDER RULE 23, F.R.Cv.P.			N D	DEMAND \$ CHECK YES only if demanded in complaint: JURY DEMAND: Yes X No					
VIII. RELATED CASI	E(S) (See instructions):	JUDGE			DOCKE	NUMBER			
DATE 11/09/2017	M	SIGNATURE OF AT	TORNEY	OF RECORD					
FOR OFFICE USE ONLY									
RECEIPT # AI	MOUNT	APPLYING IFP		JUDGE		MAG. JUD	GE		

ClassAction.org

This complaint is part of ClassAction.org's searchable class action lawsuit database and can be found in this post: <u>Employee Claims Stonemark Management Miscalculated Hourly Overtime Rates</u>