

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF OHIO  
EASTERN DIVISION

MARQUES DELONEY	)	CASE NO.
1007 Atlantic Ave	)	
Columbus, Ohio 43229	)	JUDGE
	)	
on behalf of himself and all others similarly	)	
situated,	)	<b><u>PLAINTIFF'S COMPLAINT</u></b>
	)	
Plaintiff,	)	(Jury Demand Endorsed Herein)
	)	
vs.	)	
	)	
SK FOOD GROUP, INC.	)	
c/o Statutory Agent Registered Agent	)	
Solutions, Inc.	)	
4568 Mayfield Rd. Suite 204	)	
Cleveland, OH 44121	)	
	)	
Defendant.	)	

Now comes Plaintiff Marques Deloney, by and through undersigned counsel, and for his Complaint against SK Food Group, Inc. ("SK Food" or "Defendant"), states and alleges the following:

**INTRODUCTION**

1. This is a "collective action" instituted by Plaintiff as a result of Defendant's practices and policies of not paying its non-exempt employees, including Plaintiff and other similarly situated employees, for all hours worked, including overtime compensation in violation of the Fair Labor Standards Act ("FLSA"), 29 U.S.C. §§ 201-219, as well as a "class action" pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 23 to remedy violations of the Ohio Minimum Fair Wage Standards Act ("OMFWSA"), R.C. § 4111.03.

### **JURISDICTION AND VENUE**

2. The Court has jurisdiction over Plaintiff's FLSA claims pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1331 and 29 U.S.C. § 216(b).

3. The Court has supplemental jurisdiction over Plaintiff's OMFWSA claims pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1367 because the claims are so related to the FLSA claims as to form part of the same case or controversy.

4. Venue is proper pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1391(b) because Defendant conducts business throughout this District and Division and because a substantial part of the events and omissions giving rise to the claims occurred in this District and Division.

### **PARTIES**

5. At all times relevant herein, Plaintiff was a citizen of the United States and a resident of Franklin County, Ohio.

6. At all times relevant herein, Plaintiff was an employee within the meaning of 29 U.S.C. § 203(e) and R.C. § 4111.03(D)(3).

7. At all times relevant herein, Defendant was a foreign corporation, organized and existing under the laws of the State of Washington, licensed to conduct business in the State of Ohio, with a manufacturing operation at 3301 Toy Road, Groveport, Ohio 43125.

8. At all times relevant herein, Defendant was an employer within the meaning of 29 U.S.C. § 203(d) and R.C. § 4111.03(D)(2).

9. At times relevant herein, Defendant was an enterprise within the meaning of 29 U.S.C. § 203(r).

10. At all times relevant herein, Defendant was an enterprise engaged in commerce or in the production of goods for commerce within the meaning of 29 U.S.C. § 203(s)(1).

11. At all times relevant herein, Plaintiff was an employee engaged in commerce or in the production of goods for commerce within the meaning of 29 U.S.C. §§ 206-207.

12. Written consents to join this action as to Count One, as and when executed by other individual plaintiffs, will be filed pursuant to 29 U.S.C. § 216(b).

### **FACTUAL ALLEGATIONS**

13. Defendant manufactures custom food products for its customers.

14. Defendant employed Plaintiff between July 2018 and August 2019 as a production employee at its Groveport, Ohio manufacturing facility.

15. Other similarly situated employees were employed as production employees at Defendant's Groveport, Ohio facility.

16. Defendant classified Plaintiff and other similarly situated production employees as non-exempt employees.

17. Defendant paid Plaintiff and other similarly situated production employees on an hourly basis.

18. Plaintiff and other similarly situated production employees frequently worked over 40 hours per week.

19. Plaintiff worked on average over 40 hours per week.

### **(Failure to Pay for All Hours Worked)**

20. Plaintiff and other similarly situated production employees were only paid for work performed between their scheduled start and stop times, and were not paid for the following work performed before and after their scheduled start and stop times: a) changing into and out of their personal protective equipment, including but not limited to a smock, hairnet, beard guard, gloves, steel toe boots and/or safety glasses; b) getting their work assignments, washing their hands, and

walking to their assigned area of the production floor; and/or c) performing their production work.

21. The time Plaintiff and other similarly situated production employees spent a) changing into and out of their personal protective equipment, including but not limited to a smock, hairnet, beard guard, gloves, steel toe boots and/or safety glasses; b) getting their work assignments, washing their hands, and walking to their assigned area of the production floor; and/or c) performing their production work was an integral and indispensable part of their principal activities, was required by Defendant, and was performed for Defendant's benefit.

22. Changing into and out of their personal protective equipment, including but not limited to a smock, hairnet, beard guard, gloves, steel toe boots and/or safety glasses; b) getting their work assignments, washing their hands, and walking to their assigned area of the production floor; and/or c) performing their production work are intrinsic elements of their principal activities and ones with which Plaintiff and other similarly situated production employees cannot dispense if they are to perform their principal activities.

23. The time Plaintiff and other similarly situated employees spent donning their personal protective equipment was not only an integral and indispensable part of their principal activities, but it was also required by Defendant, the Occupational Safety and Health Administration, and was performed for Defendant's benefit in that it helped keep the production floor safe and helped promote a more safe, hygienic, and efficient production process.

24. Plaintiff and other similarly situated production employees were not paid for time spent a) changing into and out of their personal protective equipment, including but not limited to a smock, hairnet, beard guard, gloves, steel toe boots and/or safety glasses; b) getting their work assignments, washing their hands, and walking to their assigned area of the production floor; and/or c) performing their production work.

25. The amount of time Plaintiff and other similarly situated production employees spent on this required and unpaid work amounted to approximately 15 to 20 minutes per day.

26. As a result of Defendant's practices and policies, Plaintiff and other similarly situated production employees were not compensated for all of the time they worked, including all of the overtime hours they worked over 40 each workweek.

**(Failure to Keep Accurate Records)**

27. Defendant failed to make, keep and preserve accurate records of the unpaid overtime worked by Plaintiff and other similarly situated manufacturing employees.

**(Defendant Willfully Violated the FLSA)**

28. Defendant knowingly and willfully engaged in the above-mentioned violations of the FLSA.

**COLLECTIVE ACTION ALLEGATIONS**

29. Plaintiff brings Count One of this action on his own behalf pursuant to 29 U.S.C. § 216(b), and on behalf of all other persons similarly situated who have been, are being, or will be adversely affected by Defendant's unlawful conduct.

30. The class which Plaintiff seeks to represent and for whom Plaintiff seeks the right to send "opt-in" notices for purposes of the collective action, and of which Plaintiff himself is a member, is composed of and defined as follows:

All former and current non-exempt manufacturing employees of SK Food Group Inc. between March 2, 2018 and the present.

31. Plaintiff is unable to state at this time the exact size of the potential class, but upon information and belief, avers that it consists of at least several hundred persons.

32. This action is maintainable as an "opt-in" collective action pursuant to 29 U.S.C. § 216(b) as to claims for unpaid overtime compensation, liquidated damages, attorneys' fees and

# 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.