### UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT DISTRICT OF NORTH DAKOTA WESTERN DIVISION

BRANDON WOODS, on Behalf of	§	
Himself and on Behalf of All Others	§	
Similarly Situated,	§	
	§	
Plaintiff,	§	
	§	CIVIL ACTION NO. :
V.	§	JURY TRIAL DEMANDED
	§	
FIRST CHOICE ENERGY SERVICES	§	
LLC,	§	
	§	
Defendant.	§	

# PLAINTIFF'S ORIGINAL COMPLAINT COLLECTIVE ACTION, CLASS ACTION & JURY DEMAND

- 1. Defendant First Choice Energy Services LLC ("Defendant") required Plaintiff Brandon Woods ("Plaintiff") to work more than forty hours in a workweek without paying the legally required amount of overtime compensation. Defendant underpaid Plaintiff, and other similarly situated workers, overtime under the Fair Labor Standards Act ("FLSA"), 29 U.S.C. § 201, et seq.
- 2. Defendant's conduct violates the FLSA, which requires non-exempt employees to be compensated for all hours in excess of forty in a workweek at one and one-half times their regular rates of pay. *See* 29 U.S.C. § 207(a). On behalf of himself and all other similarly situated employees, Plaintiff brings this action as a collective action under the FLSA, 29 U.S.C. § 216(b). Members of the collective action are referred to as the "FLSA Class Members."
- 3. Plaintiff worked for Defendant in North Dakota. Just as the under payment of overtime violates federal law, so too does it violate North Dakota state law. Accordingly, Plaintiff also brings claims arising under Title 34 of the North Dakota Century Code for Defendant's failure

to pay overtime. Plaintiff seeks to pursue these claims as a Rule 23 class action. Members of the Rule 23 class action are referred to as the "North Dakota Class Members."

#### **SUBJECT MATTER JURISDICTION AND VENUE**

- 4. This Court has jurisdiction over the subject matter of this action under 29 U.S.C. § 216(b) and 28 U.S.C. § 1331. This Court has supplemental jurisdiction over the state law claims pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1367 because those claims arise from a common nucleus of operative fact with the federal claims, namely the failure to pay overtime to non-exempt employees.
- 5. Venue is proper in this District because a Defendant does a significant portion of its business in this District and many of the wrongs herein alleged occurred in this District.
- 6. Plaintiff worked for Defendant throughout North Dakota and Defendant maintains an office in North Dakota.

#### PARTIES AND PERSONAL JURISDICTION

- 7. Plaintiff Brandon Woods is an individual residing in Harris County, Texas. Plaintiff's written consent to this action is attached hereto as Exhibit "A." Plaintiff performed work for Defendant within the last three years for which he did not receive the FLSA's required overtime.
- 8. The FLSA Class Members are all current and former flowback workers, and all employees in substantially similar positions, that worked at any time during the three-year period before the filing of this Complaint.
- 9. The North Dakota Class Members are current and former flowback that worked at any time during the two-year period before the filing of this action that were paid on an hourly basis by Defendant and who worked in North Dakota

2

10. Defendant First Choice Energy Services LLC is a limited liability company organized under the laws of Delaware. Defendant may be served process through its registered agent Registered Agent Solutions, Inc., 1709 North 19<sup>th</sup> Street Suite 3, Bismarck, ND 58501.

#### **COVERAGE**

- 11. At all material times, Defendant has been an employer within the meaning of 3(d) of the FLSA. 29 U.S.C. § 203(d).
- 12. At all material times, Defendant has been an enterprise within the meaning of 3(r) of the FLSA. 29 U.S.C. § 203(r).
- 13. At all material times, Defendant has been an enterprise or enterprise in commerce or in the production of goods for commerce within the meaning of 3(s)(1) of the FLSA because Defendant has had and continues to have employees engaged in commerce. 29 U.S.C. § 203(s)(1).
- 14. Furthermore, Defendant has an annual gross business volume of not less than \$500,000.
- 15. At all material times, Plaintiff and Class Members were employees who engaged in commerce or in the production of goods for commerce as required by 29 USC § 207.

#### **FACTS**

- 16. Defendant First Choice Energy Services LLC operates flowback equipment for the oil and gas industry.
  - 17. Defendant also offers production testing and flowback services.
  - 18. Defendant is headquartered in Minot, North Dakota.
- 19. Plaintiff worked for Defendant as flowback hand from approximately May of 2014 to March of 2015.

- 20. Defendant's flowback workers are responsible for performing manual labor at a well site, including such tasks as connecting equipment, hammering together pipe, testing the fluids returning from the well.
  - 21. Defendant pays its flowback workers an hourly rate.
- 22. However, Defendant does not pay its flowback workers for all the hours they worked.
- 23. Defendant requires its flowback workers to submit weekly timesheets that tabulate the number of hours worked per week.
- 24. When Defendant issues payment for those hours, it does not pay for every hour its employees report working. Instead, Defendant unilaterally deducts hours. Typically, Defendant deducted an hour each day.
- 25. Flowback workers like Plaintiff typically work well in excess of 40 hours per week. These workers commonly work seven days a week, twelve hours a day.
- 26. Because of the number of hours worked, the hours that Defendant fails to pay should have been paid at the FLSA's premium time and a half rate. For example, for a week when Plaintiff actually worked 84 hours but was only paid for 77 hours, he should have been paid for those additional seven hours at his time and a half overtime rate.
  - 27. Plaintiff was a non-exempt employee.
  - 28. Defendant's other hourly paid flowback workers are non-exempt employees.
- 29. The same conduct outlined above also violates North Dakota state law codified in the North Dakota Administrative Code § 46-02-07. Like its federal counterpart, North Dakota state law mandates overtime compensation must be paid at one and one-half times the employee's regular rate. The North Dakota Supreme Court recognizes a private action for the recovery of

4

unpaid wages under Title 34 of the Century Code. *Werlinger v. Champion Healthcare Corp.*, 598 N.W.2d 820 (ND 1999). By failing to pay its employees the proper amount of overtime, Defendant violated North Dakota state law.

#### COUNT ONE: VIOLATION OF 29 U.S.C. § 207

- 30. Plaintiff incorporates all allegations contained in the foregoing paragraphs.
- 31. Defendant's practice of failing to pay Plaintiff time-and-a-half for all hours worked in excess of forty (40) per workweek violates the FLSA. 29 U.S.C. § 207.
- 32. None of the exemptions provided by the FLSA regulating the duty of employers to pay overtime at a rate not less than one and one-half times the regular rate at which its employees are paid are applicable to Defendant, Plaintiff, or the FLSA Class Members.

#### **COLLECTIVE ACTION ALLEGATIONS**

- 33. Plaintiff incorporates by reference the allegations in the preceding paragraphs.
- 34. Plaintiff has actual knowledge that FLSA Class Members have also been denied overtime pay for hours worked over forty (40) hours in a workweek as a result of Defendant's failure to pay for all hours worked.
- 35. Plaintiff's knowledge is based on his personal work experience and through communications with other workers of Defendant. Plaintiff personally worked with other flowback workers under the same compensation structure at multiple job sites for Defendant.
- 36. Defendant has employed at least 15 other hourly paid flowback workers in the in the three years prior to the filing of this lawsuit.
- 37. Defendant has employed at least 25 other hourly paid flowback workers in the in the three years prior to the filing of this lawsuit.

5

- 38. Defendant has employed at least 50 other hourly paid flowback workers in the in the three years prior to the filing of this lawsuit.
- 39. Other workers similarly situated to the Plaintiff worked for Defendant throughout the United States, but were not paid overtime at the rate of one and one-half their regular rates of pay when those hours exceeded forty (40) hours in a workweek.
- 40. Although Defendant permitted and/or required FLSA Class Members to work in excess of forty (40) hours in a workweek, Defendant denied them full compensation for their hours worked over forty (40).
- 41. FLSA Class Members perform or have performed the same or similar work as Plaintiff and were not paid for all hours worked by Defendant.
- 42. Defendant shaved hours from FLSA Class Members' timesheets and did not pay for all hours worked.
  - 43. FLSA Class Members are not exempt from receiving overtime pay under the FLSA.
- 44. As such, FLSA Class Members are similar to Plaintiff in terms of relevant job duties, pay structure, and/or the denial of overtime pay.
- 45. Defendant's failure to pay overtime compensation at the rate required by the FLSA results from generally applicable policies or practices, and does not depend on the personal circumstances of any FLSA Class Member.
- 46. The experiences of Plaintiff, with respect to his pay, hours, and duties are typical of the experiences of the FLSA Class Members.
- 47. The specific job titles or precise job responsibilities of each FLSA Class Member does not prevent collective treatment.

- 48. All FLSA Class Members, irrespective of their particular job requirements, are entitled to overtime compensation for hours worked in excess of forty (40) in a workweek.
- 49. All FLSA Class Members, irrespective of their particular job requirements, are entitled to pay for all hours worked.
- 50. Although the exact amount of damages may vary among the FLSA Class Members, the damages for the FLSA Class Members can be easily calculated by a simple formula. The claims of all FLSA Class Members arise from a common nucleus of facts. Liability is based on a systematic course of wrongful conduct by Defendants that caused harm to all FLSA Class Members.
- 51. As such, the class of similarly situated Plaintiffs for the FLSA Class is properly defined as follows:

All current and former flowback workers, and all employees with substantially similar duties, who worked for Defendant at any time during the three-year period before the filing of this Complaint.

#### COUNT TWO: VIOLATION OF NORTH DAKOTA STATE LAW

- 52. Plaintiff and North Dakota Class Members incorporate all allegations contained in the foregoing paragraphs.
- 53. Defendant's practice of failing to pay overtime at one and one-half times Plaintiff's and the North Dakota Class Members' regular rates violates the Title 34 of the North Dakota Century Code and its implementing regulations.

### **RULE 23 CLASS ACTION ALLEGATIONS**

54. Plaintiff brings this action on his own behalf and as a representative party, pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 23(b). Plaintiff seeks class certification of the North Dakota state law claims with a class definition as follows:

All current and former hourly paid flowback workers paid by Defendant in the state of North Dakota at any time during the two-year period before the filing of this Complaint.

- 55. Defendant's policy of failing to pay the amount of overtime dictated by North Dakota state law affects members of the North Dakota Class in a substantially similar manner. Plaintiff and the North Dakota Class Members have claims based on the same legal and remedial theories. Plaintiff and the North Dakota Class Members have claims based on the same facts. Therefore, Plaintiff's claims are typical of the North Dakota Class Members' claims.
- 56. Although Plaintiff does not know the precise number of the members of the proposed class, there are more than 40 members. Further, the identity of the members of the class is readily discernible from Defendant's records.
- 57. There are questions of law and fact that are common to all members of the proposed class and those questions predominate over any question affecting only individual members of the class.
- 58. Plaintiff will fairly and adequately protect the interests of the proposed class in the prosecution of this action and in the administration of all matters relating to the claims stated herein. Plaintiff has no interests antagonistic to the members of the proposed class. Plaintiff is committed to the vigorous prosecution of this case as a class action and has retained counsel who are experienced in class action litigation in general and wage and hour litigation in particular.
- 59. The Class Action is a superior form to resolve the North Dakota state law claims because of the common nucleus of operative fact centered on the continued failure of Defendant to pay its employees according to the provisions of North Dakota state law because Defendant uniformly failed to pay those employees for all the hours they worked.

60. In this action, common issues will be the object of the majority of the efforts of the litigants and the Court. A class action is superior to other available methods for the fair and efficient adjudication of this controversy. A class action will also thwart unduly duplicative litigation resulting in inconsistent judgments pertaining to Defendant's policies.

#### **JURY DEMAND**

61. Plaintiff hereby demand trial by jury on all issues.

#### **PRAYER**

- 62. For these reasons, Plaintiff prays for:
  - a. An order designating the FLSA Class as a collective action and authorizing notice pursuant to 29 U.S.C. § 216(b) to all flowback testers and all similarly situated employees to permit them to join this action by filing a written notice of consent;
  - b. An order designating the North Dakota Class as a Rule 23 class action;
  - c. A judgment against Defendant awarding Plaintiff, the FLSA Class Members, and the North Dakota Class all their unpaid overtime compensation and liquidated damages;
  - d. An order awarding attorneys' fees and costs;
  - e. Such other and further relief as may be necessary and appropriate.

Respectfully submitted,

By: /s/ John Neuman
John Neuman
Sosa-Morris Neuman
Attorneys at Law
jneuman@smnlawfirm.com
Texas State Bar No. 24083560
5612 Chaucer Drive
Houston, Texas 77005
Telephone: (281) 885-8630

Telephone: (281) 885-8630 Facsimile: (281) 885-8813

LEAD ATTORNEY IN CHARGE FOR PLAINTIFF AND CLASS MEMBERS

## WAGE AND HOUR LITIGATION CONSENT FORM

Printed Name: Brandon L. Woods

- 1. I consent and agree to pursue my claims of unpaid overtime and/or minimum wage through the lawsuit filed against my employer by Sosa-Morris Neuman Attorneys at Law.
- I understand that this lawsuit is brought under the Fair Labor Standards Act and all applicable state laws. I
  hereby consent, agree and opt-in to become a plaintiff herein and be bound by any judgment by the Court or
  any settlement of this action.
- 3. I intend to pursue my claim individually, unless and until the court certifies this case as a collective or class action. I agree to serve as the class representative if the court approves. If someone else serves as the class representative, then I designate the class representatives as my agents to make decisions on my behalf concerning the litigation, the method and manner of conducting the litigation, the entering of an agreement with the plaintiffs' counsel concerning attorney's fees and costs, and all other matters pertaining to this lawsuit.
- 4. If my consent form is stricken or if I am for any reason not allowed to participate in this case, I authorize Plaintiffs' counsel to use this Consent Form to re-file my claims in a separate or related action against my employer.

Signature

The information provided below will not be filed with the court:

Date Signed 9-1-17

Exhibit A

JS 44 (Rev. 06/17)

# Case 1:17-cv-00222-DL $\leftarrow$ Cover SHEE Filed 10/17/17 Page 1 of 1

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 d	ocket sheet. (SEE INSTRUC	TIONS ON NEXT PAGE OF TH	HIS FORM.)	•			
I. (a) PLAINTIFFS			DEFENDANTS	DEFENDANTS			
Brandon Woods			First Choice Energy Services LLC				
(b) County of Residence of First Listed Plaintiff  (EXCEPT IN U.S. PLAINTIFF CASES)  (c) Attorneys (Firm Name, Address, and Telephone Number)			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.				
			Attorneys (If Known)				
Sosa-Morris Neuman Att TX 77005, 281-885-8630		haucer Drive, Houston	n,				
II. BASIS OF JURISD	ICTION (Place an "X" in O	ne Box Only)	I. CITIZENSHIP OF P (For Diversity Cases Only)	RINCIPAL PARTIES	(Place an "X" in One Box for Plaintif and One Box for Defendant)		
☐ 1 U.S. Government Plaintiff	✓ 3 Federal Question  (U.S. Government Not a Party)		P	<b>IF DEF</b> 1 □ 1 Incorporated <i>or</i> Pr of Business In □	PTF DEF rincipal Place		
☐ 2 U.S. Government Defendant	☐ 4 Diversity (Indicate Citizenshi	ip of Parties in Item III)	Citizen of Another State	2			
			Citizen or Subject of a Foreign Country	3 🗖 3 Foreign Nation	□ 6 □ 6		
IV. NATURE OF SUIT			EODEFITHDE/DENALTV		of Suit Code Descriptions. OTHER STATUTES		
□ 110 Insurance □ 120 Marine □ 130 Miller Act □ 140 Negotiable Instrument □ 150 Recovery of Overpayment	PERSONAL INJURY  310 Airplane  315 Airplane Product Liability  320 Assault, Libel &	PERSONAL INJURY  365 Personal Injury - Product Liability  367 Health Care/ Pharmaceutical Personal Injury Product Liability  368 Asbestos Personal Injury Product Liability  368 Asbestos Personal Injury Product Liability  PERSONAL PROPERTY  370 Other Fraud  371 Truth in Lending  380 Other Personal Property Damage Product Liability  PRISONER PETITIONS  Habeas Corpus:  463 Alien Detainee  510 Motions to Vacate Sentence  530 General  535 Death Penalty Other:  540 Mandamus & Other  550 Civil Rights  555 Prison Condition  560 Civil Detainee -	FORFEITURE/PENALTY  □ 625 Drug Related Seizure of Property 21 USC 881 □ 690 Other   LABOR  710 Fair Labor Standards Act □ 720 Labor/Management Relations □ 740 Railway Labor Act □ 751 Family and Medical Leave Act □ 790 Other Labor Litigation □ 791 Employee Retirement Income Security Act  IMMIGRATION □ 462 Naturalization Application □ 465 Other Immigration Actions	322 Appeal 28 USC 158   423 Withdrawal 28 USC 157   423 Withdrawal 28 USC 157   423 Withdrawal 28 USC 157   424 Withdrawal 28 USC 157   425 Withdrawal 28 USC 157   425 Withdrawal 28 USC 157   425 Withdrawal 28 USC 167   425 Withdrawal 28	□ 375 False Claims Act □ 376 Qui Tam (31 USC □ 3729(a)) □ 400 State Reapportionment □ 410 Antitrust □ 430 Banks and Banking □ 450 Commerce □ 460 Deportation □ 470 Racketeer Influenced and □ Corrupt Organizations □ 480 Consumer Credit □ 490 Cable/Sat TV □ 850 Securities/Commodities/ Exchange □ 890 Other Statutory Actions □ 891 Agricultural Acts □ 893 Environmental Matters □ 895 Freedom of Information Act □ 896 Arbitration □ 899 Administrative Procedure Act/Review or Appeal of Agency Decision □ 950 Constitutionality of State Statutes		
VI. CAUSE OF ACTIO	moved from 3  Cite the U.S. Civil Star  Fair Labor Standa  Brief description of ca  Failure to Pay Ov	Appellate Court tute under which you are fi ards Act, 29 U.S.C. 20 use: ertime	(specify, ling (Do not cite jurisdictional state	er District Litigation Transfer			
VII. REQUESTED IN COMPLAINT:							
VIII. RELATED CASS	E(S) (See instructions):	JUDGE		DOCKET NUMBER			
DATE 10/12/2017	SIGNATURE OF ATTORNEY OF RECORD /s/ John Neuman						
FOR OFFICE USE ONLY		73/ JOHN NEUMAN					
RECEIPT # Al	MOUNT	APPLYING IFP	JUDGE	MAG. JUI	OGE		

# **ClassAction.org**

This complaint is part of ClassAction.org's searchable class action lawsuit database and can be found in this post: First Choice Energy Services Owes Unpaid Overtime, Lawsuit Claims