UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT MIDDLE DISTRICT OF FLORIDA TAMPA DIVISION____

Case No. 8:17 cv 1753 T35 A EP

JOSE RAMIREZ, JOEL SANTANA and all those similarly situated,)
Plaintiff(s),))
v.)
STATEWIDE HARVESTING & HAULING, LLC)))
Defendant.))

COMPLAINT

Plaintiffs, JOSE RAMIREZ, JOEL SANTANA, and all those similarly situated, sue the Defendant, STATEWIDE HARVESTING & HAULING, LLC, and alleges:

- This is a collective action to recover money damages for unpaid overtime under the laws of the United States.
- 2. This Court has jurisdiction pursuant to the Fair Labor Standards Act, 29 U.S.C. § 201-219 (Section 216 for jurisdictional placement) ("the Act").
- 3. Plaintiff Ramirez is a resident of Polk County, Florida, within the jurisdiction of this Honorable Court. Plaintiff is a covered employee for purposes of the Act.
- 4. Plaintiff Santana is a resident of Polk County, Florida, within the jurisdiction of this Honorable Court. Plaintiff is a covered employee for purposes of the Act.
- 5. Corporate Defendant is a Florida Limited Liability Company, having its main place of business in Dundee, FL. At all times material Defendant was and is engaged in interstate commerce.

-44- 4400

COUNT I: OVERTIME WAGE AND HOUR VIOLATION BY CORPORATE DEFENDANT

- 6. Plaintiffs incorporate paragraphs 1-5 above.
- 7. This action is brought by Plaintiffs and those similarly situated to recover from unpaid overtime compensation, as well as an additional amount as liquidated damages, costs, and reasonable attorney's fees under the provisions of 29 U.S.C. § 201 et seq., and specifically under the provisions of 29 U.S.C. § 207. 29 U.S.C. § 207 (a)(1) states, "No employer shall employ any of his employees . . . for a work week longer than 40 hours unless such employee receives compensation for his employment in excess of the hours above-specified at a rate not less than one and a half times the regular rate at which he is employed."
- 8. Jurisdiction is conferred on this Court by Title 28 U.S.C. § 1337 and by Title 29 U.S.C. § 216(b). Corporate Defendant is and, at all times pertinent to this Complaint, was engaged in interstate commerce. At all times pertinent to this Complaint, Corporate Defendant operates as a limited liability company which sells and/or markets its services and/or goods to customers from throughout the United States and also provides its services for goods sold and transported from across state lines of other states, and Corporate Defendant obtains and solicits funds from non-Florida sources, accepts funds from non-Florida sources, uses telephonic transmissions going over state lines to do its business, transmits funds outside the State of Florida, and otherwise regularly engages in interstate commerce, particularly with respect to its employees. Upon information and belief, the annual gross revenue of Defendant was at all times material hereto in

- excess of \$500,000 per annum, and/or Plaintiffs, by virtue of working in interstate commerce, otherwise satisfies the Act's requirements.
- 9. By reason of the foregoing, Defendant is and was, during all times hereafter mentioned, an enterprise engaged in commerce or in the production of goods for commerce as defined in §§ 3 (r) and 3(s) of the Act, and/or Plaintiffs were engaged in interstate commerce for Defendant. Defendant's business activities involve those to which the Act applies. Defendant retrieves, packages and sends fruit from farms and, through its business activity, affects interstate commerce. Plaintiffs' work for Defendant likewise affects interstate commerce. Plaintiffs managed employees and drove employees to farms and to run errands for the workers.
- 10. Plaintiffs and those similarly situated were made to supervise other employees.

 These supervisors were made to drive workers around to the farms. Additionally, supervisors drove workers to and from their dormitories to do laundry, to buy food, and to buy personal supplies. These additional activities are in no way related to agriculture.
- 11. While employed by Defendant, Plaintiffs, and those similarly situated, worked an average of sixty (60) hours per week without being compensated at the rate of not less than one and one half times the regular rate at which they were employed.
- 12. Plaintiffs and those similarly situated were paid in relation to the amount of fruit collected from the farm. This rate was never adjusted to reflect overtime. No amount was paid for driving time to and from the employee dormitories.

- 13. Plaintiffs and those similarly situated seek to recover unpaid regular wages and unpaid overtime wages accumulated from the date of hire and/or from 3 (three) years from the date of the filing of this Complaint.
- 14. Prior to the completion of discovery and to the best of the knowledge of Plaintiffs, at the time of the filing of this Complaint, a good faith estimate of the *unpaid* overtime wages for each Plaintiff individually are as follows:
 - \$8.10 x 1.5 = \$12.15 overtime rate;
 - \$12.15 x 20 hours = \$243 per week;
 - \$243 per week x 156 weeks = owed overtime
 - \$37,908 x 2 liquidated damages = \$75,816 in total damages plus fees and costs for each Plaintiff
- 15. At all times material hereto, Defendant failed to comply with Title 29 U.S.C. §§ 201-219 and 29 C.F.R. § 516.2 and § 516.4 et seq. in that Plaintiffs and those similarly situated performed services and worked in excess of the maximum hours provided by the Act but no provision was made by Defendant to properly pay Plaintiffs and those similarly situated at the rate of time and one half for all hours worked in excess of forty hours (40) per workweek as provided in the Act.
- 16. Defendant knew and/or showed reckless disregard of the provisions of the Act concerning the payment of overtime wages and remains owing Plaintiffs and those similarly situated these overtime wages since the commencement of Plaintiffs' employment with Defendant as set forth above, and Plaintiffs are entitled to recover double damages. Defendant never posted any notice, as

- required by Federal Law, to inform employees of their federal rights to overtime and minimum wage payments.
- 17. Defendant willfully and intentionally refused to pay Plaintiffs and those similarly situated overtime wages as required by the laws of the United States as set forth above and remains owing Plaintiffs and those similarly situated these overtime wages since the commencement of their employment with Defendant as set forth above.
- 18. Plaintiffs have retained the law offices of the undersigned attorney to represent them in this action and are obligated to pay a reasonable attorneys' fee.

PRAYER FOR RELIEF

WHEREFORE, Plaintiffs and those similarly situated request that this Honorable Court:

- A. Enter judgment for Plaintiffs and any members of the prospective class against
 Defendant on the basis of Defendant's willful violations of the Fair Labor
 Standards Act, 29 U.S.C. § 201 et seq. and other Federal Regulations; and
- B. Award Plaintiffs and any members of the prospective class actual damages in the amount shown to be due for unpaid overtime compensation for hours worked in excess of forty weekly, with interest; and
- C. Award Plaintiffs and any members of the prospective class an equal amount in liquidated damages; and
- D. Award reasonable attorneys' fees and costs of suit; and
- E. Grant such other and further relief as this Court deems equitable and just and/or

available pursuant to Federal Law.

JURY DEMAND

Plaintiffs demands trial by jury of all issues so triable as of right.

Respectfully submitted on July 2, 2017 by:

/s/ R. Edward Rosenberg

R. Edward Rosenberg, Esquire

Fla. Bar No.: 88231

Email: rer@sorondorosenberg.com

Sorondo Rosenberg PA

1825 Ponce de Leon Blvd. #329

Coral Gables, FL 33134

786.708.7550

Attorney for Plaintiff

JS 44 (Rev. 06/17)

CIVIL COVER SHEET

The JS 44 civil cover sheet and the information contained herein neither replace nor supplement the filing and service of pleadings or other papers as required by law, except as provided by local rules of court. This form, approved by the Judicial Conference of the United States in September 1974, is required for the use of the Clerk of Court for the purpose of initiating the civil docket sheet. (SEE INSTRUCTIONS ON NEXT PAGE OF THIS FORM.)

purpose or initiating the civil to	ocket sneet. (See INSTRUCTIONS ON NEXT FAUE)	Or mare							
I. (a) PLAINTIFFS			DEFENDANTS						
Jose Ramirez, Joel Santana, and all those similarly situated			Statewide Harvesting & Hauling, LLC						
(b) County of Residence of First Listed Plaintiff (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 (Finn Name	Address, and Telephone Number)		Attorneys (If Known)						
	al, PA; 1825 Ponce de Leon Blvd. #329;								
II. BASIS OF JURISDICTION (Place an "X" in One Box Only)			ITIZENSHIP OF PI (For Diversity Cases Only)	RINCIPAL PA	ARTIES	Place an "X" in C and One Box for			
O 1 U.S. Government Plaintiff	3 Federal Question (U.S. Government Not a Party)	Citiz			porated <i>or</i> Prir Business In Th	ncipal Place	PTF O 4	DEF O 4	
2 U.S. Government Defendant	☐ 4 Diversity (Indicate Citizenship of Parties in Item III)	Citiz	ren of Another State 🛛	2 🗇 2 Incorp	porated <i>and</i> Pr Business In A		O 5	5	
			ten or Subject of a O preign Country	3 O 3 Forei	gn Nation	 	O 6	D 6	
IV. NATURE OF SUIT	(Place an "X" in One Box Only)		ORFEITURE/PENALTY	Click here f		Suit Code Des			
☐ 110 Insurance ☐ 120 Marine ☐ 130 Miller Act ☐ 140 Negotiable Instrument ☐ 150 Recovery of Overpayment	PERSONAL INJURY ☐ 310 Airplane ☐ 315 Airplane Product Liability ☐ 367 Health Care/ ☐ 320 Assault, Libel & Pharmaceutical	RY	25 Drug Related Seizure of Property 21 USC 881 90 Other LAROR 10 Fair Lubor Standards Act 20 Lubor/Management Relations 40 Ruilway Lubor Act 51 Family and Medical Leave Act 90 Other Labor Litigation 91 Employee Retirement	☐ 422 Appeal 28 U ☐ 423 Withdrawal 28 USC 157 FROFFRTY R ☐ 820 Copyrights ☐ 830 Patent ☐ 835 Patent - Abb New Drug A ☐ 840 Trademark ☐ 861 HIA (1395) ☐ 862 Black Lung ☐ 863 DIWC/DIW ☐ 864 SSID Title 2 ☐ 865 RSI (405(g)) FEDERAL TA	GHTS reviated pplication RITY) (923) W (405(g)) VI	375 False Cla 376 Qui Tam 3729(a)) 400 State Rea 410 Antitrust 430 Banks an 450 Commerc 460 Deportati 470 Racketes Corrupt C 480 Cansume 490 Cable/Sat 850 Securities Exchang 890 Other Sta 891 Agricultu 893 Environm 895 Freedom 895 Freedom 896 Arbitratio 896 Arbitratio	ims Act (31 USC apportion d Bankin ce ion r Influenc reganizati re Credit t TV s/Commo c tuttory Acts tental Mat of Inform	eed and ities/	
☐ 220 Foreclosure☐ 230 Rent Lease & Ejectment☐ 240 Torts to Land☐ 245 Tort Product Liability☐ 290 All Other Real Property	☐ 441 Voting ☐ 442 Employment ☐ 443 Housing/ Accommodations ☐ 445 Amer. w/Disabilities - Employment ☐ 446 Amer. w/Disabilities - Other ☐ 448 Education ☐ 463 Alien Detaince ☐ 510 Motions to Vaca Sentence ☐ 530 General ☐ 535 Death Penalty Other: ☐ 540 Mandamus & Ot ☐ 550 Civil Rights ☐ 555 Prison Condition ☐ 560 Civil Detaince - Conditions of Confinement	ite :	Incume Security Act INIMIGRATION 52 Naturalization Application 55 Other Immigration Actions	or Defendan 871 IRS—Third 26 USC 760	t) Party 9	D 899 Administrative Act/Regite Agency Discovering State Super Constitution State Super Constitution Constitu	rative Pro ew or App Decision	peal of	
	moved from 3 Remanded from the Court Appellate Court	<u> </u>	pened Another (specify)	r District	Multidistric Litigation - Transfer	اری ن	Multidis Litigatio Direct Fi	on -	
VI. CAUSE OF ACTIO	Cite the U.S. Civil Statute under which you a 29 USC 201 et seq Brief description of cause: Unpaid Overtime	are filing (1	Do not cite jurisdictional stati	utes unless diversity):		-			
VII. REQUESTED IN COMPLAINT:	CHECK IF THIS IS A CLASS ACTIO UNDER RULE 23, F.R.Cv.P.	N D	EMAND \$		YES only it DEMAND:	demanded in o	complais O No		
VIII. RELATED CASE IF ANY	C(S) (See instructions): JUDGE			DOCKET NUI	MBER				
DATE 7/17/17	SIGNATURE OF AT	TORNEY	Samuel Banuar						
POR OFFICE USE ONLY RECEIPT # AN	10UNT APPLYING IFP		JUDGE		MAG. JUDO	;E			