

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF OHIO  
WESTERN DIVISION**

JACQUELINE MILLER )  
5910 Gloucester Court )  
Dayton, Ohio, 45440 )

CASE NO.:  
  
JUDGE

Plaintiff, )

v. )

FRESH START BEHAVIORAL )  
HEALTH, INC. )  
c/o Ebenezer Aluma, statutory agent )  
2731 Delcane Drive )  
Columbus, Ohio, 43235 )

**COMPLAINT FOR VIOLATIONS  
OF THE FAIR LABOR  
STANDARDS ACT AND THE OHIO  
MINIMUM FAIR WAGE  
STANDARDS ACT**

-and- )

**(Jury Demand Endorsed Herein)**

EBENEZER ALUMA )  
2731 Delcane Drive )  
Columbus, Ohio, 43235 )

Defendants. )

**INTRODUCTION**

1. Defendant Fresh Start Behavioral Health, Inc. (“Fresh Start”) and its owner, Principal, and/or Manager, Defendant Ebenezer Aluma, refused to pay Plaintiff Jacqueline Miller for all hours worked, resulting in unpaid overtime. Accordingly, Defendants’ conduct violated the Fair Labor Standards Act (“FLSA”), 29 U.S. Code § 207 and the Ohio Minimum Fair Wage Standards Act (“OMFWSA”).

**PARTIES.**

2. Miller is an individual residing in Montgomery County, Ohio.
3. Fresh Start is a for-profit corporation organized under the laws of the State of Ohio, and who maintains offices in West Carrollton, Ohio, and whom operates in Ohio.
4. At all times referenced herein, Aluma was the president, co-owner, and/or principal of Fresh Start.

5. At all times referenced herein, Aluma supervised and/or controlled Miller's employment with the Fresh Start, controlled the day-to-day operations of Fresh Start, to include controlling its compensation policies and practices, and acted directly or indirectly in the interest of Fresh Start in relation to its employees, and was an employer within the meaning of section 3(d) of the FLSA and Article II, section 34a of the Ohio Constitution.

**PERSONAL JURISDICTION.**

6. Defendants hire citizens of the state of Ohio, contract with companies in Ohio, and own or rent property in Ohio. As such, the exercise of personal jurisdiction over Defendants comports with due process.
7. Miller performed work in this judicial district, was paid unlawfully by Defendants pursuant to work performed in this district and/or was hired out of this district.
8. This cause of action arose from or relates to the contacts of Defendants with Ohio residents, thereby conferring specific jurisdiction over Defendants.

**SUBJECT MATTER JURISDICTION AND VENUE.**

9. This Court has jurisdiction over the subject matter of this action under 29 U.S.C. § 216(b) and 28 U.S.C. § 1331.
10. This Court has supplemental jurisdiction over Miller's state law claims pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1367, as Miller's state law claims are so closely related to her federal law claims that they form part of the same case or controversy under Article III of the United States Constitution.
11. Venue is proper in this District because Defendants do a sizeable portion of their business in this District, and many of the wrongs herein alleged occurred in this District.

**FLSA COVERAGE.**

12. At all times referenced herein, Fresh Start was an enterprise within the meaning of Section 3(r) of the FLSA, 29 U.S.C. § 203(r) and formed a single enterprise engaged in commerce within the meaning of Section 3(s)(1) of the FLSA, 29 U.S.C. § 203(s)(1), in that said

enterprise at all times hereinafter mentioned had employees engaged in commerce or in the production of goods for commerce, or employees handling, selling or otherwise working on goods or materials that have been moved in or produced for commerce by any person and in that enterprise had an annual gross volume of sales made or business done of not less than \$500,000.00.

13. At all times material to the Complaint, Miller directly participated in the actual movement of things in interstate commerce as her job duties required her to order and acquire supplies, equipment, and/or materials originating outside of Ohio, and was therefore subject to individual coverage under the FLSA.

**FACTUAL ALLEGATIONS.**

14. Fresh Start is a provider of in-patient and out-patient mental health care and substance abuse counseling services.
15. At all times referenced herein, Fresh Start operated out of an office located at 1909 S. Alex Road, West Carrollton, Ohio, 45449.
16. Miller was hired by Defendants on or around March 11, 2021 as an Assistant to Aluma.
17. At all times referenced herein, Miller was paid on an hourly basis.
18. At all times referenced herein, Miller recorded the hours she worked on a time card.
19. Miller regularly worked more than forty (40) hours per week during her employment with Defendants.
20. Miller reported the hours she worked over forty (40) per week to Defendants on her time cards.
21. Defendants refused to pay Miller any wages at all for any time she worked in excess of forty (40) hours per week.
22. Defendants failed to pay Miller overtime when she worked greater than forty (40) hours in a week.

23. Miller complained to Aluma about not being paid for the hours she worked over forty (40) (“Overtime Complaint”).
24. Aluma responded to Miller’s overtime Complaint by telling her that “if you work more than forty (40) hours that is your decision.”
25. Aluma refused to pay Miller for the hours she worked over forty (40) in a week.
26. Aluma refused to pay Miller overtime.
27. Miller’s employment with Defendants ended on or about May 27, 2021.
28. As a result of Defendants’ failure to pay Miller overtime, Miller has suffered damages.

**COUNT I: VIOLATION OF THE FAIR LABOR STANDARDS ACT: FAILURE TO PAY OVERTIME.**

29. Miller restates each and every prior paragraph of this Complaint, as if it were fully restated herein.
30. The FLSA requires each covered employer such as Defendants to compensate all non-exempt employees at a rate of not less than 1.5 times the regular rate of pay for work performed in excess of 40 hours in a work week.
31. Miller was not exempt from the right to receive overtime pay under the FLSA during her employment with Defendants.
32. Miller is entitled to be paid overtime compensation for all overtime hours worked.
33. At all times relevant to this Complaint, Defendants had a policy and practice of failing and refusing to pay overtime to its employees for their hours worked in excess of forty (40) hours per week.
34. Defendants either recklessly failed to investigate whether their failure to pay Miller overtime violated the Federal Wage Laws of the United States; intentionally misled Miller to believe that Defendants were not required to pay her overtime, and/or concocted a scheme pursuant to which they deprived Miller of the overtime pay she earned.

35. Defendants' conduct as alleged herein constitutes a willful violation of the FLSA within the meaning of 29 U.S.C. § 255(a).
36. Miller is entitled to damages in the amount of her unpaid overtime compensation, plus liquidated damages as provided by the FLSA, 29 U.S.C. § 216(b), and other such legal and equitable relief as the Court deems just and proper, including her attorneys' fees and costs.
37. Defendants violated the FLSA without a good faith belief that their conduct was lawful.
38. Miller requests recovery of her attorney's fees and costs associated with this cause as provided by 29 U.S.C. § 216(b)

**COUNT II: VIOLATION OF THE OHIO MINIMUM FAIR WAGE STANDARDS ACT, O.R.C. § 4111.03, et seq, BASED ON FAILURE TO PAY OVERTIME.**

39. Miller restates each and every prior paragraph of this Complaint, as if it were fully restated herein.
40. At all relevant times, Defendants have been, and continue to be, an "employer" within the meaning of the OMFWSA.
41. At all relevant times, Defendants have employed and continue to employ, "employees," within the meaning the OMFWSA.
42. Miller was an employee of Defendants as that term is defined by the OMFWSA.
43. Ohio R.C. § 4111.03 provides that "[a]n employer shall pay an employee for overtime at a wage rate of one and one-half times the employee's wage rate for hours worked in excess of forty hours in one workweek, in the manner and methods provided in and subject to the exemptions of section 7 and section 13 of the [FLSA]..."
44. Defendants failed to pay Miller overtime for hours she worked in excess of 40 per week.
45. In denying Miller overtime compensation, Defendants violated the OMFWSA and Article II, Section 34a of the Ohio Constitution.

# 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.