

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS  
AUSTIN DIVISION

JOHN LYNCH and DAXTON  
HARTSFIELD, individually and on  
behalf of all others similarly situated,

*Plaintiffs,*

v.

TESLA, INC.

*Defendant.*

No. 22-597

CLASS ACTION COMPLAINT

CLASS ACTION COMPLAINT

John Lynch and Daxton Hartsfield, individually and on behalf of all others similarly situated, file this Class Action Complaint against Defendant Tesla, Inc. (“Tesla”) for violating the Worker Adjustment and Retraining Notification Act, 29 U.S.C. § 2101 et sq. (the “WARN Act”) by terminating Plaintiffs and Class Members without providing sufficient (or any) advance written notice.

**I. NATURE OF THE ACTION**

1. Tesla has violated the WARN Act by terminating Plaintiffs and similarly situated individuals (the “Class Members”) without advance or written notice.

2. Pursuant to the WARN Act, Tesla is required to provide Plaintiffs and Class Members with the required sixty (60) days advance written notice of a mass layoff. However, in connection with the recent mass layoffs, Tesla has not provided written notice, or advance notice, to Plaintiffs and the “Class Members” prior to terminating their employment.

3. Plaintiffs and the Class Members were employees of Tesla who have been

terminated without cause on their part as a part of mass layoffs beginning in approximately May or June of 2022.

4. Tesla has failed to give Plaintiffs and the Class Members any advance written notice of their terminations. Instead, Tesla has simply notified the employees that their terminations would be effective immediately. Tesla has also failed to provide a statement of the basis for reducing the notification period to zero days advance notice.

5. Tesla's failure to provide its employees with any advance written notice has had a devastating economic impact on Plaintiffs and the Class Members.

6. As a consequence, Plaintiffs and the Class Members are entitled under the WARN Act to recover from Tesla their respective compensation and benefits for sixty (60) days.

7. Specifically, Plaintiffs seek to certify the following class defined as:

**All former Tesla employees throughout the United States who have not been given a minimum of sixty (60) days written notice of termination and whose employment has been terminated as a result of a "mass layoff" or "plant closing," as defined by the Workers Adjustment and Retraining Notification Act of 1988, beginning in approximately May or June of 2022**

8. Accordingly, Plaintiffs, on behalf of themselves and on behalf of the Class Members, seek recovery of damages in the amount of sixty (60) days' compensation and benefits for each of them by reason of Tesla's violation of their rights under the WARN Act.

## II. PARTIES

9. Plaintiff John Lynch is an adult resident of Nevada. Until his layoff, Plaintiff Lynch worked as an employee of Tesla at its Sparks, Nevada Gigafactory. Lynch is an "aggrieved employee" within the meaning of 29 U.S.C. § 2104(a)(7).

10. Plaintiff Daxton Hartsfield is an adult resident of Nevada. Until his layoff, Plaintiff

Hartsfield worked as an employee of Tesla at its Sparks, Nevada Gigafactory. Hartsfield is an “aggrieved employee” within the meaning of 29 U.S.C. § 2104(a)(7).

11. Plaintiffs bring this lawsuit as a Rule 23 class action on behalf of the Class Members. The Class Members consist of all former Tesla employees throughout the United States who have not been given a minimum of sixty (60) days’ written notice of termination and whose employment was terminated in “mass layoffs” or “plant closings,” as defined by the Workers Adjustment and Retraining Notification Act of 1988, beginning in May or June of 2022.

12. At all relevant times, Tesla has been a business authorized to conduct business in the State of Texas. Tesla’s principal place of business is 13101 Harold Green Road, Austin, Texas 78725. Tesla is a public corporation and may be served by serving its registered agent for service of process, CT Corporation, 1999 Bryan St., Suite 900, Dallas, Texas 75201, or wherever it may be found.

### **III. JURISDICTION AND VENUE**

13. This Court has jurisdiction over this proceeding pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1331 and 29 U.S.C. § 2104(a)(5).

14. This Court has personal jurisdiction over this matter because Tesla is headquartered in this District and conducts substantial business operations in this District.

### **IV. BACKGROUND AND FACTS**

15. Tesla employs thousands of people across the United States. On information and belief, in approximately May or June 2022, Tesla initiated a mass layoff of employees at its sites across the country. It has been widely reported in the media that in early June 2022, Tesla’s CEO Elon Musk communicated to Tesla’s top executives that Tesla needed to eliminate 10% of its total

workforce.

16. Prior to their terminations, the named Plaintiffs were employed in Tesla's Gigafactory 2 plant in Sparks, Nevada.

17. On June 10, 2022, Plaintiff Lynch was notified that his employment was being terminated effective immediately. Tesla did not provide sixty (60) days advance written notice (or any advance notice at all) to Plaintiff Lynch of his impending layoff.

18. On June 15, 2022, Plaintiff Hartsfield was notified that his employment was being terminated effective immediately. Tesla did not provide sixty (60) days advance written notice (or any advance notice at all) to Plaintiff Hartsfield of his impending layoff.

19. Upon information and belief, thousands of other employees working for Tesla across the United States have been terminated (collectively, the "Class Members"). In fact, Tesla terminated more than 500 employees alone at its Gigafactory 2 plant in Sparks, Nevada where the named Plaintiffs were employed.

20. Plaintiffs bring this action individually, and, pursuant to Rules 23(a) and (b)(3) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, on behalf of the other members of the Class.

21. At all relevant times, Tesla has employed 100 or more employees, exclusive of part-time employees, (i.e., those employees who had worked fewer than 6 of the 12 months prior to the date notice was required to be given or who had worked fewer than an average of 20 hours per week during the 90 day period prior to the date notice was required to be given) (the "Part-Time Employees"), or employed 100 or more employees who in the aggregate worked at least 4,000 hours per week exclusive of hours of overtime within the United States.

22. The terminations beginning in approximately May or June 2022, of the employment

of persons who worked at the various facilities for Tesla have resulted in the loss of employment for more than 500 employees (excluding part-time employees).

23. Upon information and belief, Plaintiffs and the Class Members have not received written notice at least sixty (60) days in advance of the termination of their employment, and have not received as much notice as practicable under the circumstances

## **V. CLASS ACTION ALLEGATIONS AND CLAIMS**

24. The above and foregoing paragraphs are incorporated herein as if set forth in full.

25. Plaintiffs and the Class Members constitute a Class within the meaning of Rules 23(a) and (b)(3) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure.

26. The Class Members are similarly situated to the Plaintiffs with respect to their rights under the WARN Act.

27. Common questions of law and fact are applicable to all members of the Class.

28. The common questions of law and fact arise from and concern the following facts, among others:

- a. That all Class Members enjoyed the protection of the WARN Act;
- b. That all Class Members have been employees of Tesla and worked at Tesla's facilities;
- c. That Tesla has terminated the employment of all Class Members without cause on their part;
- d. That Tesla has terminated the employment of the Class Members without giving them at least sixty (60) days prior written notice as required by the WARN Act;
- e. That Tesla has failed to pay the Class Members wages and to provide other employee benefits for a 60-day period following their respective terminations; and,
- f. On information and belief, the issues raised by affirmative defenses that may be asserted by Tesla.

# 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.