	Case 2:21 av 00491 CDR Desument 1 Filed 02/22	21 Dage 1 of 14	
	Case 2:21-cv-00481-CDB Document 1 Filed 03/22	21 Page 1 01 14	
1	Todd C. Werts, Ariz. Bar No. 35380		
1	LEAR WERTS LLP		
2	103 Ripley Street		
3	Columbia, MO 65201 Telephone: 573-875-1991		
4	Facsimile: 573-279-0024		
5	Email: werts@learwerts.com Attorneys for Plaintiffs		
6	In the United States District Court		
7			
8	Phoenix Division		
9	Kathy Arrison and Tristan Smith, individually, and		
10	on behalf of a Class of others similarly situated,	Case No.	
11	Plaintiffs,	Case No.	
12	V.	Jury Trial Demanded	
13	Walmart, Inc. and Wal-Mart Associates, Inc.,	Class Action	
13	Defendants.		
15	COMPLAINT		
16	Plaintiffs Kathy Arrison and Tristan Smith, individually and on behalf of		
17	others similarly situated (collectively, Plaintins ), by and through their		
18	undersigned counsel, for their complaint against Defendants Walmart, Inc. and Wal-		
19	Mart Associates, Inc. (collectively, "Walmart"), hereby state as follows:		
20	1. In the Spring of 2020, Walmart implemented a company-wide policy		
21	requiring its workers to undergo a mandatory COVID-19 screening each shift.		
22	Workers were instructed to arrive before their scheduled shift to complete the		
23	requisite questionnaire, screening, and body temperature scan.		
24	2. Walmart's workers continue to work through the pandemic. And they		
25	put in the time necessary to comply with Walmart's COVID-19 policies so that the		
26	put in the time necessary to comply with walliarts		

company's stores can remain in operation. But Walmart does not pay these employees for the time that the company requires of them. As a result, Walmart is unjustly enriched at the expense of its workers.

27

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

23

24

25

3. This lawsuit is brought as a Rule 23 class action under Arizona law to recover compensation owed to Plaintiffs and other similarly situated Walmart employees in the State of Arizona.

# JURISDICTION AND VENUE

This Court has subject matter jurisdiction over this controversy under 4. 28 U.S.C. § 1332(d) as this case alleges a class action claim in which the matter in controversy exceeds \$5,000,000 and most of the class members are citizens of a state different than the citizenship of the defendants.

9 Venue in this district is proper pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1391(b) and (c), 5. 10 because Walmart is deemed a resident of the District of Arizona as it is subject to 11 personal jurisdiction in this District. Venue in this division of the District of Arizona 12 is proper because Walmart maintains multiple stores in the Phoenix Division of this 13 Court and a substantial part of the events giving rise to this claim occurred in the 14 Phoenix Division of this Court.

## PARTIES

6. Defendant Walmart Inc. f/k/a Wal-Mart Stores, Inc. is a Delaware corporation with its principal place of business located at 702 SW 8th Street, Bentonville, Arkansas 72716. Walmart Inc. is a citizen of Delaware and Arkansas.

7. Defendant Wal-Mart Associates, Inc. is a Delaware corporation with its principal place of business located at 702 SW 8th Street, Bentonville, Arkansas 72716. Wal-Mart Associates, Inc. is a citizen of Delaware and Arkansas. 22

Plaintiff Kathy Arrison is a resident and citizen of the State of Arizona 8. and was employed as an hourly retail associate by Walmart at the Walmart store on Northsight Boulevard in Scottsdale, Arizona from February 2019 to November 2020.

9. Plaintiff Tristan Smith is a resident and citizen of the State of Arizona 26 and was employed by Walmart as an hourly retail associate at the Walmart store on 27 McKellips Road in Mesa, Arizona since December 2019. 28

GENERAL ALLEGATIONS

10. At last count, Walmart employed 33,618 workers in Arizona. *See* https://corporate.walmart.com/our-story/locations/united-states/arizona (last accessed Mar. 19, 2021).

4 5

6

7

1

2

3

11. The average wage for Walmart's workers in Arizona is \$14.63. *Id.* 

12. Walmart's footprint in Arizona consists of 84 Supercenters, 2 discount stores, 26 Neighborhood Markets, and 12 Sam's Clubs. *Id.* 

8 13. Following the outbreak of the COVID-19 pandemic, Walmart
9 implemented a company-wide policy requiring each of its hourly, non-exempt
10 employees to undergo a physical and medical examination to check for symptoms of
11 COVID-19 each shift. The examination was conducted on the premises of Walmart,
12 was required by Walmart, and was necessary for each employee to perform his/her
13 work for Walmart.

14. Walmart did not pay its employees for the time spent undergoing these
required COVID-19 screenings.

1615. Plaintiff Kathy Arrison worked for Walmart as an hourly, non-exempt17employee. She was paid approximately \$13.50 to \$14.50 per hour during this time.

18 16. Plaintiff Tristan Smith worked for Walmart as an hourly, non-exempt
employee. He was paid \$12.90 per hour.

17. Starting in or about April 2020, Walmart required, and continues to
 require, its employees to arrive at its retail stores and fulfillment centers prior to the
 start of their scheduled shifts to participate in mandatory COVID-19 screening.

18. The screening process typically involves standing in a line with the other workers arriving for the beginning of the scheduled shift and waiting for the sole person designated by Walmart to take the temperature of each employee whose shift is about to start and then ask a series of questions related to each employees' health condition, such as whether they had trouble breathing, were coughing, had a runny nose, chest pain, and other questions regarding their health.

#### Case 2:21-cv-00481-CDB Document 1 Filed 03/22/21 Page 4 of 14

1

2

3

4

5

6

They were also asked questions such as whether the employee has travelled recently, whether the employee was exposed to someone with COVID-19, and other similar questions. If an employee passes the examination, the employee is also given a face mask and gloves that he/she must put on before entering the store. After entering the store, the employee then typically must walk to the opposite end of the store where the time clocks are located and is then allowed to clock-in for the day.

19. If an employee does not pass the initial examination, that employee is 7 sent to a second examination. The employee is then asked a series of follow-up 8 questions to identify whether the worker currently has symptoms of COVID-19 and 9 poses a potential health hazard to the store and its customers. If the employee 10 passes the second examination, the employee is then given a face mask and gloves 11 and permitted to enter the store and eventually clock-in for the day. If not, the 12 employee is not permitted to continuing working that day and is not permitted to 13 clock in. 14

1520.Walmart employees, including Ms. Arrison and Mr. Smith, are not16allowed to clock-in until after they undergo the mandatory COVID-19 screening.

17 21. Walmart's managers and supervisors instructed their employees, 18 including Ms. Arrison and Mr. Smith, to arrive several minutes prior to their 19 scheduled shift in order to have enough time to wait in line, complete the required 20 screening, enter the store, and still clock-in at or just before the employees' 21 scheduled shift. Employees were subjected to, and received, discipline under 22 Walmart's attendance policy if they were unable to clock-in on-time regardless of 23 the required COVID-19 screening.

22. Regardless of how long the employee had been on-site for the COVID19 screening, Walmart employees were not allowed to clock-in sooner than
approximately eight (8) minutes before their scheduled shift.

27 23. The amount of time it takes to wait in line and undergo the COVID-19
28 examination is approximately 10 minutes to 15 minutes on average. This amount of

time could be longer depending on the number of other Walmart employees in line for the COVID-19 screening.

24. The time spent by Walmart's employees arriving early to wait in line and then undergo the COVID-19 screening should have been paid by Walmart because it constitutes compensable time worked. During this time, Plaintiffs were subject to the control of Walmart.

25. Plaintiffs were required to follow Walmart's instructions while awaiting, and during, the COVID-19 screening. Walmart required every employee to complete the COVID-19 screening; it was not optional. Indeed, Plaintiffs faced the threat of discipline, including possible termination, if they failed to comply.

Additionally, Plaintiffs were confined to the premises of Walmart when
they waited for the examination, during the examination, and were not permitted to
leave the premises after the examination before being permitted to clock in.

Moreover, Walmart compels its employees to perform specific tasks
during the examination. They must answer questions, submit to having their
temperature taken, and wear masks and gloves.

17 28. In other words, Walmart directs, commands, and restrains its
18 employees during the COVID-19 examination process, preventing them from using
19 that time effectively for their own purposes.

29. The COVID-19 screenings were also necessary to the principal work
performed by Plaintiffs and were necessary to ensure a safe environment for
Walmart's customers. The COVID-19 examinations were undertaken on Walmart's
premises primarily for the benefit of Walmart.

30. The COVID-19 examinations are intended to ensure that the virus does
not infect Walmart's workers or customers. If Walmart did not have the COVID-19
screening, workers could unintentionally bring the virus into the Walmart facilities
causing a mass breakout of the virus infecting hundreds to thousands of other

28

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

workers and customers of Walmart. Thus, the examinations were necessary to ensure that the virus did not disrupt Walmart's business operations.

31. The job duties of all Walmart hourly employees involve interaction with the public, as explained by Walmart in its own job descriptions:

Stocking and Unloading: "Stocking, backroom, & receiving a) associates work to ensure customers can find all of the items they have on their shopping list. Depending on the shift you work, your job could include moving inventory in the backroom, unloading trucks, or helping customers stocking while shelves." Walmart Careers, Stocking & Unloadina. https://careers.walmart.com/us/jobs/SU101627565CP-stocking-unloading (last accessed Mar. 19, 2021).

 b) Food & Grocery: "Duties and Responsibilities – Help customers find the products they are looking for." Walmart Careers, *Food & Grocery*, https://careers.walmart.com/us/jobs/FG101607675CP-food-grocery (last accessed Mar. 19, 2021).

c) Cashier & Front End Services: "You might be the first, last, and sometimes only associate that customers interact with. That's why it's so important to smile, greet, and thank each and every customer." Walmart Careers, *Cashier & Front End Services*, https://careers.walmart.com/us/jobs/
 FE101604359CP-cashier-front-end-services (last accessed Mar. 19, 2021).

d) Auto Care Center: "Duties and Responsibilities – Ensure customers have a great first and last impression." Walmart Careers, *Auto Care Center*, https://careers.walmart.com/us/jobs/VCC101601043CP-auto-care-center (last accessed Mar. 19, 2021).

e) Fuel Station: "Duties and Responsibilities – Acknowledge and greet customers with a smile." Walmart Careers, *Fuel Station*, https://careers.walmart.com/us/jobs/FS101610985CP-fuel-station (last accessed Mar. 19, 2021).

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

f) General Merchandise: "Duties and Responsibilities – ... Smile, greet, and thank customers with a positive attitude." Walmart Careers, *General Merchandise*, https://careers.walmart.com/us/jobs/GM101614301CP-general-merchandise (last accessed Mar. 19, 2021).

g) Online Orderfilling and Delivery: Duties and Responsibilities –
Acknowledge and greet customers with a smile[;] [a]nswer customer questions." Walmart Careers, Online Orderfilling and Delivery, https://careers.walmart.com/us/jobs/OOD101624249CP-online-orderfilling-and-delivery (last accessed Mar. 19, 2021).

32. As a result, the COVID-19 screenings were integral and indispensable
to the principal activity and primary job duty performed by Plaintiffs: to serve and
assist Walmart customers.

33. Walmart knew or should have known that its employees should be
paid for the time they were required to arrive early and participate in the
mandatory COVID-19 screenings.

1634. Arizona statutes provide that "Hours worked' includes all time an17employee is employed." Ariz. Rev. Stat. § 23-350.4

35. Courts have recognized that "hours worked' is defined under Arizona 18 law as 'all hours for which an employee covered under the Act is employed and 19 required to give the employer, including *all time during which an employee is on duty* 20 or at a prescribed work place and all time the employee is suffered or permitted to 21 work."" In re Amazon.Com, Inc. Fulfillment Ctr. Fair Labor Standards Act (FLSA) & 22 *Wage & Hour Litig.*, 905 F.3d 387, 404–05 (6th Cir. 2018) (quoting Ariz. Admin. Code 23 R.20-5-1202(9)); accord Roberts v. State, \_\_\_ P.3d \_\_\_, 2021 WL 786615, at \*5 (Ariz. 24 Ct. App. Mar. 2, 2021) (recognizing the quoted regulation applies "to wage claims by 25 private employees"). 26

36. Further, courts have recognized that "'on duty,' means 'time spent working or waiting that the employer controls and that the employee is not

permitted to use for the employee's own purpose.<sup>'''</sup> *In re Amazon.com FLSA Litig.*, 905 F.3d at 404–405 (quoting Ariz. Admin. Code R.20-5-1202(12)); *accord Roberts*, 2021 WL 786615, at \*5.

37. Arizona's regulations are consistent with those of the United States 4 Department of Labor. See Substantive Policy Statement Regarding Interpretation of 5 "Hours Worked" for Purposes of the Arizona Minimum Wage Act (Ariz. Ind. Comm'n 6 Aug. 16, 2007) https://www.azica.gov/sites/default/files/Minimum%2520Wage 7 %2520-%2520Hours%2520Worked.pdf (last accessed Mar. 19, 2021) (explaining 8 "the Industrial Commission of Arizona will be guided by and rely upon 29 CFR Part 9 785"). The U.S. DOL has issued regulations and opinion letters stating that 10 examinations, like the COVID-19 screenings at issue here, constitute time that 11 should be paid for by employers. See 29 CFR § 785.43; DOL Wage and Hour Opinion 12 Letter, 1998 WL 852652 (Jan. 26, 1998) ("Generally, whenever an employer 13 imposes special requirements or conditions that an employee must meet before 14 commencing or continuing productive work, the time spent in fulfilling such special 15 conditions is regarded as indispensable to the performance of the principal activity 16 the employee is hired to perform."). 17

38. Walmart has demonstrated its knowledge that the time spent in the 18 COVID-19 screenings should be compensated in that in or about November 2020, 19 Walmart began adding an additional 5 minutes to each employee's daily recorded 20 time to partially compensate for the screenings. This 5-minute addition is 21 insufficient to fully compensate the affected Walmart employees for the time 22 actually spent in the COVID-19 screenings. Further, no effort was made by Walmart 23 to reimburse employees for any of the time they spent in COVID-19 screenings that 24 occurred prior to November 2020. 25

26

27

28

1

2

3

CLASS ACTION ALLEGATIONS

39. Plaintiffs bring this case as a class action pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 23 on her own behalf and as class representative on behalf of the following:

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

13

14

15

16

17

18

Persons who are currently working or previously worked for Walmart as an hourly employee in a Walmart facility in Arizona and participated in required pre-shift COVID-19 screenings.

40. This class numbers in the thousands of persons. As a result, joinder of all class members in a single action is impracticable. Class members may be informed of the pendency of this class action through a variety of means, including but not limited to, direct mail, email, jobsite posting, and website posting.

9 41. There are questions of fact and law common to the class that, under
10 Arizona state law, predominate over any questions affecting only individual
11 members. The questions of law and fact common to the class arising from
12 Walmart's actions include, without limitation, the following:

a) whether Walmart instituted a policy requiring its employees to arrive at the jobsite early for a pre-shift COVID screening;

b) whether Walmart paid for the time spent by its employees to comply with Walmart's COVID screening policy; and

c) whether Walmart was unjustly enriched by failing to pay its employees for that time.

42. The questions set forth above predominate over any questions
affecting only individual persons, and a class action is superior with respect to
considerations of consistency, economy, efficiency, fairness, and equity to other
available methods for the fair and efficient adjudication of the state law claims.

43. Plaintiffs' claims under Arizona state law are typical of those of the
class in that class members have been employed in the same or similar positions as
Plaintiffs and were subject to the same or similar practices as Plaintiffs.

44. A class action is the appropriate method for the fair and efficient
adjudication of this controversy. Walmart has acted or refused to act on grounds
generally applicable to the class. The presentation of separate actions by individual

class members could create a risk of inconsistent and varying adjudications, establish incompatible standards of conduct for Walmart, and/or substantially impair or impede the ability of class members to protect their interests.

45. Plaintiffs are adequate representatives of the Arizona class because they are members of the class and their interests do not conflict with the interests of the members of the class they seek to represent. The interests of the members of the class will be fairly and adequately protected by Plaintiffs and their undersigned counsel. Counsel are experienced in the litigation of civil matters, including the prosecution of complex wage and hour, employment, and class action cases.

46. Maintenance of this action as a class action is a fair and efficient
method for adjudication of this controversy. It would be impracticable and
undesirable for each member of the class who suffered harm to bring a separate
action. In addition, the maintenance of separate actions would place a substantial
and unnecessary burden on the courts and could result in inconsistent
adjudications, while a single class action can determine, with judicial economy, the
rights of all class members.

## COUNT I ARIZONA WAGE LAW

47. Plaintiffs re-allege the allegations set forth above in paragraphs 1–46.

48. Walmart's failure to pay the correct amount of hourly wages permits a
civil suit to recover treble the amount of wages due to Plaintiffs under Ariz. Rev.
Stat. §§23-351 and 23-355.

49. Plaintiffs only seek unpaid hourly wages. Plaintiffs do not seek under
this Count premium pay based on the fact that they worked more than 40 hours in
any given workweek.

26 WHEREFORE, Plaintiffs demand judgment against Walmart and pray this
27 Court:

28

17

18

19

1

2

a. certify the claim set forth above as a class action pursuant to Rule 23 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure;

b. award Plaintiffs Kathy Arrison, Tristan Smith, and all similarly situated employees damages in an amount that is treble the amount of unpaid wages pursuant to Ariz. Rev. Stat. § 23-355;

c. award Plaintiffs Kathy Arrison, Tristan Smith, and all similarly situated employees pre-judgment and post-judgment interest as provided by law; and

award Plaintiffs Kathy Arrison, Tristan Smith, and all similarly situated
 employees such other relief as the Court deems fair and equitable.

# 10 11

12

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

### COUNT II RECORD KEEPING VIOLATION

50. Plaintiffs re-allege the allegations set forth above in paragraphs 1–46.

13 51. Ariz. Rev. Stat. § 23-364 permits a private party to bring a civil action
14 for violation of the record keeping requirements of Ariz. Admin. Code § R20-5-1210,
15 *et seq.*

16 52. Walmart has violated and continues to violate Arizona's record keeping
17 requirements by failing to keep timecards for each of its hourly employees that
18 record the correct daily starting and stopping time for each individual employee, the
19 actual hours worked each workday, and the total hours worked each workweek.

20 53. Walmart's above-described violation of Arizona's record keeping
21 requirements was willful, in that it acted with reckless disregard of the law.

54. As a result, Walmart is liable to its Arizona employees for civil penalties
in the amount of at least \$250 for the first violation and at least \$1,000 for each
subsequent violation.

WHEREFORE, Plaintiffs demand judgment against Walmart and pray thisCourt:

a. certify the claim set forth above as a class action pursuant to Rule 23 of
the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure;

b. award Plaintiffs Kathy Arrison, Tristan Smith, and all similarly situated 1 employees civil penalties in the amount of at least \$250 for the first violation and at 2 least \$1,000 for each subsequent violation; 3 C. award Plaintiffs Kathy Arrison, Tristan Smith, and all similarly situated 4 employees pre-judgment and post-judgment interest as provided by law; 5 d. award Plaintiffs Kathy Arrison, Tristan Smith, and all similarly situated 6 employees reasonable attorney's fees and costs of suit; and 7 award Plaintiffs Kathy Arrison, Tristan Smith, and all similarly situated e. 8 employees such other relief as the Court deems fair and equitable. 9 10 COUNT III 11 **UNJUST ENRICHMENT / QUANTUM MERUIT** 12 55. Plaintiffs re-allege the allegations set forth above in paragraphs 1–46. 13 Walmart has benefited from the labor Plaintiffs have expended 56. 14 participating in Walmart's mandated COVID-19 screenings without paying its 15 employees for all of the time spent arriving early to their assigned shifts in order to 16 complete the mandated COVID-19 screening. 17 Walmart has been enriched by not paying its employees for all time its 57. 18 employees were at their prescribed place of work in order to complete COVID-19 19 screenings before the beginning of their scheduled shifts. 20 58. Plaintiffs have been impoverished by Walmart's failure to pay its 21 employees for all time its employees were at their prescribed place of work in order 22 to complete COVID-19 screenings before the beginning of their scheduled shifts. 23 59. As described above, there is a connection between Walmart's 24 enrichment and Plaintiffs' impoverishment because of Walmart's failure to pay its 25 employees for all time its employees were at their prescribed place of work in order 26 to complete COVID-19 screenings before the beginning of their scheduled shifts. 27 28

60. Walmart was aware or should have been aware that it was receiving the benefit of this unpaid work at the time the work was being performed and accepted and retained that benefit without paying fair compensation for the same.

3 4

5

6

7

8

9

23

24

25

26

27

28

1

2

61. Walmart's acceptance and retention of the benefit of the employees' unpaid labor was unjust and inequitable and resulted in Walmart being unjustly enriched.

62. There is no justification for Walmart to have failed to pay its employeesfor all time its employees at their prescribed place of work in order to completeCOVID-19 screenings before the beginning of their scheduled shifts.

63. Plaintiffs recognize they may not double-recover for their unpaid
wages. Accordingly, should Plaintiffs prevail on Count I herein for all wages and
damages claimed, then they would not be entitled to recover under this Count III.
However, should Plaintiffs not prevail on their Count I and recover for all wages and
damage claimed, then they will have had no legal remedy for their harm.

WHEREFORE, Plaintiffs demand judgment against Walmart and pray this
 Court:

a. certify the claim set forth above as a class action pursuant to Rule 23 of
 the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure;

19b. order Walmart to disgorge the value of its ill-gained benefits to20Plaintiffs Kathy Arrison, Tristan Smith, and all similarly situated employees;

c. award Plaintiffs Kathy Arrison, Tristan Smith, and all similarly situated
 employees pre-judgment and post-judgment interest as provided by law; and

d. award Plaintiffs Kathy Arrison, Tristan Smith, and all similarly situated employees such other relief as the Court deems fair and equitable.

	Case 2:21-cv-00481-CDB Document 1 Filed 03/22/21 Page 14 of 14	
1	DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL	
2	Plaintiffs hereby request a trial by jury of all issues so triable.	
3		
4	Respectfully submitted,	
5	LEAR WERTS LLP	
6		
7	/s/ Todd C. Werts	
-	Todd C. Werts, Ariz. Bar No. 35380 Bradford B. Lear, <i>pro hac vice forthcoming</i>	
8	Anthony J. Meyer, pro hac vice forthcoming	
9	103 Ripley Street	
10	Columbia, MO 65201 Telephone: 573-875-1991	
11	Facsimile: 573-279-0024	
12	Email: lear@learwerts.com	
13	Email: werts@learwerts.com	
	Email: meyer@learwerts.com	
14	Attorneys for Plaintiffs	
15		
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		
26		
27		
28		