Case 4:21-cv-00428-JM Document 1 Filed 05/18/21 Page 1 of 13

FILED
U. S. DISTRICT COURT
EASTERN DISTRICT ARKANSAS

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

MAY 1 8 2021

JAMES W. McCORMACK, CLERK By: DEP CLERK

JARED SANTIAGO, Individually and on Behalf of All Others Similarly Situated

PLAINTIFF

VS.

No. 4:21-cv- 428- JM

UNITED PARCEL SERVICE, INC.

ORIGINAL COMPLAINT—COLLECTIVE ACTION

COMES NOW Plaintiff Jared Santiago ("Plaintiff"), individually and on behalf of all others similarly situated, by and through his attorneys Colby Qualls and Josh Sanford of Sanford Law Firm, PLLC, and for his Original Complaint—Collective Action ("Complaint") against United Parcel Service, Inc. ("Defendant"), he does hereby state and allege as follows:

I. PRELIMINARY STATEMENTS

1. 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"), the Arkansas Minimum Wage Act, Ark. Code Ann. § 11-4-201, et seq. (the "AMWA"), and applicable administrative rules and regulations for declaratory judgment, monetary damages, liquidated damages, prejudgment interest, and costs, including reasonable attorneys' fees as a result of Defendant's failure to pay Plaintiff and all others similarly situated a proper overtime compensation for all hours that Plaintiff and all others similarly situated worked.

Page 1 of 12
Jared Santiago, et al. v. United Parcel Service, Inc.
U.S.D.C. (E.D. Ark.) Case No. 4:21-cv-___
Original Complaint—Collective Action

II. JURISDICTION AND VENUE

2. 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.

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

controversy and arise out of the same facts as her FLSA claims. Therefore, this Court

has supplemental jurisdiction over Plaintiff's AMWA claims pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §

1367(a).

4. Defendant conducts business within the State of Arkansas.

5. 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.

6. Plaintiff was employed by Defendant within the Central Division of the

Eastern District of Arkansas, and venue is proper in this Court pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §

1391.

III. THE PARTIES

7. Plaintiff is an individual and a resident of Saline County.

8. Defendant is a foreign, for-profit corporation.

9. Defendant's registered agent for service of process is Corporation Service

Company, 300 Spring Building, Suite 900, 300 South Spring Street, Little Rock,

Arkansas 72201.

10. Defendant, in the regular course of business, maintains a website at

https://www.ups.com/us/en/global.page? .

Page 2 of 12
Jared Santiago, et al. v. United Parcel Service, Inc.
U.S.D.C. (E.D. Ark.) Case No. 4:21-cv-__
Original Complaint—Collective Action

IV. FACTUAL ALLEGATIONS

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

as though fully incorporated in this section.

12. Defendant provides packaging and shipping services.

13. Defendant had the power to hire and fire Plaintiff, often supervised

Plaintiff's work and determined his work schedule, and made decisions regarding

Plaintiff's pay, or lack thereof.

14. Defendant has at least two employees that handle, sell, or otherwise work

on goods or materials that have been moved in or produced for commerce, such as

vehicles and machinery such as forklifts.

15. Defendant's annual gross volume of sales made or business done was not

less than \$500,000.00 (exclusive of excise taxes at the retail level that are separately

stated) during each of the three calendar years preceding the filing of this complaint.

16. Within the three years preceding the filing of this lawsuit, Defendant has

continuously employed at least four employees.

17. At all relevant times herein, Defendant was an "employer" of Plaintiff within

the meaning of the FLSA and the AMWA.

18. Plaintiff was employed by Defendant from June of 2013 until the present

as a Hub Operations Supervisor.

19. Defendant classified Plaintiff as a salaried employee, exempt from the

overtime requirements of the FLSA.

20. Defendant also employed other Hub Operations Supervisors.

Case 4:21-cv-00428-JM Document 1 Filed 05/18/21 Page 4 of 13

21. Defendant also classified other Hub Operations Supervisors as salaried

employees, exempt from the overtime requirements of the FLSA.

22. At all times material herein, Plaintiff has been entitled to the rights,

protections and benefits provided under the FLSA and the AMWA.

23. At all relevant times herein, Defendant directly hired Hub Operations

Supervisors to work at its jobsites, paid them wages and benefits, controlled their work

schedules, duties, protocols, applications, assignments and employment conditions,

and kept at least some records regarding their employment.

24. As a Hub Operations Supervisor, Plaintiff's duties consisted of unloading

and sorting packages, and facilitating the unloading and sorting of packages from

trucks.

25. Other Hub Operations Supervisors had similar duties to Plaintiff.

26. Plaintiff and other Hub Operations Supervisors did not hire or fire any

other employee.

27. Plaintiff and other Hub Operations Supervisors were not asked to provide

input as to which employees should be hired or fired.

28. Plaintiff and other Hub Operations Supervisors did not exercise discretion

or independent judgment as to matters of significance.

29. Plaintiff's and other Hub Operations Supervisors' primary duties were

repetitive, rote or mechanical tasks which were subject to close review and

management.

30. Plaintiff and other Hub Operations Supervisors sought input from their

supervisors in lieu of making significant decisions on their own.

Page 4 of 12
Jared Santiago, et al. v. United Parcel Service, Inc.
U.S.D.C. (E.D. Ark.) Case No. 4:21-cv-___
Original Complaint—Collective Action

Case 4:21-cv-00428-JM Document 1 Filed 05/18/21 Page 5 of 13

31. In carrying out their duties, Plaintiff and other Hub Operations Supervisors

followed the processes set by Defendant and others.

32. Plaintiff regularly worked over forty hours each week.

33. Plaintiff estimates he regularly worked approximately 55 to 60 hours per

week.

34. Specifically, Plaintiff's regular schedule required him to work from 3:00 pm

until 12:00 a.m. or later, Monday through Friday.

35. Upon information and belief, other Hub Operations Supervisors had

similar schedules and worked a similar number of hours to Plaintiff.

36. Plaintiff and other Hub Operations Supervisors performed their work on

Defendant's premises.

37. Defendant knew or should have known that Plaintiff and other Hub

Operations Supervisors were working hours in excess of forty each week.

38. Plaintiff was paid around \$67,000 annually.

39. Upon information and belief, other Hub Operations Supervisors were paid

a similar amount.

40. Plaintiff and other Hub Operations Supervisors were not paid overtime

wages for hours worked over forty per week.

41. At all relevant times herein, Defendant has deprived Plaintiff and other

salaried Hub Operations Supervisors of overtime compensation for all of the hours

worked over forty per week.

42. Upon information and belief, the pay practices that violate the FLSA

alleged herein were the same at all of Defendant's locations because the policy was a

Page 5 of 12
Jared Santiago, et al. v. United Parcel Service, Inc.
U.S.D.C. (E.D. Ark.) Case No. 4:21-cv-__
Original Complaint—Collective Action

centralized human resources policy implemented uniformly from the corporate

headquarters.

43. Defendant knew or showed reckless disregard for whether its actions

violated the FLSA.

V. REPRESENTATIVE ACTION ALLEGATIONS

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

as though fully incorporated in this section.

45. Plaintiff brings his 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), on behalf of all

persons who were, are, or will be employed by Defendant as similarly situated salaried

employees at any time within the applicable statute of limitations period, who are

entitled to payment of the following types of damages:

A. Minimum wages for all hours worked;

B. Overtime premiums for all hours worked in excess of forty per week;

C. Liquidated damages; and

D. The costs of this action, including attorney's fees.

46. Plaintiff proposes the following class under the FLSA:

All salaried Hub Operations Supervisors, and all salaried employees whose duties are similar to Hub Operations Supervisors,

who within the past three years.

47. In conformity with the requirements of FLSA Section 16(b), Plaintiff has

filed or will soon file written a Consent to Join this lawsuit.

48. The relevant time period dates back three years from the date on which

Plaintiff's Original Complaint—Collective Action was filed herein and continues forward

through the date of judgment pursuant to 29 U.S.C. § 255(a), except as set forth herein

below.

49. The proposed FLSA collective members are similarly situated in that they

share these traits:

A. They worked more than 40 hours in most or all weeks;

B. They had substantially similar job duties, requirements, and pay

provisions;

C. They were paid a salary;

D. They were misclassified by Defendant as exempt from the overtime

requirements of the FLSA; and

E. They were subject to Defendant's common policy of failing to pay overtime

wages for all hours worked over forty each week.

50. Plaintiff is unable to state the exact number of the collective but believes

that there are at least twenty other employees who worked as Hub Operations

Supervisors and were misclassified as salaried employees.

51. Defendant can readily identify the members of the Section 16(b) collective,

which encompasses all salaried Hub Operations Supervisors.

52. The names and physical and mailing addresses of the FLSA collective

action plaintiffs are available from Defendant, and a Court-approved Notice should be

provided to the FLSA collective action plaintiffs via first class mail and email to their last

known physical and electronic mailing addresses as soon as possible, together with

other documents and information descriptive of Plaintiff's FLSA claim.

Page 7 of 12
Jared Santiago, et al. v. United Parcel Service, Inc.
U.S.D.C. (E.D. Ark.) Case No. 4:21-cv-___
Original Complaint—Collective Action

VI. FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION (Individual Claim for Violation of the FLSA)

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

as though fully incorporated in this section.

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

the FLSA, 29 U.S.C. § 201, et seq.

55. At all times relevant to this Complaint, Defendant has been Plaintiff's

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

56. At all times relevant to this Complaint, Defendant has been, and continues

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

203.

57. 29 U.S.C. §§ 206 and 207 require any enterprise engaged in commerce to

pay all employees a minimum wage for all hours worked up to 40 each week and to pay

1.5x regular wages for all hours worked over 40 each week, unless an employee meets

certain exemption requirements of 29 U.S.C. § 213 and all accompanying Department

of Labor regulations.

58. At all times relevant times to this Complaint, Defendant misclassified

Plaintiff as exempt from the overtime requirements of the FLSA.

59. Despite the entitlement of Plaintiff to overtime payments under the FLSA,

Defendant failed to pay Plaintiff an overtime rate of 1.5x his regular rate of pay for all

hours worked over 40 each week.

60. Defendant failed to pay Plaintiff a lawful minimum wage for all hours

worked.

61. Defendant's failure to pay Plaintiff all wages owed was willful.

Page 8 of 12
Jared Santiago, et al. v. United Parcel Service, Inc.
U.S.D.C. (E.D. Ark.) Case No. 4:21-cv-__ Original Complaint—Collective Action Case 4:21-cv-00428-JM Document 1 Filed 05/18/21 Page 9 of 13

62. 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 years prior to the filing of

this Complaint.

VII. SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION (Collective Action Claim for Violation of the FLSA)

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

as though fully incorporated in this section.

64. Plaintiff, individually and on behalf of all others similarly situated, asserts

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

seq.

65. At all times relevant times to this Complaint, 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.

66. 29 U.S.C. §§ 206 and 207 require any enterprise engaged in commerce to

pay all employees a minimum wage for all hours worked up to 40 each week and to pay

1.5x regular wages for all hours worked over 40 each week, unless an employee meets

certain exemption requirements of 29 U.S.C. § 213 and all accompanying Department

of Labor regulations.

67. At all times relevant to this Complaint, Defendant misclassified Plaintiff

and all others similarly situated as exempt from the overtime requirements of the FLSA.

68. Despite the entitlement of Plaintiff and those similarly situated to overtime

payments under the FLSA, Defendant failed to pay Plaintiff and all those similarly

Page 9 of 12
Jared Santiago, et al. v. United Parcel Service, Inc.
U.S.D.C. (E.D. Ark.) Case No. 4:21-cv-___
Original Complaint—Collective Action

situated an overtime rate of 1.5x their regular rates of pay for all hours worked over 40

each week.

69. Defendant failed to pay Plaintiff and all other similarly situated employees

a lawful minimum wage for all hours worked.

70. Defendant's failure to pay Plaintiff and all others similarly situated all

wages owed was willful.

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

Plaintiff and all those similarly situated for monetary damages, liquidated damages, and

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

three years prior to the filing of this Complaint.

VIII. THIRD CAUSE OF ACTION (Individual Claim for Violation of the AMWA)

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

as though fully incorporated in this section.

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

the AMWA, Ark. Code Ann. § 11-4-201, et seq.

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

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

75. Sections 210 and 211 require employers to pay employees a minimum

wage for all hours worked up to 40 each week and to pay 1.5x regular wages for all

hours worked over 40 in a week unless an employee meets certain exemption

requirements of 29 U.S.C. § 213 and accompanying DOL regulations.

76. Despite the entitlement of Plaintiff to lawful overtime wages under the

AMWA, Defendant failed to pay Plaintiff lawful overtime wages for all hours worked over

forty each week.

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

intentional, unreasonable, arbitrary and in bad faith.

78. 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 years prior to the filing of

this Complaint, pursuant to Ark. Code Ann. § 11-4-218.

IX. PRAYER FOR RELIEF

WHEREFORE, premises considered, Plaintiff Jared Santiago, individually on

behalf of all others similarly situated, respectfully prays as follows:

A. That Defendant be summoned to appear and answer this Complaint;

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

the FLSA and its related regulations;

C. Certification of a collective under Section 216 of the FLSA of all individuals

similarly situated, as further defined in any motion for the same;

D. Judgment for damages for all unpaid overtime wage compensation owed

under the FLSA, the AMWA and their related regulations;

E. Judgment for liquidated damages pursuant to the FLSA, the AMWA and

their related regulations;

F. An order directing Defendant to pay Plaintiff and all others similarly

situated prejudgment interest, a reasonable attorney's fee and all costs connected with

this action; and

G. Such other and further relief as this Court may deem just and proper.

Page 11 of 12

Jared Santiago, et al. v. United Parcel Service, Inc.
U.S.D.C. (E.D. Ark.) Case No. 4:21-cv-___

Respectfully submitted,

JARED SANTIAGO, Individually and on Behalf of All Others Similarly Situated, PLAINTIFF

SANFORD LAW FIRM, PLLC Kirkpatrick Plaza 10800 Financial Centre Pkwy, Suite 510 Little Rock, Arkansas 72211

Telephone: (501) 221-0088 Facsimile: (888) 787-2040

Colby Qualls

Ark. Bar No. 2019246

colby@sanfordlawfirm.com

Jøsh Skanford

Ark. Bar No. 2001037 josh@sanfordlawfirm.com

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

JARED SANTIAGO, Individually and on Behalf of All Others Similarly Situated

PLAINTIFF

VS.

No. 4:21-cv-

UNITED PARCEL SERVICE, INC.

DEFENDANT

CONSENT TO JOIN COLLECTIVE ACTION

I was employed as a salaried worker for United Parcel Service, Inc., within the past three years. I understand this lawsuit is being brought under the Fair Labor Standards Act for <u>unpaid overtime wages</u>. 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.

JARED SANTIAGO

May 18, 2021

Josh Sanford, Esq.
SANFORD LAW FIRM, PLLC
Kirkpatrick Plaza
10800 Financial Centre Parkway, Suite 510
Little Rock, Arkansas 72211
Telephone: (501) 221-0088
Facsimile: (888) 787-2040
josh@sanfordlawfirm.com

IS 44 (Rev. 06/17)

CIVIL COVER SHEET 4:21-4-428-JM

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 do	ocket sheet. (SEE INSTRUC	CTIONS ON NEXT PAGE O	F THIS FO	PRM.)	. , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,	ca for the ase of	ine cicia of court for the	
I. (a) PLAINTIFFS				DEFENDANTS				
JARED SANTIAGO, Individually and on Behalf of All Others Similarly Situated				UNITED PARCEL SERVICE, INC.				
(b) County of Residence of First Listed Plaintiff Saline (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 Address and Telephone Number) Josh Sanford, SANFORD LAW FIRM, PLLC, Kirkpatrick Plaza,				Attorneys (If Known)				
10800 Financial Centre P		ttle Rock, Arkansas	72211					
501-221-0088; josh@san	tordiawtirm.com							
II. BASIS OF JURISDI	CTION (Place an "X" in (One Box Only)	III. CI	TIZENSHIP OF P	RINCIPAL	L PARTIES,	(Place an "X" in One Box for Plaintiff	
□ 1 U.S. Government	★ 3 Federal Question			(For Diversity Cases Only) PTF DEF and One Box for Defendant) PTF DEF				
Plaintiff	(U.S. Government)	Not a Party)	Citize			Incorporated or Pri		
						of Business In T	his State	
☐ 2 U.S. Government	☐ 4 Diversity		Citize	en of Another State	2 🗖 2	Incorporated and P		
Defendant	(Indicate Citizensh	ip of Parties in Item III)				of Business In A	Another State	
				en or Subject of a reign Country	3 🗖 3	Foreign Nation	6 6	
IV. NATURE OF SUIT	(Place an "X" in One Box O	nlv)	10.	icigii Counti y	Click h	ere for: Nature c	of Suit Code Descriptions.	
CONTRACT		ORTS	FC	DRFEITURE/PENALTY	BANK	KRUPTCY	OTHER STATUTES	
☐ 110 Insurance ☐ 120 Marine	PERSONAL INJURY 310 Airplane	PERSONAL INJUR 365 Personal Injury -	Y 🗇 62	5 Drug Related Seizure of Property 21 USC 881	☐ 422 Appeal ☐ 423 Withdr		375 False Claims Act	
☐ 130 Miller Act	☐ 315 Airplane Product	Product Liability	□ 69	0 Other	28 US		376 Qui Tam (31 USC 3729(a))	
☐ 140 Negotiable Instrument ☐ 150 Recovery of Overpayment	Liability ☐ 320 Assault, Libel &	☐ 367 Health Care/ Pharmaceutical			DDODED	TY RIGHTS	☐ 400 State Reapportionment ☐ 410 Antitrust	
& Enforcement of Judgment		Personal Injury	-		□ 820 Copyri		430 Banks and Banking	
☐ 151 Medicare Act ☐ 152 Recovery of Defaulted	☐ 330 Federal Employers' Liability	Product Liability 368 Asbestos Personal			830 Patent 835 Patent	- Abbreviated	☐ 450 Commerce ☐ 460 Deportation	
Student Loans	☐ 340 Marine	Injury Product			New D	rug Application	☐ 470 Racketeer Influenced and	
(Excludes Veterans) ☐ 153 Recovery of Overpayment	☐ 345 Marine Product Liability	Liability PERSONAL PROPER	, _{TV}	LABOR	SOCIAL S	nark SECURITY	Corrupt Organizations 480 Consumer Credit	
of Veteran's Benefits	☐ 350 Motor Vehicle	370 Other Fraud		0 Fair Labor Standards	□ 861 HIA (1	1395ff)	☐ 490 Cable/Sat TV	
☐ 160 Stockholders' Suits ☐ 190 Other Contract	☐ 355 Motor Vehicle Product Liability	☐ 371 Truth in Lending ☐ 380 Other Personal	I 72	Act 0 Labor/Management	☐ 862 Black I	Lung (923) /DIWW (405(g))	☐ 850 Securities/Commodities/ Exchange	
☐ 195 Contract Product Liability	☐ 360 Other Personal	Property Damage		Relations	☐ 864 SSID 1	Title XVI	☐ 890 Other Statutory Actions	
☐ 196 Franchise	Injury 362 Personal Injury -	☐ 385 Property Damage Product Liability		0 Railway Labor Act 1 Family and Medical	□ 865 RSI (4	05(g))	891 Agricultural Acts 893 Environmental Matters	
	Medical Malpractice			Leave Act	<u> </u>		☐ 895 Freedom of Information	
REAL PROPERTY 210 Land Condemnation	CIVIL RIGHTS 440 Other Civil Rights	PRISONER PETITION Habeas Corpus:	_	0 Other Labor Litigation 1 Employee Retirement		U.S. Plaintiff	Act 896 Arbitration	
☐ 220 Foreclosure	☐ 441 Voting	☐ 463 Alien Detainee		Income Security Act	or Def	endant)	☐ 899 Administrative Procedure	
☐ 230 Rent Lease & Ejectment ☐ 240 Torts to Land	☐ 442 Employment ☐ 443 Housing/	510 Motions to Vacate Sentence	•		□ 871 IRS—7	Third Party C 7609	Act/Review or Appeal of Agency Decision	
☐ 245 Tort Product Liability	Accommodations	☐ 530 General			1		☐ 950 Constitutionality of	
☐ 290 All Other Real Property	 445 Amer. w/Disabilities - Employment 	535 Death Penalty Other:		IMMIGRATION 2 Naturalization Application			State Statutes	
	446 Amer. w/Disabilities -	☐ 540 Mandamus & Othe		5 Other Immigration	į			
	Other 448 Education	☐ 550 Civil Rights ☐ 555 Prison Condition		Actions				
	-	☐ 560 Civil Detainee - Conditions of	Į					
		Confinement						
V. ORIGIN (Place an "X" in	1 One Box Only)							
			J 4 Rein	, Transie		□ 6 Multidistri		
Proceeding State	te Court	Appellate Court	Reop	ened Anothe (specify)	r District	Litigation Transfer	- Litigation - Direct File	
			e filing (I	Oo not cite jurisdictional stat	tutes unless dive	ersity):		
VI. CAUSE OF ACTIO	N 29 U.S.C. § 201, of Brief description of ca			<u>-</u> .				
	Unpaid Wages	iuse.						
VII. REQUESTED IN		IS A CLASS ACTION	D	EMAND \$	СН	IECK YES only	if demanded in complaint:	
COMPLAINT:	UNDER RULE 2	3, F.R.Cv.P.			JU	RY DEMAND:	☐ Yes 🕱 No	
VIII. RELATED CASE								
IF ANY	(See instructions):	JUDGE			DOCKET	NUMBER		
DATE		SIGNATURE OF ATT	ORNEY C	F RECORD				
May 18, 2021								
FOR OFFICE USE ONLY		/) //						
RECEIPT # AM	MOUNT '	APPLYING IFP		IUDGE		MAG IIID	GE	

ClassAction.org

This complaint is part of ClassAction.org's searchable class action lawsuit database and can be found in this post: <u>UPS Owes Hub Operations Managers Overtime Pay, Lawsuit Alleges</u>