	140.	•	<u> </u>
Ton Bui, individually and others similarly situated	on behalf of all	S	In the County Court at Law
	Plaintiffs	S S	
vs.		S .	County Court No
Sonogenic Ultrasound Ser	rvices, Inc. and	S	
Afaq Zaheer	Defendants	S	Tarrant County, Texas

## Plaintiff's Original Petition

Plaintiff Ton Bui, individually and on behalf of all other non-exempt ultrasound technologists currently and formerly employed by Sonogenic Ultrasound Services, Inc. and Afaq Zaheer (collectively, "Defendants"), each of whom are similarly situated ("Plaintiff" and "Class Members" herein) brings this Fair Labor Standards Act ("FLSA") suit against Defendants and shows as follows:

# A. Discovery Control Plan.

Plaintiff intends to conduct discovery under Level 2 of Texas Rule of Civil Procedure 190.2 because this suit involves only monetary relief aggregating more than \$50,000.00 excluding court costs, prejudgment interest, and attorney fees.

### B. Nature of Suit.

- 1. The FLSA was passed by Congress in 1938 in an attempt to eliminate low wages and long hours and to correct conditions that were detrimental to the health and well-being of workers. To achieve its humanitarian goals, the FLSA "limits to 40 a week the number of hours that an employer may employ any of his employees subject to the Act, unless the employee receives compensation for his employment in excess of 40 hours at a rate not less than one and one-half times the regular rate at which he is employed." Walling v. Helmerich & Payne, 323 U.S. 37, 40 (1944) (discussing the requirements of 29 U.S.C. § 207 (a)).
- 2. Defendants failed to pay Plaintiff in accordance with the Fair Labor Standards Act. Specifically, Plaintiff was misclassified as a contractor instead of as a non-exempt

employee, and as a result, Defendant failed to pay Plaintiff at time and one half his regular rate of pay for hours worked in a workweek in excess of forty hours.

#### C. Parties.

- 3. Plaintiff Ton Bui is an individual who was employed by Defendants within the meaning of the FLSA within the three year period preceding the filing of this Complaint. Plaintiff lives in Tarrant County, Texas.
- 4. The "Class Members" are other non-exempt ultrasound technologists who were misclassified as contractors by Defendants, within the actionable time period.
- 5. Defendant Sonogenic Ultrasound Services, Inc. ("Defendant Sonogenic") is a corporation, existing under the laws of Texas, whose office address is 860 Hebron Parkway, Suite 804, Lewisville, Texas 75057. Defendant Sonogenic may be served by serving its registered agent, Afaq Zaheer at 4202 Jessica Lane, Carrollton, Texas 75010.
- 6. Defendant Afaq Zaheer ("**Defendant Zaheer**") is an individual living in the State of Texas. Defendant Zaheer may be served at 4202 Jessica Lane, Carrollton, Texas 75010.

### D. <u>Jurisdiction and Venue</u>.

- 7. This Court has jurisdiction over the claim because state courts have concurrent jurisdiction with federal courts on cases filed under the Fair Labor Standards Act. 29 U.S.C. §216(b). In addition, Plaintiff's damages are within the Court's jurisdictional limit.
- 8. Venue is proper in this court pursuant to Texas Civil Practice and Remedies Code § 15.002(a), because the actions giving rise to this lawsuit occurred in Tarrant County, Texas.
- 9. All conditions precedent have been performed or have occurred.

## E. Coverage.

10. At all material times, Defendants have acted, directly or indirectly, in the interest of an employer with respect to Plaintiff.

- 11. At all material times, Defendants have been an employer within the meaning of the Section 3(d) of the FLSA, 29 U.S.C. § 203(d).
- 12. At all material times, Defendants have been an enterprise within the meaning of Section 3(r) of the FLSA, 29 U.S.C. § 203(r).
- 13. At all material times, Defendants have been an enterprise engaged in commerce or in the production of goods for commerce within the meaning of Section 3(s)(1) of the FLSA, 29 U.S.C. § 203(s)(1), in that said enterprise has 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 said enterprise has had and has an annual gross volume of sales made or business done of not less than \$500,000 (exclusive of excise taxes at the retail level which are separately stated).
- 14. Defendant Zaheer had and has authority to set corporate policy, participate in decisions regarding the classification of employees and the payment of overtime as well as participate in decisions regarding whether or not to pay Plaintiff overtime. In addition, Defendant Zaheer had and has operational control of significant aspects of the Defendant Sonogenic's day-to-day functions and independently exercised control over the work situation. He had and has direct involvement in the day-to-day operation of Defendant Sonogenic and had and has some direct responsibility for the supervision of the employees.
- 15. Defendant Zaheer acts, and has acted, directly or indirectly, in the interests of an employer in relation to Plaintiff.
- 16. At all times hereinafter mentioned, Plaintiff was an individual employee who was engaged in commerce or in the production of goods for commerce as required by 29 U.S.C. §§ 206 -207.

### F. Factual Allegations

- 17. Defendants have operations throughout the Dallas/Fort Worth Metroplex through which Defendants provide ultrasound services to patients. In connection with this business, Defendants provide the following services: ultrasound scans and digital imagining scans.
- 18. Defendants provide the ultrasound services through their use of a network of alleged "independent contractors." In reality, the alleged independent contractors are actually

- employees of Defendants who are performing non-exempt work which is the fundamental service provided by Defendants.
- 19. Plaintiff was employed by Defendants as a non-exempt "Ultrasound Technologist."
- 20. Plaintiff worked in this capacity from approximately August 3, 2011 through the present.
- 21. Although Defendants reported Plaintiff's income on an IRS Form 1099, Plaintiff was Defendants' employee at all times relevant hereto.
- 22. As a non-exempt "Ultrasound Technologist" for all work he performed for Defendants. Plaintiff was paid (1) on a per-scan ("piece-rate") basis; and (2) a flat fee gas and travel for scans located at certain locations.
- 23. From at least August of 2011 and continuing through the present, Plaintiff worked in excess of forty (40) hours per week for which Plaintiff was not compensated at the statutory rate of one and one-half times Plaintiffs regular rate of pay, including, but not limited to, time spent driving during the workday, and post-shift work processing inspections and doing paperwork.
- 24. Defendants misclassified Plaintiff as an independent contractor, despite the fact that Plaintiff:
  - a. was not required to posses any advanced skill or knowledge to perform his work for Defendants;
  - b. was required by Defendants to perform his job in a particular manner, on which Defendants trained him;
  - c. was economically dependent on Defendants;
  - d. assisted Defendants in carrying out their principal business;
  - e. was not required to make any substantial financial investment in his employment;
  - f. received all assignments, routes and schedules from Defendants;
  - g. was required to and did in fact sign a covenant not to compete which allegedly prevents Plaintiff from working for competing businesses of Defendants during

- the term of Plaintiff's employment by Defendants and for two years thereafter at the conclusion of Plaintiff's employment by Defendants; and
- h. was unable to enhance/increase his wages other than by performing additional inspections.
- 25. Under the aforementioned piece-rate pay methodology, Plaintiff was paid solely by the number of ultrasound scans he completed.
- 26. Plaintiff, and those similarly situated to him, routinely worked in excess of forty (40) hours per week as part of their regular job duties.
- 27. Despite the fact that Plaintiff, and those similarly situated to him, worked more than forty (40) hours per week, Defendants failed to pay Plaintiff, and those similarly situated to him, overtime compensation at a rate of one and one-half times his regular rate of pay for hours worked over forty (40) in a workweek.
- 28. Defendant has employed and continue to employ other individuals as non-exempt "Ultrasound Technologists," paid solely per scan completed, whose income is reported on IRS Form 1099 on a piece-rate basis, who performed and continue to perform the same or similar job duties under the same pay policies as Plaintiff.
- 29. With regard to Plaintiff Defendants have violated Title 29 U.S.C. § 207 from August 3, 2011 through the present, in that:
  - a. Plaintiff worked in excess of forty (40) hours per week for his period of employment with Defendants;
  - b. No payments, or insufficient payments and/or provisions for payment, have been made by Defendants to properly compensate Plaintiff at the statutory rate of one and one-half times Plaintiffs regular rate for those hours worked in excess of forty (40) hours per work week as provided by the FLSA; and
  - c. Defendant has failed to maintain proper time records as mandated by the FLSA.
- 30. Plaintiff has retained the Law Office of Chris R. Miltenberger, PLLC to represent him in this litigation and has agreed to pay the firm a reasonable fee for its services.
  - G. Collective Action Allegations.

- 31. Plaintiff and the Class Members were all non-exempt employees of Defendants and performed the same or similar job duties as one another in that they performed ultrasound scans on behalf of Defendants.
- 32. All of these individuals were and are paid in the same manner, solely on a piece-rate basis, per scan completed.
- 33. All of these individuals were misclassified as independent contractors despite the fact that they:
  - a. were not required to posses any advanced skill or knowledge to perform their work for Defendants;
  - b. were required by Defendants to perform their job in a particular manner, on which Defendants trained them;
  - c. were economically dependent on Defendants;
  - d. assisted Defendants in carrying out Defendants' principal business;
  - e. were not required to make any substantial financial investment in their employment;
  - f. received all assignments, routes and schedules from Defendants;
  - g. were required to and did in fact sign a covenant not to compete which allegedly prevents them from working for competing businesses of Defendants during the term of their employment by Defendants and for two years thereafter at the conclusion of their employment by Defendants; and
  - h. were unable to enhance/increase their wages other than by performing additional inspections.
- 34. Further, Plaintiff and the Class Members were subjected to the same pay provisions in that they were all paid per scan but were not compensated at a rate one and one-halftimes their regular rate of pay for all hours worked in excess of forty (40) hours in a workweek.
- 35. Thus, the Class Members are owed overtime wages for the same reasons as Plaintiff.

- 36. Defendants' failure to compensate its ultrasound technologists for hours worked in excess of forty (40) hours in a workweek as required by the FLSA results from a policy or practice applicable to all of Defendants' non-exempt ultrasound technologists.
- 37. This policy or practice was applicable to Plaintiff and the Class Members. Application of this policy or practice does/did not depend on the personal circumstances of Plaintiff or those joining this lawsuit. Rather, the same policy or practice which resulted in the non-payment of overtime to Plaintiff applied and continues to apply to all Class Members. Accordingly, the Class Members are properly defined as:
  - a. All piece-rate paid ultrasound technologists and other individuals working for Defendants providing ultrasound technology services, who worked for Defendants within the last three years, whose income was reported on IRS Form 1099, who worked in excess of 40 hours in one or more workweeks and were not compensated at one and one-half times their regular rate of pay for all hours worked in excess of 40 hours in one or more workweeks.
- 38. Defendants knowingly, willfully, or with reckless disregard carried out its illegal pattern or practice of failing to pay overtime compensation with respect to Plaintiff and the Class Members.
- 39. Defendants did not act in good faith and/or have reasonable grounds for a belief that their actions did not violate the FLSA nor did they act in reliance upon any of the following in formulating their pay practices: (a) case law; (b) the FLSA, 29 U.S.C. § 201, et seq.; (c) Department of Labor Wage & Hour Opinion Letters; or (d) the Code of Federal Regulations.
- 40. During the relevant period, Defendants violated the FLSA by employing employees in an enterprise engaged in commerce or in the production of goods for commerce within the meaning of the FLSA, as aforesaid, for one or more workweeks without compensating such employees for their work at a rate of at least one and one-half times their regular rate of pay for all hours worked in excess of forty (40) hours in a workweek.
- 41. Defendants have acted willfully in failing to pay Plaintiff and the Class Members in accordance with the law.
- 42. Defendant has failed to maintain accurate records of Plaintiff's and the Class Members' work hours in accordance with the law.

43. As a collective action, Plaintiff seeks this Court's appointment and or designation as representative of a group of similarly situated individuals as defined herein.

# H. Cause of Action: Failure to Pay Wages in Accordance with the Fair Labor Standards Act.

- 44. Each and every allegation contained in the foregoing paragraphs 1-43 is re-alleged as if fully rewritten herein.
- 45. Plaintiff was, and is, entitled to be paid at the statutory rate of one and one-half times Plaintiff's regular rate of pay for those hours worked in excess of forty (40) hours.
- 46. At all times material hereto, Defendants failed, and continue to fail, to maintain proper time records as mandated by the FLSA.
- 47. To date, Defendants continue to fail to pay their ultrasound technologists and similarly situated employees their FLSA mandated overtime pay, despite Defendants' recognition that the ultrasound technologist position is non-exempt and entitled to same.
- 48. Defendants' actions in this regard were/are willful and/or showed/show reckless disregard for the provisions of the FLSA as evidenced by their continued failure to compensate Plaintiff at the statutory rate of one and one-half times Plaintiffs regular rate of pay for the hours worked in excess of forty (40) hours per weeks when they knew, or should have known, such was, and is due.
- 49. Defendants have failed to properly disclose or apprise Plaintiff of Plaintiff's rights under the FLSA.
- 50. Due to the intentional, willful, and unlawful acts of Defendants, Plaintiff suffered and continues to suffer damages and lost compensation for time worked over forty (40) hours per week, plus liquidated damages.
- 51. Plaintiff is entitled to an award of reasonable attorneys' fees and costs pursuant to 29 U.S.C. §216(b).

## I. Demand for Jury.

Plaintiff demands a jury trial and tenders the appropriate fee with this petition.

## J. Reporter Demand.

Plaintiff requests the Official Court Reporter for this Court perform all the duties of the office, as set forth in Section 52.046 of the Government Code of the State of Texas, and as set forth in Rule 13 of the Rules of Appellate Procedure, including reporting all testimony and trial proceedings, voir dire examinations and jury arguments.

## K. Reservation of Rights.

Plaintiff specifically reserves the right to bring additional causes of action against Defendant and to amend this Petition as necessary.

## L. Request for Disclosure.

Under Texas Rule of Civil Procedure 194, Plaintiff requests that Defendant disclose, within 50 days of the service of this request, the information or material described in Rule 194.2 (a) - (k) to be produced at the Law Office of Chris R. Miltenberger, 430 N. Carroll, Suite 120, Southlake, Texas 76092.

### M. Prayer.

WHEREFORE, PREMISES CONSIDERED, Plaintiff prays that he recover from Defendants, the following:

- a. Compensation for all hours worked at a rate not less than the applicable minimum wage;
- b. Overtime compensation for all unpaid hours worked in excess of forty hours in any workweek at the rate of one-and-one-half times their regular rates;

- c. All unpaid wages and overtime compensation;
- d. An award of liquidated and/or punitive damages as a result of the Defendant's willful failure to pay wages and overtime compensation pursuant to 29 U.S.C § 216;
- e. Reasonable attorney's fees, expert fees, costs, and expenses of this action as provided by the FLSA;
- f. Pre-judgment and post-judgment interest at the highest rates allowed by law;
- g. For an order revoking any license enabling Defendant to operate in Texas and revoking any certificate authorizing Defendant to do business in Texas if any judgment rendered in this case has not been satisfied within three (3) months from the date of filing said final judgment; and

Chr Mtte

h. Such other relief as to which Plaintiff may be entitled.

Dated this 26th day of March, 2013.

Respectfully submitted,

THE LAW OFFICE OF CHRIS R. MILTENBERGER, PLLC

s/ Chris R. Miltenberger

BY: CHRIS R. MILTENBERGER

Texas Bar Number: 14171200

430 N. Carroll, Suite 120

Southlake, Texas 76092

(817) 296-0422

(817) 446-5062 (fax)

chris@crmlawpractice.com

Attorney for Plaintiff

### CIVIL CASE INFORMATION SHEET

CAVAL CIABLE AND CAMPAINED A							
CAUSE NUMBER (FOR CLERK USE ONLY):	COURT (FOR CLERK USE ONLY):						
STYLED TON BUI, INDIVIDUALLY AND ON BEHAL FO ALL OTHERS SI							

SERVICES, INC AND AFAQ ZAHEER

(e.g., John Smith v. All American Insurance Co; In re Mary Ann Jones; In the Matter of the Estate of George Jackson)

A civil case information sheet must be completed and submitted when an original petition or application is filed to initiate a new civil, family law, probate, or mental

filing. This sheet, approved by	ment motion for modification or end the Texas Judicial Council, is inter- ice of pleading or other documen missible at trial.	nded to co	ollect information that	will be used for stat	istical purp	oses only. It neither replaces nor
1. Contact information for pers	on completing case information s	neet:	Names of parties in o	case:	Person	or entity completing sheet is:
Name: Chris R. Miltenberger  Address: 430 N. Carroll, Suite 120	Email: chris@crmlawpractice.com Telephone: 817-296-0422		Plaintiff(s)/Petitioner(s):  Ton Bui		Attorney for Plaintiff/Petitioner  Pro Se Plaintiff/Petitioner  Title IV-D Agency Other:	
			Additional Parties in Child Support Ca			
City/State/Zip: Southlake, Texas 76092	Fax: 817-416-5062		Defendant(s)/Respondent(s):  Custodial Parent:  Sonogenic Ultrasound Services, Inc.			
Signature: State Bar No: 14171200		Afaq Zaheer Non-Custodial Parent:  Presumed Father:				
~		, ,	[Attach additional page as ne	cessary to list all parties]		energy and the control of the contro
2. Indicate case type, or identify	the most important issue in the c	ase (seiec	t only 1);		E	
	Civil	ac constant	and the second second		гат	ily Law Post-judgment Actions
Contract	Injury or Damage		Real Property	Marriage Relati	onship	(non-Title IV-D)
Debt/Contract Consumer/DTPA Debt/Contract Fraud/Misrepresentation	Assault/Battery Construction Defamation Malpractice	Eminent Domain/ Condemnation Partition Ouiet Title		Annulment Declare Marria Divorce With Childr	i	Enforcement Modification—Custody Modification—Other Title IV-D
Other Debt/Contract:  Foreclosure	Accounting Legal Medical	Tre	spass to Try Title er Property:	No Children		Enforcement/Modification Paternity Reciprocals (UIFSA)
■ Home Equity—Expedited ■ Other Foreclosure	Other Professional Liability:	n.	lated to Criminal			Support Order
Franchise	Motor Vehicle Accident	Re	Matters	Other Family	Law	Parent-Child Relationship
Insurance Landlord/Tenant Non-Competition Partnership Other Contract:	Premises  Product Liability  Asbestos/Silica  Other Product Liability  List Product:  Other Injury or Damage:	∭Jud ∭Nor ∭Seiz ∭Wri	unction gment Nisi I-Disclosure cure/Forfeiture t of Habeas Corpus— indictment	Enforce Foreig Judgment Habeas Corpus Name Change Protective Ord Removal of Di of Minority Other:	gn s er	Adoption/Adoption with Termination Child Protection Child Support Custody or Visitation Gestational Parenting Grandparent Access Paternity/Parentage
Employment	Öther	Civil	3.5			Termination of Parental
Discrimination Retaliation Termination Workers' Compensation Other Employment: FLSA	Administrative Appeal Antitrust/Unfair Competition Code Violations Foreign Judgment Intellectual Property	Perp	yer Discipline setuate Testimony urities/Stock cious Interference er:			Rights Other Parent-Child:
Tax	,		Probate & Mo	ental Health		
Tax Appraisal Tax Delinquency Other Tax	Probate/Wills/Intestate Administration Dependent Administration Independent Administration Other Estate Proceedings		Guardianship—Adul Guardianship—Mino Mental Health Other:			
3. Indicate procedure or remedy Appeal from Municipal or Jus Arbitration-related Attachment Bill of Review Certiorari Class Action	tice Court  Garnish Interple License Mandan Post-jud	tory Judgr ment ader nus	nent ·	Protec Receiv Seque	stration orary Restra	nedy nining Order/Injunction