

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF NEW JERSEY

DAVID J. BAILEY
270 James Street
Mount Ephraim, NJ 08059

Plaintiff,
v.

AMAZON.COM, INC. *d/b/a*
AMAZON.COM
410 Terry Avenue North
Seattle, WA 98108
and
AMAZON.COM SERVICES, INC.
202 Westlake Ave. N
Seattle, WA 98108

Defendants.

CIVIL ACTION

DOCKET NO.:

JURY TRIAL DEMANDED

CIVIL ACTION COMPLAINT

David J. Bailey (*hereinafter* referred to as “Plaintiff,” unless indicated otherwise), by and through his undersigned counsel, hereby avers as follows:

INTRODUCTION

1. This action has been initiated by Plaintiff against Amazon.com, Inc. *d/b/a* Amazon.com and Amazon.com Services, Inc. (*hereinafter* collectively referred to as “Defendants”) for violations of the New Jersey Conscientious Employee Protection Act (“CEPA” – N.J.S.A. §§ 34:19-1, *et seq.*). Plaintiff asserts he was terminated from his employment with Defendants for retaliatory reasons. As a direct consequence of Defendants’ unlawful actions, Plaintiff seeks damages as set forth herein.

JURISDICTION AND VENUE

2. Plaintiff resides in and is a citizen of New Jersey.

3. Amazon.com, Inc. *d/b/a* Amazon and Amazon.com Services, Inc. are incorporated under the laws of Delaware with headquarters and/or principal places of business in Washington, rendering them citizens of Delaware and Washington.

4. The United States District Court for the District of New Jersey has original subject matter jurisdiction over this action pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1332 because there is complete diversity of citizenship, as Plaintiff is a citizen of New Jersey, Defendants are citizens of Seattle and Delaware, and the amount in controversy exceeds \$75,000.

5. This Court may properly maintain personal jurisdiction over Defendants because Defendants' contacts with this state and this judicial district are sufficient for the exercise of jurisdiction in order to comply with traditional notions of fair play and substantial justice, satisfying the standard set forth by the United States Supreme Court in *Int'l Shoe Co. v. Washington*, 326 U.S. 310 (1945), and its progeny.

6. Venue is properly laid in this District pursuant to 28 U.S.C. sections 1391(b)(1) and (b)(2), because Plaintiff worked for Defendants in New Jersey and *all actions underlying this case occurred in New Jersey*.

7. Venue is further appropriate in this Venue as Plaintiff was hired through and performed work solely for Defendants in their 281 Benigno Boulevard, Bellmawr, New Jersey facility.

PARTIES

8. The foregoing paragraphs are incorporated herein in their entirety as if set forth in full.

9. Plaintiff is an adult individual with an address as set forth in the above caption.

10. Upon information and belief, Amazon.com, Inc. *d/b/a* Amazon.com is an online retailer that offers a wide range of products, including books, music, videotapes, computers,

electronics, home and garden, and numerous other products, with headquarters located at the above-captioned address.

11. Upon information and belief, Amazon.com Services, Inc. is a multinational technology company that focuses on e-commerce, cloud computing, digital streaming, artificial intelligence implementation, and facilities management services, with headquarters located at the above-captioned address. Plaintiff's paystubs and W-2 forms list Amazon.com Services, Inc. as his employer located at that address.

12. Because of their interrelation of operations, common ownership or management, centralized control of labor relations, common ownership or financial controls, and other factors Defendants are sufficiently interrelated and integrated in their activities, labor relations, ownership, and management that they made be treated as a single and/or joint employer for purposes of the instant action.

13. At all times relevant herein, Defendants acted by and through their agents, servants and employees, each of whom acted at all times relevant herein in the course and scope of their employment with and for the Defendants.

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

14. The foregoing paragraphs are incorporated herein in their entirety as if set forth in full.

15. Plaintiff was hired by Defendants on or about June 26, 2019 as a Learning Ambassador for Defendants' 281 Benigno Boulevard, Bellmawr, New Jersey facility.

16. Plaintiff was primarily supervised by Area Manager, Paul Zirbser (*hereinafter* "Zirbser").

17. Throughout his tenure with Defendants, Plaintiff was a hard-working employee who performed his job well.

18. As a Learning Ambassador for Defendants' Bellmawr, New Jersey facility, Plaintiff assisted floor managers, trained new associates, ensured that existing associates maintained quality standards, and enforced Amazon protocols.

19. As a result of the global COVID-19 pandemic, on or about March 21, 2020, New Jersey Governor Phillip D. Murphy (*hereinafter* "Governor Murphy"), signed Executive Order No. 107, which ordered steps to mitigate the community spread of COVID-19, including but not limited to "practic[ing] social distancing and stay[ing] six feet apart whenever practicable."

20. Thereafter, on or about April 8, 2020, Governor Murphy, signed Executive Order No. 122, mandating that all manufacturing and warehousing businesses "require individuals to maintain six feet or more distance between them wherever possible" and "require workers and visitors to wear cloth face coverings, in accordance with CDC recommendations. . . [and] gloves, while on the premises."

21. Executive Order No. 122 further provides that "[i]t shall be the duty of every person or entity in this State or doing business in this State . . . to cooperate fully in all matters concerning this Executive Order" or risk being subjected to all available penalties under the law, including fines and/or imprisonment, pursuant to New Jersey Revised Statutes § App. A:9-49 (2013).

22. In or about March and April of 2020, in compliance with the aforesaid New Jersey State laws, Defendants instituted certain safety protocols for its employees, including but not limited to requiring masks for all employees and maintaining six feet or more distance between employees working and/or in Defendants facilities.

23. As a Learning Ambassador, Plaintiff was tasked with enforcing Defendants' aforesaid safety protocols in the facility during his shifts. Defendants advised Plaintiff that these protocols were to be strictly enforced and that violators would be subjected to suspension or even termination.

24. While strictly enforcing Defendants' aforesaid safety and social distancing protocols, Plaintiff observed that Shift Manager, Kristopher Lauderdale (*hereinafter* "Lauderdale") repeatedly violated both New Jersey State COVID-19 mitigation laws/regulations and Defendants' safety protocols by not wearing his mask (either at all or incorrectly) and not maintaining at least six feet distance from other employees.

25. Plaintiff further observed that whenever another Learning Ambassador or employee reported Lauderdale for violating New Jersey State COVID-19 mitigation laws/regulations and Defendants' safety protocols, the reporting/complaining employee would be written up and/or suspended by Defendants' management for bogus reasons.

26. Plaintiff himself had repeated informed Lauderdale that he was violating state COVID-19 mitigation laws and Defendants' safety protocols on several occasions to no avail.

27. What Plaintiff was experiencing was highly disturbing (with regard to the safety and health of Defendants' employees during a global pandemic). COVID-19 related deaths and infections were continuing to rise unabated at this time, and Plaintiff was dismayed by Defendants' managements' failure to properly enforce Governor Murphy's emergency mandates and HR's clear condonement of disciplining, suspending or terminating any employee who attempted to report Lauderdale or his aforesaid violations/illegal conduct.

28. For example, in or about early August of 2020, Plaintiff was working his regular shift and observed that Lauderdale and another manager were standing and talking within just 2-3 feet of either. When Plaintiff advised Lauderdale and the other manager that they were not following mandated social distancing guidelines, Lauderdale ignored Plaintiff and visibly rolled his eyes.

29. After Lauderdale rolled his eyes at Plaintiff's reminder to follow safety/social distancing guidelines, Plaintiff walked over to another employee and expressed his frustration at

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.