Springs Fire Protection District

Labor Standards Act

- 4. Defendant, BORREGO SPRINGS FIRE PROTECTION DISTRICT, is a political subdivision of the State of California and employed the Plaintiffs. Defendant implemented an illegal compensation computation method which undercounts Plaintiffs' "regular rate" of pay. Defendant's method of calculating Plaintiffs' "regular rate" of pay results, and has resulted, in the under-payment for overtime hours worked. Defendant suffered or permitted Plaintiffs to perform overtime work without proper compensation.
- 5. Plaintiffs bring this action on behalf of themselves and all other similarly situated individuals. Those individuals constitute a well-defined community of interest in the questions of law and fact at issue in this case. The claims

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

of the represented Plaintiffs are typical of the claims of those similarly situated.

The named Plaintiffs will fairly and adequately reflect and represent the interests of those similarly situated. There is no conflict as to the individually named Plaintiffs and other members of the class with respect to this action or with respect to the claims for relief set forth herein.

III.

JURISDICTION

- 7. This action is brought pursuant to the provisions of the FLSA, 29 U.S.C. sections 201, et seq., to recover from Defendant unpaid overtime compensation, interest thereon, liquidated damages, costs of suit, and reasonable attorney fees. This Court has jurisdiction over this action pursuant to 28 U.S.C. section 1331 and 29 U.S.C. section 216(b), because this action is based on the FLSA. This Court has subject matter jurisdiction of this action pursuant to 29 U.S.C. sections 207, et seq.
- 8. Venue is proper because the acts and omissions giving rise to this action occurred primarily in the Southern District.

IV.

COLLECTIVE ACTION ALLEGATIONS

9. Plaintiffs bring this action on behalf of themselves and all other persons similarly situated who work, or have worked, for the Defendant at any time in the last three years and were deprived of their complete statutory overtime compensation. Those individuals are similarly situated and constitute a well-defined community of interest in their respective questions of law and fact relevant to this action. Plaintiffs' claims are typical of those of other individuals similarly situated. Plaintiffs will fairly and adequately represent the interests of those similarly situated.

- 11. Plaintiffs' claims for relief for violations of the FLSA are brought and maintained as an "opt-in" collective action pursuant to 29 U.S.C. section 216(b) for all violations of the FLSA.
- 12. Plaintiffs hereby consent to sue for violations of the FLSA, pursuant to 29 U.S.C. sections 216(b) and 256.
- 13. On information and belief, the exact number of members similarly situated in the collective group, as herein identified and described, is estimated to consist of well over fifteen individuals.
- 14. A collective action is a superior method for bringing this action in that there is a well-defined community of interest in the questions of law and fact. There are common questions of law and fact in this action relating to and affecting the rights of each member of the collective group, including: whether Defendant failed to fully compensate Plaintiffs and similarly situated individuals for all overtime hours worked by excluding certain remunerations from the "regular rate" of pay used to calculate their overtime compensation, including but not limited to: cash in lieu of health benefits, contributions made towards the purchase of health benefits, holiday in lieu compensation, paramedic certification pay, as well as other payments made pursuant to the applicable collective bargaining agreements. The relief sought is common to the entire class.
- 15. Plaintiffs' claims and the claims of those similarly situated depend on a showing of Defendant's acts and omissions giving rise to Plaintiffs' rights to the relief sought herein. There is no conflict as to the named Plaintiffs and

- other members of the collective group seeking to opt in, with respect to this action, or with respect to the claims for relief set forth herein.
- 16. This action is properly maintained as a collective action in that the prosecution of separate actions by individual members of the collective group would create a risk of adjudications with respect to individual members of the class which may, as a practical matter, be dispositive of the interests of the other members not parties to the adjudications, or may substantially impair or impede their ability to protect their interests.
- 17. Plaintiffs' counsel is experienced and capable in the field of FLSA and labor/employment litigation and has successfully represented thousands of claimants in other litigation of this nature.
- 18. Plaintiffs' counsel will conduct and be responsible for Plaintiffs' case herein. David E. Mastagni, Isaac Stevens, Tashayla D. Billington, and Joel Weinstein, who will be primarily responsible for litigating this matter, have represented thousands of employees pursuing wage and hour claims throughout the State of California, and have recovered significant sums on their behalf.
- 19. This action is appropriate for conditional certification as a collective action because Defendant subjected Plaintiffs, and the class of putative plaintiffs they seek to represent, to the same uniform practice of excluding certain remunerations from the "regular rate" of pay used to calculate their overtime compensation, including but not limited to: cash in lieu of health benefits, contributions made towards the purchase of health benefits, holiday in lieu compensation, paramedic certification pay, as well as other payments made pursuant to the applicable collective bargaining agreements.
- 20. This factual nexus is sufficient to justify the Court to exercise its discretion to ensure that accurate and timely notice is given to all similarly situated

1 current and former non-exempt employees of Defendant so that they may make an informed decision about whether or not to join this action. V. 3 **FACTUAL ASSERTIONS** 4 Plaintiffs are, or were, employed by the Defendant within the last three (3) 5 21. 6 years. 22. At all times relevant hereto, Defendant suffered or permitted Plaintiffs and 7 8 other similarly situated individuals to work hours beyond statutory 9 thresholds for overtime compensation required by the FLSA. 10 23. At all times relevant hereto, Defendant impermissibly excluded certain 11 remunerations or undervalued the "regular rate" of pay, upon which all forms of Plaintiffs' overtime compensation are based. 12 24. Pursuant to 29 U.S.C. section 207(e), the "regular rate" must include all 13 remuneration received by an employee unless it is explicitly excluded. The 14 15 burden is on an employer to demonstrate that a payment is excludable from 16 the regular rate. (Madison v. Resources for Human Development 233 F.3d 17 175, 187 (3rd. Cir. 2000).) 18 25. Defendant's past and current practice of computing Plaintiffs' overtime has 19 impermissibly reduced the amount being paid to them by failing to include 20 all statutorily required amounts into the calculation of their "regular rate" of 21 pay as defined by 29 U.S.C. section 207(e). 22 Defendant failed to include monetary compensation paid to Plaintiffs and 23 other similarly situated individuals in lieu of Defendant-provided health insurance in the "regular rate" used to calculate overtime compensation. 24 25 27. For example, as part of the compensation Defendant offered to Plaintiffs and 26 other similarly situated individuals, it paid monetary compensation to 27 individuals who opted out of Defendant-provided health benefits coverage. 28

- 28. At all times relevant hereto, Defendant placed no condition on use of these in-lieu payments.
- 29. Also, as part of the compensation it provided Plaintiffs, Defendant made contributions on behalf of Plaintiffs and other similarly situated individuals towards the purchase of health benefits.
- 30. In calculating the "regular rate" for the purposes of overtime compensation, Defendant excluded certain remunerations it paid Plaintiffs and similarly situated individuals, including but not limited to: cash payments in lieu of health benefits, contributions made towards the purchase of health benefits, holiday in lieu compensation, paramedic certification pay, as well as other payments made pursuant to applicable collective bargaining agreements. Plaintiffs are informed and believe Defendant treated such payments made to similarly situated individuals in the same manner.
- 31. At all times relevant hereto, Defendant treated payments made to Plaintiffs in lieu of health benefits as wages for the purposes of applicable tax withholdings. Plaintiffs are informed and believe Defendant treated such payments made to similarly situated individuals in the same manner.
- 32. Pursuant to 29 U.S.C. section 207(e), Defendant is statutorily required to include all forms of remuneration in Plaintiffs' "regular rate" of pay.
- 33. 29 U.S.C. section 207(e)(2) does not allow Defendant to exclude from the "regular rate" monetary compensation paid to Plaintiffs and similarly situated individuals in lieu of contributions for health benefits or spending less than the allowance provided.
- 34. Similarly, 29 U.S.C. section 207(e)(4) only allows employers to exclude from the "regular rate" contributions they irrevocably make to a trustee or third person when made pursuant to a "bona fide plan" for providing health insurance benefits.

- 35. The Department of Labor's interpretation of the term "bona fide plan" is set forth in 29 C.F.R. section 778.215(a)(5), which states in part:
- 36. The plan must not give an employee the right to assign his benefits under the plan nor the option to receive any part of the employer's contributions in cash instead of the benefits under the plan: Provided, however, That if a plan otherwise qualified as a bona fide benefit plan under section 7(e)(4) of the Act, it will still be regarded as a bona fide plan even though it provides, as an incidental part thereof, for the payment to an employee in cash of all or a part of the amount standing to his credit.
- 37. In *Flores v. City of San Gabriel*, 824 F.3d 890 (9th Cir. 2016); cert. denied (2017) 137 S.Ct. 2117., the Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals held that payments to employees in lieu of health benefits were not excludable from the "regular rate" of pay under either 29 U.S.C. sections 207(e)(2) or (e)(4). With respect to the exclusion codified in 207(e)(2) and its companion federal regulation, the court noted "[u]nder § 778.224(a), a payment may not be excluded from the "regular rate" of pay pursuant to § 207(e)(2) if it is generally understood as compensation for work, even though the payment is not directly tied to specific hours worked by an employee." (*Id.*) Further, the court held that cash payments in lieu of health benefits are not excludable from the "regular rate" under 207(e)(4) because those payments were not made to a trustee or third party.
- 38. The court in *Flores*, *supra*, also held that when the total cash payments made directly to employees pursuant to a benefit plan are more than "incidental," the plan is not bona fide for the purposes of 29 U.S.C. section 207(e)(4) and 29 C.F.R. section 778.215. (*Id.* at 903.) Therefore, any contributions made on behalf of an employee towards the purchase of health benefits that are not made pursuant to a bona fide plan are required to be included in the calculation of the "regular rate".

- 39. On information and belief, Defendant's total cash payments made directly to employees in lieu of health insurance or benefits were more than "incidental" in each of the three (3) years preceding this action.
- 40. Defendant's health benefits plan is not bona fide for the purposes of 29 U.S.C. section 207(e)(4) and 29 C.F.R. section 778.215.
- 41. Defendant's payments made on behalf of Plaintiffs and other similarly situated individuals towards the purchase of health benefits were not made pursuant to a bona fide plan within the meaning of 29 U.S.C. section 207(e)(4) and 29 C.F.R. section 778.215.
- 42. Payments made on behalf of Plaintiffs and other similarly situated individuals towards the purchase of health benefits are required to be included in the calculation of their overtime compensation.
- 43. Defendant's payments made on behalf of Plaintiffs and other similarly situated individuals towards the purchase of health benefits were not included in any employees' regular rate for the purposes of determining overtime compensation.
- 44. Because the remunerations paid to Plaintiffs and similarly situated individuals in lieu of health benefits were not made for hours of non-work, or made pursuant to a bona fide benefit plan, they must be included in the "regular rate" of pay for determining overtime compensation as required by the FLSA.
- 45. At all times relevant hereto, Defendant, through pattern and practice on a district-wide basis, did not include the monetary compensation it provided directly to Plaintiffs and similarly situated individuals, in lieu of health benefits as well as for spending less than the monthly allowance provided, towards Defendant-provided health benefits coverage into the "regular rate" of pay for the purposes of determining overtime compensation as required by the FLSA.

- 46. Likewise, Plaintiffs are informed and believe, and based thereon allege, Defendant failed to include contributions it made on their behalf and on behalf of other similarly situated individuals toward the purchase of health benefits in the "regular rate" used to calculate their overtime compensation.
- 47. Plaintiffs and similarly situated individuals are not entitled to paid idle holidays. Rather, Defendant requires Plaintiffs and, on information and belief, similarly situated individuals to work their regularly assigned scheduled regardless of holidays. Under the MOU governing the employment of firefighters, engineers, and fire captains, Plaintiffs and similarly situated individuals are paid compensation in lieu of observing holidays. Plaintiffs and, on information and belief, similarly situated individuals are not allowed to use this holiday in lieu compensation as leave. These holiday in lieu payments did not fluctuate with the working hours of Plaintiffs and, on information and belief, similarly situated individuals.
- 48. Defendant excluded Plaintiffs' holiday in lieu pay from their respective "regular rate" used to calculated their overtime. On information and belief, Defendant excluded holiday in lieu pay from the "regular rate" used to calculate overtime for all similarly situated individuals.
- 49. 29 C.F.R. 778.218(b) prohibits an employer from using 29 U.S.C. section 207(e)(2) to exclude payments from the "regular rate" that are made for regularly scheduled days of rest or in addition to compensation for working on other days or not due to holidays.
- 50. Defendant also provided additional incentive payments to Plaintiffs pursuant to the applicable collective bargaining agreement, including, but not limited to paramedic certification pay.
- 51. Defendant, through pattern and practice, did not include these additional incentive payments it made pursuant to the applicable collective bargaining agreement into the calculation of Plaintiffs' respective "regular rate" of pay

for the purposes of determining overtime compensation as required by the FLSA. Further, on information and belief, Defendant did not include incentive payments provided by the applicable collective bargaining agreements into the "regular rate" of pay of similarly situated individuals for the purposes of determining overtime compensation as required by the FLSA.

- 52. By excluding certain items of remuneration from the "regular rate" of pay used to calculate the overtime compensation paid to Plaintiffs and other similarly situated individuals, including but not limited to cash in-lieu of health benefits, contributions towards the purchase of health benefits, holiday in lieu compensation, paramedic certification pay, as well as other payments provided by the applicable collective bargaining agreements, Defendant failed to pay them one and one-half times their "regular rate" of pay for all hours of overtime they worked.
- 53. At all times relevant hereto, Defendant and its agents and representatives were aware of their obligations to properly compute and use the correct "regular rate" of pay in calculating overtime compensation owed to Plaintiffs and similarly situated individuals.
- 54. Plaintiffs are informed and believe, and based thereon allege, Defendant and its agents and/or representatives willfully and knowingly violated the FLSA by continuing to exclude remunerations from the calculation of Plaintiffs' and similarly situated individuals' "regular rate" of pay.
- 55. Defendant's failure to properly compensate Plaintiffs and similarly situated individuals was not in good faith and is a willful violation of the FLSA as it applies to employees of local governments.
- 56. As a result of the foregoing violations of the FLSA alleged herein, Plaintiffs seek damages for lost overtime compensation as well as liquidated damages thereon. Plaintiffs seek these damages for the entire period of time

1		Defendant engaged in said unlawful and willful conduct, beginning three
2		years prior to the filing of this complaint as prescribed by the FLSA.
3	57.	Plaintiffs also seek reasonable attorney fees and costs pursuant to 29 U.S.C.
4		section 216(b).
5		VI.
6		FIRST COUNT
7		(Fair Labor Standards Act - Failure to Pay All Overtime
8		Compensation Earned)
9	63.	Plaintiffs incorporate by reference each and every paragraph above inclusive
10		as though set forth fully herein.
11	64.	Defendant suffered or permitted Plaintiffs and, on information and belief,
12		other similarly situated individuals to work overtime but failed to include all
13		required forms of compensation into the "regular rate" of pay used to
14		calculate their overtime compensation.
15	65.	By failing to include all requisite forms of compensation in the "regular rate"
16		of pay used to calculate overtime compensation, Defendant failed to
17		compensate Plaintiffs and similarly situated individuals at one and one-half
18		times the "regular rate" of pay for all overtime hours as required by the
19		FLSA.
20	66.	At all times relevant hereto, Defendant and its agents and representatives
21		were aware of their obligations to pay Plaintiffs and similarly situated
22		individuals for all hours worked at one and half times the "regular rate" of
23		pay as required by the FLSA.
24	67.	At all times relevant hereto, Defendant and its agents and representatives
25		knew or should have known of their obligations to pay Plaintiffs and
26		similarly situated individuals overtime compensation at one and one-half of
27		their "regular rate" of pay for all hours worked in excess of the applicable
28		maximum weekly hours established by section 207 of the FLSA.
	Com	plaint for Violations of the Fair 12 Mike Aboumrad et al., v. Borrego

For an order to timely notify all potential collective class members of 7. this action; For such other and further relief as the court deems just and proper. 8. Respectfully submitted, Dated: May 18, 2020 MASTAGNI HOLSTEDT, A.P.C. By: /s/ David E. Mastagni DAVID E. MASTAGNI, Esq. ISAAC S. STEVENS, Esq. TASHAYLA D. BILLINGTON, Esq. JOEL M. WEINSTEIN, Esq.

JS 44 (Rev. 06/17)

CIVIL COVER SHEET

The JS 44 civil cover sheet and the information contained herein neither replace nor supplement the filing and service of pleadings or other papers as required by law, except as provided by local rules of court. This form, approved by the Judicial Conference of the United States in September 1974, is required for the use of the Clerk of Court for the purpose of initiating the civil docket sheet. (SEE INSTRUCTIONS ON NEXT PAGE OF THIS FORM.)

I. (a) PLAINTIFFS				DEFENDA	NTS						
MIKE ABOUMRAD et al	•1		BORREGO SPRINGS FIRE PROTECTION DISTRICT								
(b) County of Residence (E	***************************************	County of Residence of First Listed Defendant San Diego (IN U.S. PLAINTIFF CASES ONLY) NOTE: IN LAND CONDEMNATION CASES, USE THE LOCATION OF THE TRACT OF LAND INVOLVED. Attorneys (If Known)									
(c) Attorneys (Firm Name,											
David E. Mastagni, Mast 1912 "I" Street, Sacrame	•	446-4692						'200	CV0933 L	. k	(SC
II. BASIS OF JURISD	ICTION (Place an "X" in C	ne Box Only)	III. CI	TIZENSHIP C)F PR	INCL	PAL PA	RTIES	(Place an "X" in	One Box	for Plaintif
□ 1 U.S. Government Plaintiff	■ 3 Federal Question (U.S. Government)	Not a Party)		(For Diversity Cases (Only) PTF	e DEI	7 1 Incorpo		and One Box j		
2 U.S. Government Defendant	1 4 Diversity (Indicate Citizensh	ip of Parties in Item III)	Citize	en of Another State	O 2	2 0			Principal Place Another State	5	□ 5
				en or Subject of a reign Country	O 3	3 0	3 Foreign	Nation		D 6	5 6
IV. NATURE OF SUIT									of Suit Code D		
□ 110 Insurance □ 120 Marine □ 130 Miller Act □ 140 Negotiable Instrument □ 150 Recovery of Overpayment & Enforcement of Judgment □ 151 Medicare Act □ 152 Recovery of Defaulted Student Loans (Excludes Veterans) □ 153 Recovery of Overpayment of Veteran's Benefits □ 160 Stockholders' Suits □ 190 Other Contract □ 195 Contract Product Liability □ 196 Franchise □ 210 Land Condemnation □ 220 Foreclosure □ 230 Rent Lease & Ejectment □ 240 Torts to Land □ 245 Tort Product Liability □ 290 All Other Real Property	PERSONAL INJURY 310 Airplane 315 Airplane Product Liability 320 Assault, Libel & Slander 330 Federal Employers' Liability 340 Marine 345 Marine Product Liability 350 Motor Vehicle 355 Motor Vehicle Product Liability 360 Other Personal Injury 362 Personal Injury Medical Malpractice CIVIL RIGHTS 440 Other Civil Rights 441 Voting 442 Employment 443 Housing/ Accommodations 445 Amer. w/Disabilities - Employment 446 Amer. w/Disabilities - Other 448 Education	PERSONAL INJUR 365 Personal Injury - Product Liability 367 Health Care/ Pharmaceutical Personal Injury Product Liability Personal Injury Product Liability PERSONAL PROPENTY 370 Other Fraud 371 Truth in Lending 380 Other Personal Property Damage 385 Property Damage Product Liability PRISONER PETITIO Habeas Corpus: 463 Alien Detainee 510 Motions to Vacate Sentence 530 General 535 Death Penalty Other: 540 Mandamus & Oth 550 Civil Rights 555 Prison Conditions of Confinement	1	DRFEITURE/PENAI 5 Drug Related Seizur of Property 21 USC 0 Other LABOR 0 Fair Labor Standard: Act 0 Labor/Management Relations 0 Railway Labor Act 1 Family and Medical Leave Act 0 Other Labor Litigation 1 Employee Retiremer Income Security Act IMMIGRATION 2 Naturalization Appli 5 Other Immigration Actions	s 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	BANKRUPTCY □ 422 Appeal 28 USC 158 □ 423 Withdrawal 28 USC 157 PROPERTY RIGHTS □ 820 Copyrights □ 830 Patent □ 835 Patent - Abbreviated New Drug Application □ 840 Trademark SOCIAL SECURITY □ 861 HIA (1395ff) □ 862 Black Lung (923) □ 863 DIWC/DIWW (405(g)) □ 864 SSID Title XVI □ 865 RSI (405(g)) FEDERAL TAX SUITS □ 870 Taxes (U.S. Plaintiff or Defendant) □ 871 IRS—Third Party 26 USC 7609			OTHER STATUTES 375 False Claims Act 376 Qui Tam (31 USC 3729(a)) 400 State Reapportionment 410 Antitrust 430 Banks and Banking 450 Commerce 460 Deportation 470 Racketeer Influenced and Corrupt Organizations 480 Consumer Credit 490 Cable/Sat TV 850 Securities/Commodities/ Exchange 890 Other Statutory Actions 891 Agricultural Acts 893 Environmental Matters 895 Freedom of Information Act 896 Arbitration 899 Administrative Procedure Act/Review or Appeal of Agency Decision 950 Constitutionality of State Statutes		
X 1 Original □ 2 Rea	moved from	Remanded from CAppellate Court tute under which you at	J 4 Reins Reop	ened A	nother I pecify)	District	I	Multidistr Litigation Transfer	-	Multidis Litigatio Direct Fi	n -
VI. CAUSE OF ACTIO	ON 29 U.S.C. §§ 201 Brief description of ca	, et seq. use:						nd liquid	lated damag	es	
VII. REQUESTED IN COMPLAINT:	, DI	ther compensation, interest thereon and liquidated dama DEMAND S CHECK YES only if demanded To be proven JURY DEMAND: Yes							nt:		
VIII. RELATED CASE IF ANY	(See instructions):	JUDGE				_DOCI	KET NUMI	BER		······································	
DATE 5/18/20 FOR OFFICE USE ONLY		SIGNATURE OF AT	TORNEY O	F RECORD							
	MOUNT	APPLYING IFP		JUDO	ЗE		N	ИАG. JUD	GE		

JS 44 Reverse (Rev. 06/17)

INSTRUCTIONS FOR ATTORNEYS COMPLETING CIVIL COVER SHEET FORM JS 44

Authority For Civil Cover Sheet

The JS 44 civil cover sheet and the information contained herein neither replaces nor supplements the filings and service of pleading or other papers as required by law, except as provided by local rules of court. This form, approved by the Judicial Conference of the United States in September 1974, is required for the use of the Clerk of Court for the purpose of initiating the civil docket sheet. Consequently, a civil cover sheet is submitted to the Clerk of Court for each civil complaint filed. The attorney filing a case should complete the form as follows:

- **I.(a)** Plaintiffs-Defendants. Enter names (last, first, middle initial) of plaintiff and defendant. If the plaintiff or defendant is a government agency, use only the full name or standard abbreviations. If the plaintiff or defendant is an official within a government agency, identify first the agency and then the official, giving both name and title.
 - (b) County of Residence. For each civil case filed, except U.S. plaintiff cases, enter the name of the county where the first listed plaintiff resides at the time of filing. In U.S. plaintiff cases, enter the name of the county in which the first listed defendant resides at the time of filing. (NOTE: In land condemnation cases, the county of residence of the "defendant" is the location of the tract of land involved.)
 - (c) Attorneys. Enter the firm name, address, telephone number, and attorney of record. If there are several attorneys, list them on an attachment, noting in this section "(see attachment)".
- II. Jurisdiction. The basis of jurisdiction is set forth under Rule 8(a), F.R.Cv.P., which requires that jurisdictions be shown in pleadings. Place an "X" in one of the boxes. If there is more than one basis of jurisdiction, precedence is given in the order shown below.
 United States plaintiff. (1) Jurisdiction based on 28 U.S.C. 1345 and 1348. Suits by agencies and officers of the United States are included here.
 United States defendant. (2) When the plaintiff is suing the United States, its officers or agencies, place an "X" in this box.
 Federal question. (3) This refers to suits under 28 U.S.C. 1331, where jurisdiction arises under the Constitution of the United States, an amendment to the Constitution, an act of Congress or a treaty of the United States. In cases where the U.S. is a party, the U.S. plaintiff or defendant code takes precedence, and box 1 or 2 should be marked.
 Diversity of citizenship. (4) This refers to suits under 28 U.S.C. 1332, where parties are citizens of different states. When Box 4 is checked, the citizenship of the different parties must be checked. (See Section III below; NOTE: federal question actions take precedence over diversity cases.)
- III. Residence (citizenship) of Principal Parties. This section of the JS 44 is to be completed if diversity of citizenship was indicated above. Mark this section for each principal party.
- IV. Nature of Suit. Place an "X" in the appropriate box. If there are multiple nature of suit codes associated with the case, pick the nature of suit code that is most applicable. Click here for: Nature of Suit Code Descriptions.
- V. Origin. Place an "X" in one of the seven boxes.
 - Original Proceedings. (1) Cases which originate in the United States district courts.

Removed from State Court. (2) Proceedings initiated in state courts may be removed to the district courts under Title 28 U.S.C., Section 1441. When the petition for removal is granted, check this box.

Remanded from Appellate Court. (3) Check this box for cases remanded to the district court for further action. Use the date of remand as the filing date

Reinstated or Reopened. (4) Check this box for cases reinstated or reopened in the district court. Use the reopening date as the filing date. Transferred from Another District. (5) For cases transferred under Title 28 U.S.C. Section 1404(a). Do not use this for within district transfers or multidistrict litigation transfers.

Multidistrict Litigation – Transfer. (6) Check this box when a multidistrict case is transferred into the district under authority of Title 28 U.S.C. Section 1407.

Multidistrict Litigation – Direct File. (8) Check this box when a multidistrict case is filed in the same district as the Master MDL docket.

PLEASE NOTE THAT THERE IS NOT AN ORIGIN CODE 7. Origin Code 7 was used for historical records and is no longer relevant due to changes in statue.

- VI. Cause of Action. Report the civil statute directly related to the cause of action and give a brief description of the cause. Do not cite jurisdictional statutes unless diversity. Example: U.S. Civil Statute: 47 USC 553 Brief Description: Unauthorized reception of cable service
- VII. Requested in Complaint. Class Action. Place an "X" in this box if you are filing a class action under Rule 23, F.R.Cv.P. Demand. In this space enter the actual dollar amount being demanded or indicate other demand, such as a preliminary injunction. Jury Demand. Check the appropriate box to indicate whether or not a jury is being demanded.
- VIII. Related Cases. This section of the JS 44 is used to reference related pending cases, if any. If there are related pending cases, insert the docket numbers and the corresponding judge names for such cases.

Date and Attorney Signature. Date and sign the civil cover sheet.