UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF MISSISSIPPI OXFORD DIVISION

CHRIS GILLAND, PAUL W. FERRELL, ANTHONY BUSE, BUCK FRANKS and TARVIS D. DAVIS,

Plaintiffs,

V.

 $^{Case\ No.}$ 3:18-CV-135-MPM-RP

CITY OF BALDWYN, MISSISSIPPI,

Defendant.

COMPLAINT UNDER THE FLSA

Plaintiffs Chris Gilland, Paul W. Ferrell, Anthony Buse, Buck Franks and Tarvis D. Davis bring this action against Defendant City of Baldwyn, Mississippi under the federal Fair Labor Standards Act, 29 U.S.C. § 201 *et seq.* ("FLSA") for failure to pay overtime compensation and state law claims for unjust enrichment.

I. JURISDICTION

- 1. This Court has original jurisdiction to hear this Complaint and to adjudicate the claims stated herein under 28 U.S.C. § 1331 and 29 U.S.C. § 216(b).
- 2. This Court has supplemental jurisdiction pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1367 over Plaintiffs' state law claims.

II. FACTS

A. Parties

3. Plaintiff Chris Gilland is an adult resident of Belden, Mississippi. During the applicable statutory period, Plaintiff Gilland worked for Defendant as a K9 handler, narcotic

investigator and patrol officer.

- 4. Plaintiff Paul W. Ferrell is an adult resident of Baldwyn, Mississipi. During the applicable statutory period, Plaintiff Ferrell worked for Defendant as a patrol officer.
- 5. Plaintiff Anthony Buse is an adult residen tof Baldwyn, Mississippi. During the applicable statutory period, Plaintiff Buse worked for Defendant as a patrol officer
- 6. Plaintiff Buck Franks is an adult resident of Baldwyn, Mississippi. During the applicable statutory period, Plaintiff Franks worked for Defendant as a patrol officer.
- 7. Plaintiff Tarvis D. Davis is an adult resident of Houston, Mississippi. During the applicable statutory period, Plaintiff Davis worked for Defendant as a patrol officer, corporal and sergeant.
- 8. Defendant City of Baldwyn, Mississippi is a municipality formed and oragnized under Mississippi law within Lee County, Mississippi and with parts of the municipality in Prentiss County, Mississippi. Mr. Michael James serves as the mayor of the City of Baldwyn, Mississippi.
- 9. Defendant City of Baldwyn, Mississippi is a public entity covered by the FLSA, 29 U.S.C. § 203(d), (x).
- 10. At all relevant times herein, Defendant City of Baldwyn, Mississippi was an "employer" of the Plaintiffs within the meaning of the FLSA, 29 U.S.C. § 203(d).

B. Factual Allegations

- 11. Defendant City of Baldwyn, Mississippi operates the Baldwyn Police Department, located at 920 N. 4th Street, Baldwyn, Mississippi 38824.
- 12. Plaintiff Gilland has been employed by Defendant since approximately April 23, 2015. He initially worked as a patrol officer. On or around 2016, he worked as a K9 handler and narcotic investigator. In 2017, Plaintiff Gilland began working as a K9 handler.

- 13. Plaintiff Gilland generally works, over the course of two (2) weeks, five (5) days during the first week and two (2) days during the second week. Throughout his employment, he has worked in excess of eighty-four (84) hours over a two (2) week period without receiving all of the straight time and overtime compensation for all hours worked. Throughout his employment, he was paid between \$14.01 and \$15.93 per hour.
- 14. Plaintiff Ferrell has been employed by Defendant since approximately September 2015. Plaintiff Ferrell worked from September 2015 to approximately April 2017 as a patrol officer. Plaintiff Ferrell began working for Defendant again in November 2017 as a patrol officer.
- 15. Plaintiff Ferrell generally works, over the course of two (2) weeks, five (5) days during the first week and two (2) days during the second week. Throughout his employment, he has worked in excess of eighty-four hours (84) over a two (2) week period without receiving all of the straight time and overtime compensation for all hours worked. Throughout his employment, he was paid \$14.01 per hour.
- 16. Plaintiff Buse has been employed by Defendant as a patrol officer since approximately 2011.
- 17. Plaintiff Buse generally works, over the course of two (2) weeks, five (5) days during the first week and two (2) days during the second week. Throughout his employment, he has worked in excess of eighty-four (84) hours over a two (2) week period without receiving all of the straight time and overtime compensation for all hours worked
- 18. Plaintiff Franks has been employed by Defendant since approximately August 2013. From approximately August 2013 to November 2016, he worked as a part time officer. Plaintiff Franks began working as a full-time officer on or around November 2016.
 - 19. Plaintiff Franks generally works, over the course of two (2) weeks, five (5) days

during the first week and two (2) days during the second week. Throughout his employment, he has worked in excess of eighty-four (84) hours over a two (2) week period without receiving all of the straight time and overtime compensation for all hours worked. Throughout his employment, he was paid between \$10.00 and \$14.01 per hour.

- 20. Plaintiff Davis has been employed by Defendant since approximately October 14, 2014. Plaintiff Davis began working as a patrol officer and was promoted to corporal in approximately 2016. On or around December 6, 2017, he began working as sergeant.
- 21. Plaintiff Davis generally works, over the course of two (2) weeks, five (5) days during the first week and two (2) days during the second week. Throughout his employment, he has worked in excess of eighty-four (84) hours over a two (2) week period without receiving all of the straight time and overtime compensation for all hours worked. Throughout his employment, he was paid between \$14.01 and \$15.23 per hour.
- 22. Plaintiffs utilize a time clock and handwritten "yellow sheet" logs to track all time worked.
- 23. Despite utilizing a time clock and handwritten logs, Defendant has historically only compensated Plaintiffs for eighty (80) hours of work over the course of a two (2) week period, despite Plaintiffs being scheduled for eighty-four (84) or more hours per pay period.
- 24. Despite maintaining time records, Defendant deducted and manipulated actual time worked from Plaintiffs' time cards and would not count time worked that was noted on the handwritten time logs in calculating Plaintiffs' weekly pay.
- 25. Defendant intentionally altered and manipulated time sheets and work records to reduce the total number of hours worked by the Plaintiffs during a two (2) week pay period.
 - 26. Defendant intentionally made deductions from Plaintiffs' pay and reduced

Plaintiffs' hourly rate if Plaintiffs worked less than eighty-four (84) hours over the course of two (2) weeks.

- 27. Plaintiffs frequently made complaints about not receiving straight time and overtime compensation to Defendant, yet Defendant continued its illegal pay and time-shaving practices.
- 28. To the extent Defendant claims its pay practices are valid, Defendant has failed to adopt and comply with a valid 207(k) overtime payment system pursuant to 29 U.S.C. § 207(k) and its implementing regulations.
- 29. The exact amount of damages sustained by the Plaintiffs is unknown and not capable of being ascertained with any certainty at this time. Plaintiffs will amend their complaint as necessary as discovery proceeds in this case.

III. CAUSES OF ACTION

Count 1: Unpaid Overtime Under the Fair Labor Standards Act, 29 U.S.C. § 201, et seq.

- 30. Plaintiffs hereby incorporate paragraphs 1-29, as if fully set forth herein.
- 31. The FLSA requires that covered employees, such as Plaintiffs, receive overtime compensation "not less than one and one-half times" their regular rate of pay for all hours worked over 40 in a workweek. See 29 U.S.C. § 207(a)(1).
- 32. During the applicable statutory period, Defendant suffered and permitted Plaintiffs to routinely work more than forty (40) hours per week without overtime compensation.
- 33. At all times during the applicable statutory period, Defendant was aware that Plaintiffs continued to work in excess of forty (40) hours per week on a regular basis because they were scheduled to work more than forty (40) hours per week and maintained records noting overtime worked.

- 34. As a result of its actions and the conduct described above, Defendant has violated the provisions of the FLSA, 29 U.S.C. §§ 201 *et seq.*, with respect to Plaintiffs. Thus, Plaintiffs suffered a loss of wages.
- 35. Additionally, Defendant was well aware that it was required to pay Plaintiffs overtime, evidenced by the fact that Defendant regularly scheduled Plaintiffs to work in excess of forty (40) hours per week.
- 36. The foregoing conduct on the part of Defendant constitute a willful violation of the FLSA within the meaning of 29 U.S.C. § 255(a) as Defendant knew or showed reckless disregard for the fact that its compensation practices were in violation of federal law.

Count 2: Breach of Contract Under Mississippi State Law

- 37. Plaintiffs hereby incorporate paragraphs 1-29, as if fully set forth herein.
- 38. Defendant contractually agreed to pay, and was required to pay, Plaintiffs for all hours worked. Plaintiffs worked hours for which they were not properly compensated, and Defendant has withheld wages, which in equity and good conscience belong to Plaintiffs.
- 39. Failing to pay all straight time and non-overtime hours to Plaintiffs has caused Plaintiffs to suffer financial harm. As a result, Plaintiffs have suffered a loss in pay.
- 40. Thus, Plaintiffs are entitled to "gap time" wages owed for all non-overtime hours worked.

Count 3: Quantum Meruit / Unjust Enrichment Under Mississippi State Law

- 41. Plaintiffs hereby incorporate paragraphs 1-29, as if fully set forth herein.
- 42. Under the doctrine of quantum meruit / unjust enrichment, Defendant contractually agreed to pay, and was required to pay, Plaintiffs for all hours worked. Plaintiffs rendered valuable services to Defendant by working hours for which they were not properly compensated, and

Defendant has withheld wages, which in equity and good conscience belong to Plaintiffs.

- 43. Failing to pay all straight time and non-overtime hours to Plaintiffs unjustly enriched Defendant at the expense of Plaintiffs and in violation of Mississippi law.
 - 44. As a result, Plaintiffs have suffered a loss in pay.
 - 45. Plaintiffs are entitled to "gap time" wages for non-overtime hours.

IV. PRAYER FOR RELIEF

WHEREFORE, Plaintiffs in this action demands:

- 1. Judgment against Defendant for an amount equal to unpaid back wages at the applicable overtime rates;
- 2. Judgment against Defendant that its violations of the FLSA were willful;
- 3. An equal amount to the overtime damages as liquidated damages as required by the FLSA;
- 4. Judgment against Defendant for an amount equal to Plaintiffs' unpaid straight time wages;
- 5. All recoverable costs, expenses, and attorney's fees incurred in prosecuting these claims;
- 5. Leave to add additional plaintiffs by motion, the filing of written consent forms, or any other method approved by the Court;
- 7. An order requiring Defendant to preserve all electronically stored information relevant to this lawsuit; and,
- 8. For all such further relief as the Court deems just and equitable.

Respectfully submitted,

/s/ William B. Ryan

William B. Ryan – MS Bar #99667 DONATI LAW, PLLC 1545 Union Avenue Memphis, TN 38104 Telephone: 901-278-1004

Fax: 901-278-3111

Email: billy@donatilaw.com

ATTORNEY FOR PLAINTIFFS

Dated: 6.13.2018

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 illitiating the civil do	Seket sheet. (SEE INSTRUCE)	HONS ON NEAT TAGE OF	11115110	KW.)						
L (a) PLAINTIFFS CHRIS GILLAND, PAUL W. FERRELL, ANTHONY BUSE, BUCK FRANKS and TARVIS D. DAVIS				DEFENDANTS CITY OF BALDWYN, MISSISSIPPI						
(b) County of Residence of First Listed Plaintiff				County of Residence of First Listed Defendant						
(EXCEPT IN U.S. PLAINTIFF CASES)				(IN U.S. PLAINTIFF CASES ONLY)						
(BICLI I II C.S. I EIII II I C.ISES)				NOTE: IN LAND CONDEMNATION CASES, USE THE LOCATION OF THE TRACT OF LAND INVOLVED.						
(c) Attorneys (Firm Name, 2) William B. Ryan, Donati I 38104, 901-278-1004	Address, and Telephone Number Law, PLLC, 1545 Unio	r) n Ave., Memphis, T	⁻N	Attorneys (If Known)						
II. BASIS OF JURISDI	CTION (Place an "X" in O	ne Box Only)		I TIZENSHIP OF P	RINCIPA	L PARTIES				
□ 1 U.S. Government 3 Federal Question				(For Diversity Cases Only)	TF DEF		and One Box for		nt) DEF	
Plaintiff	(U.S. Government Not a Party)		Citize	Citizen of This State PTF DEF Citizen of This State 1 1 1 Incorporated or Principal Place of Business In This State						
☐ 2 U.S. Government Defendant			Citizen of Another State						□ 5	
				Citizen or Subject of a					□ 6	
IV. NATURE OF SUIT	ATURE OF SUIT (Place an "X" in One Box Only)					Click here for: Nature of Suit Cod			le Descriptions.	
CONTRACT	ТО	RTS	FC	DRFEITURE/PENALTY	BAN	KRUPTCY	OTHER S	TATUTE	S	
□ 110 Insurance □ 120 Marine □ 130 Miller Act □ 140 Negotiable Instrument □ 150 Recovery of Overpayment & Enforcement of Judgment □ 151 Medicare Act □ 152 Recovery of Defaulted Student Loans (Excludes Veterans) □ 153 Recovery of Overpayment of Veteran's Benefits □ 160 Stockholders' Suits □ 190 Other Contract □ 195 Contract Product Liability □ 196 Franchise REAL PROPERTY □ 210 Land Condemnation □ 220 Foreclosure □ 230 Rent Lease & Ejectment □ 245 Tort Product Liability □ 290 All Other Real Property	PERSONAL INJURY □ 310 Airplane □ 315 Airplane Product Liability □ 320 Assault, Libel & Slander □ 330 Federal Employers' Liability □ 340 Marine □ 345 Marine Product Liability □ 350 Motor Vehicle □ 355 Motor Vehicle □ Product Liability □ 360 Other Personal Injury □ 362 Personal Injury Medical Malpractice CIVIL RIGHTS □ 440 Other Civil Rights □ 441 Voting □ 442 Employment □ 443 Housing/ Accommodations □ 445 Amer. w/Disabilities - Employment □ 446 Amer. w/Disabilities - Other □ 448 Education	PERSONAL INJURY 365 Personal Injury - Product Liability 367 Health Care/ Pharmaceutical Personal Injury Product Liability 368 Asbestos Personal Injury Product Liability PERSONAL PROPER 370 Other Fraud 371 Truth in Lending 380 Other Personal Property Damage Product Liability PRISONER PETITION Habeas Corpus: 463 Alien Detainee 510 Motions to Vacate Sentence 530 General 535 Death Penalty Other: 540 Mandamus & Othe 550 Civil Rights 555 Prison Condition 560 Civil Detainee - Conditions of	71	5 Drug Related Seizure of Property 21 USC 881 0 Other LABOR 0 Fair Labor Standards Act 0 Labor/Management Relations 0 Railway Labor Act 1 Family and Medical Leave Act 0 Other Labor Litigation 1 Employee Retirement Income Security Act IMMIGRATION 2 Naturalization Application 5 Other Immigration Actions	423 Withd 28 U PROPEF 820 Copy 830 Paten New 840 Trade 861 HIA (862 Black 863 DIW(864 SSID 865 RSI (870 Taxes or De 871 IRS—26 U	SC 157 RTY RIGHTS rights t t - Abbreviated Drug Application mark SECURITY (1395ff) t Lung (923) C/DIWW (405(g)) Title XVI 405(g)) SL TAX SUITS 6 (U.S. Plaintiff efendant)	□ 480 Consume: □ 490 Cable/Sat □ 850 Securities Exchang: □ 890 Other Sat □ 891 Agricultu □ 893 Environm □ 895 Freedom Act □ 896 Arbitratio □ 899 Administ	(31 USC) pportionm d Banking e on: Influence brganizatio r Credit TV //Commod-e tuttory Actiral Acts central Matte of Informa on rative Processor or Appelecision onality of	ed and ons lities/ cions ers ation	
V. ORIGIN (Place an "X" in	0 0 0 1	Confinement								
X 1 Original □ 2 Rea	moved from 3	Remanded from Appellate Court	J 4 Rein Reop	,	r District	☐ 6 Multidistri Litigation Transfer	- I	Multidisti Litigation Direct File	1 -	
VI CALICE OF A COM	29 USC 201		e filing (1	Oo not cite jurisdictional stat	tutes unless di	versity):				
VI. CAUSE OF ACTION	Brief description of ca	use: ire to pay overtime	and MS	state law claims						
VII. REQUESTED IN COMPLAINT: CHECK IF THIS IS A CLASS ACTION UNDER RULE 23, F.R.Cv.P.				DEMAND \$ CHECK YES only if demanded in complaint: JURY DEMAND: □ Yes ▼No						
VIII. RELATED CASI	E(S)									
IF ANY	(See instructions): JUDGE			DOCKET NUMBER						
DATE		SIGNATURE OF ATT		OF RECORD						
06/13/2018		/s/William B. Ry	yan							
FOR OFFICE USE ONLY	·				·			· <u></u>		

RECEIPT #1563984AMOUNT \$400 APPLYING IFP JUDGE MPM MAG. JUDGE DD