

1 Keith A. Custis (#218818)  
 2 kcustis@custislawpc.com  
 3 CUSTIS LAW, P.C.  
 4 1875 Century Park East, Suite 700  
 Los Angeles, California 90067  
 (213) 863-4276

5 Ashley Keller (*pro hac vice forthcoming*)  
 6 ack@kellerlenkner.com  
 7 Travis Lenkner (*pro hac vice forthcoming*)  
 8 tdl@kellerlenkner.com  
 Marquel Reddish (*pro hac vice forthcoming*)  
 9 mpr@kellerlenkner.com  
 10 KELLER LENKNER LLC  
 150 N. Riverside Plaza, Suite 4270  
 Chicago, Illinois 60606  
 (312) 741-5220

11 Warren Postman (*pro hac vice forthcoming*)  
 12 wdp@kellerlenkner.com  
 13 KELLER LENKNER LLC  
 1300 I Street, N.W., Suite 400E  
 Washington, D.C. 20005  
 (202) 749-8334

14  
 15 *Attorneys for Petitioners*

16 **UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**  
 17 **NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**  
 18 **SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION**

19	TERRELL ABERNATHY, et al.,	)	Case No. 3:19-cv-07545
20		)	
21	<i>Petitioners,</i>	)	<b>PETITION FOR ORDER</b>
22		)	<b>COMPELLING ARBITRATION</b>
23	vs.	)	
24	DOORDASH, INC.,	)	
25		)	
26	<i>Respondent.</i>	)	
27		)	
28		)	

1 Petitioners file this Petition for an Order compelling Respondent DoorDash, Inc. to  
2 arbitration as follows:

3 **NATURE OF THE PETITION**

4 1. Petitioners are 2,236 DoorDash couriers (“Dashers”) who are attempting to arbitrate  
5 individual claims against DoorDash for misclassifying them as independent contractors instead of  
6 employees. Petitioners contend that in misclassifying them, DoorDash has violated the Fair Labor  
7 Standards Act, 29 U.S.C. §§ 206, 207, and related California state and local laws.

8 2. In order to begin making deliveries for DoorDash, each Petitioner was required to  
9 sign a contract that contained a sweeping “Mutual Arbitration Provision.” No Petitioner recalls  
10 opting out of that arbitration provision.

11 3. The Mutual Arbitration Provision requires that the parties arbitrate any dispute  
12 regarding a Dasher’s classification as an independent contractor. The provision also requires that  
13 arbitration be administered by the American Arbitration Association (“AAA”) under AAA’s  
14 Commercial Rules. Those Rules, in turn, authorize AAA to require that each party pay filing fees  
15 before AAA will empanel an arbitrator and proceed with the parties’ arbitration. DoorDash’s  
16 arbitration provision expressly requires that DoorDash pay a portion of the fees and costs necessary  
17 to commence arbitration.

18 4. On August 26, 2019, in accordance with the parties’ agreement, counsel for  
19 Petitioners served an individual demand for arbitration on DoorDash and AAA on behalf of each  
20 Petitioner. Each Petitioner promptly satisfied his or her filing-fee obligation.

21 5. AAA determined that each Petitioner’s demand for arbitration met the requirements  
22 under AAA’s rules to proceed with arbitration. Thus, pursuant to its rules, AAA imposed successive  
23 deadlines of October 14, 2019, October 28, 2019, and November 7, 2019 for DoorDash to pay its  
24 share of the filing fees necessary to commence each Petitioner’s arbitration and empanel an  
25 arbitrator.

26 6. DoorDash refused to comply with AAA’s deadlines. It did not pay the filing fees  
27 necessary for a single Petitioner to proceed with arbitration.

28 7. On November 8, 2019, AAA terminated Petitioners’ arbitrations due to DoorDash’s

1 refusal to satisfy its filing fee obligations.

2 8. Petitioners have filed this Petition to require DoorDash to abide by the arbitration  
3 agreement it drafted.

4 **PARTIES**

5 9. Petitioners are Dashers who have made deliveries for DoorDash in California.  
6 Details for each Petitioner are listed in Exhibit A.

7 10. Respondent DoorDash, Inc. is a Delaware corporation headquartered at 901 Market  
8 Street, Sixth Floor, San Francisco, California 94103.

9 **JURISDICTION AND VENUE**

10 11. This Court has jurisdiction over this action pursuant to 9 U.S.C. § 4 and 28 U.S.C.  
11 §§ 1331 and 1367 because the underlying controversy involves claims arising under federal law.

12 12. This Court has personal jurisdiction over DoorDash because DoorDash has its  
13 headquarters and principal place of business in California.

14 13. Venue is proper in this district (San Francisco Division) pursuant to 9 U.S.C. § 4  
15 and 28 U.S.C. § 1391(b) because DoorDash is headquartered and conducts business in San  
16 Francisco County, and many of the acts and omissions complained of occurred in San Francisco  
17 County.

18 **INTRADISTRICT ASSIGNMENT**

19 14. This action is properly assigned to the San Francisco Division of this District,  
20 pursuant to Civil Local Rule 3-2(c) and (d), because a substantial part of the events or omissions  
21 that give rise to the claim occurred in San Francisco County, which is served by the San Francisco  
22 Division.

23 **BACKGROUND**

24 15. DoorDash is an on-demand delivery service through which customers may order  
25 food and other items from participating merchants for delivery. DoorDash pays Dashers to make  
26 those deliveries.

27 16. Petitioners are Dashers whom DoorDash has misclassified as independent  
28 contractors rather than employees, in violation of federal, state, and local law.

1           17. DoorDash executed an agreement with each Petitioner requiring that DoorDash and  
2 the Petitioner individually arbitrate any claim arising from the agreement, including a claim that  
3 the Petitioner has been misclassified. *See, e.g.*, Ex. B (DoorDash’s 2019 Independent Contractor  
4 Agreement). The agreement further requires that the arbitration be administered by AAA under its  
5 Commercial Arbitration Rules. *See id.*

6           18. Under the Commercial Rules, “[t]he arbitrator shall interpret and apply the[] rules  
7 insofar as they relate to the arbitrator’s powers and duties.” Commercial Rule 8. Where no  
8 arbitrator is yet available, or where a rule does not involve the “arbitrator’s powers and duties,” the  
9 rules “shall be interpreted and applied by the AAA.” *Id.*<sup>1</sup>

10           19. Commercial Rule 56 further authorizes AAA to “require the parties to deposit in  
11 advance of any hearings such sums of money as it deems necessary to cover the expense of the  
12 arbitration, including the arbitrator’s fee.” Commercial Rule 56.

13           20. The Commercial Rules also state that AAA’s Employment Fee Schedule applies  
14 where, as here, workers bring claims asserting that they were misclassified as independent  
15 contractors. *Id.* at 2 n.\*. And the Employment Fee Schedule states that “[t]he employer or  
16 company’s share of filing fees is due as soon as the employee or individual meets his or her filing  
17 requirements.” Employment Fee Schedule at 2.<sup>2</sup>

18           21. DoorDash has enforced its broad arbitration agreement to preclude couriers from  
19 filing misclassification claims against it in court. *See, e.g., Magana v. DoorDash, Inc.*, 343 F. Supp.  
20 3d 891 (N.D. Cal. 2018) (compelling a Dasher to arbitrate misclassification claims); *Mckay v.*  
21 *DoorDash, Inc.*, No. 19-cv-04289-MMC, 2019 WL 5536199 (N.D. Cal. Oct. 25, 2019) (same).

22           22. On August 26, 2019, in accordance with the parties’ agreement, counsel for  
23 Petitioners served an individual demand for arbitration on DoorDash and AAA on behalf of each  
24 Petitioner. Each Petitioner promptly satisfied his or her filing-fee obligation.

25           23. AAA then determined that each Petitioner’s arbitration demand satisfied AAA’s  
26 filing requirements.

27 <sup>1</sup> Available at [https://www.adr.org/sites/default/files/CommercialRules\\_Web\\_FINAL\\_1.pdf](https://www.adr.org/sites/default/files/CommercialRules_Web_FINAL_1.pdf).

28 <sup>2</sup> Available at [https://www.adr.org/sites/default/files/Employment\\_Fee\\_Schedule1Nov19.pdf](https://www.adr.org/sites/default/files/Employment_Fee_Schedule1Nov19.pdf).

1           24.     Applying its Commercial Rules and Employment Fee Schedule, AAA imposed a  
2 deadline of October 14, 2019 for DoorDash to pay the filing fees it owed for AAA to empanel  
3 arbitrators and proceed with Petitioners' arbitrations.

4           25.     DoorDash sought an extension of that deadline, which AAA granted, to October 28,  
5 2019.

6           26.     DoorDash did not pay the filing fees it owed on October 28 because, it argued, each  
7 Petitioner's demand was "insufficient to launch arbitration under the DoorDash Independent  
8 Contractor Agreement, as well as AAA's own rules."

9           27.     AAA rejected that argument and made "an administrative determination that the  
10 minimum filing requirements have been met by [Petitioners]." AAA thus set a final deadline of  
11 November 7, 2019 for DoorDash to pay the filing fees it owed.

12           28.     DoorDash refused to comply with that deadline. It did not pay the fees for an  
13 arbitrator to be empaneled for a single Petitioner's arbitration.

14           29.     On November 8, 2019, AAA "administratively closed" Petitioners' files because  
15 DoorDash "failed to submit the previously requested filing fees for [Petitioners'] individual  
16 matters."

### 17   CONCLUSION

18           30.     Each Petitioner and DoorDash entered into an agreement requiring them to arbitrate  
19 the issue of whether that Petitioner is an independent contractor or an employee.

20           31.     DoorDash breached that agreement because it refused to comply with AAA's  
21 administrative determinations regarding the filing fees it must pay under the agreement—fees AAA  
22 requires before it will empanel arbitrators and begin Petitioners' arbitrations.

23           32.     Until DoorDash complies with AAA's administrative determinations, Petitioners'  
24 arbitrations cannot commence. Petitioners are in limbo: Their arbitration agreements prevent them  
25 from bringing their claims in court, but DoorDash refuses to arbitrate their claims under the terms  
26 of the arbitration agreement.

27           33.     Accordingly, this Court should compel DoorDash to arbitrate under 9 U.S.C. § 4.  
28

# Explore Litigation Insights

Docket Alarm provides insights to develop a more informed litigation strategy and the peace of mind of knowing you're on top of things.

## Real-Time Litigation Alerts



Keep your litigation team up-to-date with **real-time alerts** and advanced team management tools built for the enterprise, all while greatly reducing PACER spend.

Our comprehensive service means we can handle Federal, State, and Administrative courts across the country.

## Advanced Docket Research



With over 230 million records, Docket Alarm's cloud-native docket research platform finds what other services can't. Coverage includes Federal, State, plus PTAB, TTAB, ITC and NLRB decisions, all in one place.

Identify arguments that have been successful in the past with full text, pinpoint searching. Link to case law cited within any court document via Fastcase.

## Analytics At Your Fingertips



Learn what happened the last time a particular judge, opposing counsel or company faced cases similar to yours.

Advanced out-of-the-box PTAB and TTAB analytics are always at your fingertips.

## API

Docket Alarm offers a powerful API (application programming interface) to developers that want to integrate case filings into their apps.

## LAW FIRMS

Build custom dashboards for your attorneys and clients with live data direct from the court.

Automate many repetitive legal tasks like conflict checks, document management, and marketing.

## FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS

Litigation and bankruptcy checks for companies and debtors.

## E-DISCOVERY AND LEGAL VENDORS

Sync your system to PACER to automate legal marketing.