

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF INDIANA  
SOUTH BEND DIVISION

----- )	
)	
In re FEDEX GROUND PACKAGE )	Cause No. 3:05-MD-527-RM
SYSTEM, INC., EMPLOYMENT )	(MDL 1700)
PRACTICES LITIGATION )	
)	
----- )	
THIS DOCUMENT RELATES TO: )	
)	
<i>Robert Gennell, Jr., et al. v. FedEx Ground</i> )	
<i>Package System, Inc.,</i> )	
Civil No. 3:05-cv-00534-RLM-CAN (NH) )	
----- )	

---

**THIRD AMENDED COMPLAINT  
(CLASS ACTION)**

---

Plaintiffs, on behalf of themselves and a Class of persons similarly situated, for their Third Amended Complaint against Defendant, state and allege as follows:

**PARTIES**

1. Plaintiffs, Robert Gennell, Jr., Kimball P. Rice, Donald Swazey, Gary Terrio, Lance Tucker, and Shane Tucker, on behalf of themselves and a class of similarly situated individuals, seek relief for the causes of action complained of herein which arise out of the same series of transactions and involve common questions of law and fact.

2. Plaintiffs are, or have been employed by the Defendant and have, as a result of the acts of Defendant complained of herein, been economically damaged by Defendant.

3. Defendant FedEx Ground Package System, Inc. ("FEG"), and its division, FedEx Home Delivery ("FHD") (hereinafter together referred to as "Defendant" or "Defendant"), is a Delaware corporation doing business as two national companies, affiliated with the Federal

Express Corporation. At all relevant times, Defendant was engaged in providing small package information, transportation and delivery services in the United States, including in the State of New Hampshire.

4. Defendant is qualified to, and does, transact business in the State of New Hampshire.

5. Defendant employs local package delivery drivers for FEG and FHD, all of whom, at FEG's and FHD's direction and control, perform package delivery to local businesses and residences.

#### **JURISDICTION AND VENUE**

6. Jurisdiction in this matter is based upon diversity of citizenship, as Defendant is a resident of the State of Delaware, and all Plaintiffs are residents of the State of New Hampshire, the amount in controversy is in excess of the statutory minimum, thus jurisdiction is based upon 28 U.S.C. 1332.

7. Venue herein is proper pursuant to the order of the Judicial Panel for Multidistrict Litigation transferring this action to this Court.

#### **INTRODUCTION**

8. The United States of America, and several States, have enacted laws and promulgated regulations intended to protect workers, employees and other persons from predatory, abusive and unfair business practices to which they may be exposed by their employers. Among these laws is the New Hampshire Workers Compensation Act, RSA §§281-A:1 et seq., which requires that employers provide workers compensation insurance (or that employers be permitted to self insure) for industrially-injured or ill employees. Additionally, the New Hampshire Unemployment Insurance Act, RSA §§282-A: et seq., provides certain safety

net benefits for “persons unemployed through no fault of their own.” Other laws, regulations and practices regulate the payment of wages and compensation, and the re-imbusement of business expenses by employees.

9. Employers may not avoid these obligations by pretending that their employees are “independent contractors,” and misclassifying them as such when, in fact, their workers are not independent contractors because they do not have the right to control the means and manner in which they perform their so-called “independent” contract, but, rather, are directed by their employer, in this case, the Defendant.

### **CLASS ACTION ALLEGATIONS**

10. This action is brought on behalf of a Class of persons currently and formerly employed by Defendant as employees within the definition of "employee" in the common and statutory law, but who, similar to the named Plaintiffs, are or were erroneously Classified as "contractors" or "independent contractors." Occupations or jobs in which Class Members worked or work include route delivery drivers for FEG and FHD. The Class includes all such persons employed by Defendant within the six-year statute of limitations. The Class is specifically defined as follows:

All individuals who worked for Defendant FedEx Ground System, Inc. and/or its subsidiary FedEx Home Delivery, Inc. in New Hampshire from March 21, 1999 to March 21, 2005 (the Class Period), as package pick-up and delivery drivers, and who were Classified as “independent contractors” and thereby deprived of various protections under New Hampshire law.

11. FEG and FHD employ thousands of drivers to pick up and deliver packages for its customers throughout the United States. As a condition of employment, each FEG and FHD driver is required to sign a lengthy form contract entitled the “Pick-up And Delivery Contractor Operating Agreement” that mischaracterizes each driver as an “independent contractor.” These

Operating Agreements conceal the true nature of the relationship between Defendant and its drivers: that of employer and employee.

12. Plaintiffs, and Plaintiff Class Members, were denied the accoutrements of employment, including, but not limited to:

- a. wages;
- b. overtime pay;
- c. holiday pay;
- d. workers' compensation;
- e. unemployment insurance;
- f. contributions to Defendant's retirement plan;
- g. participation in Defendant's Employee Stock Purchase Plan;
- h. income tax withholding; and,
- i. meal, break and rest periods.

13. Plaintiffs, and Plaintiff Class Members, were required to pay Defendant's operating expenses, all of which should have been paid by Defendant, including, but not limited to:

- a. delivery vehicle purchase;
- b. various insurances, including vehicle insurance and work accident insurance;
- c. delivery vehicle maintenance and repairs;
- d. purchase and maintenance of logos and uniforms;
- e. fuel;
- f. cargo claims; and,
- g. "business support," including maps, signs, logos, training and scanners.

14. Despite Defendant's control over virtually all material aspects of the employment relationship, and despite the unequivocal command of applicable statutes and case law to the effect that workers such as Plaintiffs are entitled to the protections due employees under New Hampshire law, and despite the finding of the Los Angeles Superior Court in Estrada v. FedEx Ground Package Systems, Inc. (Case # BC 210130) that these drivers are employees, Defendant continues to misclassify its drivers as independent contractors. As a result, these drivers are deprived of the rights and protections guaranteed by New Hampshire law to employees, and they are deprived of employer-financed workers compensation coverage and unemployment insurance benefits. Furthermore, the terms and conditions of their employment contract require these drivers to purchase, operate and maintain expensive trucks for Defendant's exclusive benefit and to work under other unlawful conditions. Defendant's mischaracterization of its drivers as independent contractors, the concealment and/or non-disclosure of the true nature of the relationship between Defendant and its drivers and the attendant deprivation of substantial rights and benefits of employment are part of an on-going unlawful and fraudulent business practice by Defendant which this court should enjoin.

15. The named Plaintiffs are adequate representatives of the Class because they were treated in the same manner as other Class Members by the Defendant and they have been damaged by this treatment in the same manner as other Class Members by their exclusion from employee compensation programs, plans and agreements and employee benefit plans and rights.

16. There are common questions of law and fact applicable to the entire Class including, but not limited to, the question whether Plaintiffs and Plaintiff Class Members are entitled to certain types of employee compensation and benefits because they are employees of

Defendant as defined by common and statutory law, even though Defendant has misrepresented to Plaintiffs and Plaintiff Class Members their true employment status.

17. This case should be certified as a Class action pursuant to Rule 23 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure because the common questions of law and fact concerning Defendant's liability predominate over any individual question over the amount of damages to each person and that:

- a. The members of the Class are so numerous that their individual joinder in a single action is impossible and/or impracticable;
- b. The central questions of law and fact involved in this action are of a common or general interest and those common legal and factual issues predominate over any questions affecting only individual members of the Class. Among the common questions of law and fact are the following:
  - i. Whether Class Members have been misclassified as independent contractors pursuant to Defendant's operating agreements;
  - ii. Whether the Defendant has violated their legal obligations under various provisions of New Hampshire law;
  - iii. Whether Defendant unlawfully failed to provide workers compensation insurance benefits and unemployment insurance benefits to the Class Members in violation of New Hampshire Law;
  - iv. Whether Defendant intentionally and/or negligently misrepresented to Plaintiffs and the Class they seek to represent their true employment status and thereby induced them to incur substantial expenses in reliance on such representations and;
  - v. Whether injunctive and declaratory relief and an equitable accounting are proper.

18. The claims of the named Plaintiffs are identical to the claims of other members of the Class. The named Plaintiffs share the same interests as other members of the Class in this action because, like other Class Members, they have each been misclassified and suffered financial loss of thousands of dollars due to Defendant's wrongful misclassification. Given the

significance of their losses, they have the incentive, and are committed, to vigorously prosecuting this action. They have retained competent and experienced counsel who specialize in Class action and employment litigation to represent them and the proposed Class. A Class action is the only realistic method available for the fair and efficient adjudication of this controversy. The expense and burden of individual litigation makes it impracticable for members of the Class to seek redress individually for the wrongful conduct alleged herein. Were each individual member required to bring a separate lawsuit, the resulting multiplicity of proceedings would cause undue hardship and expense for the litigants and the Court and create the risk of inconsistent rulings which would be contrary to the interest of justice and equity.

**FACTS COMMON TO ALL CAUSES OF ACTION**

19. Defendant is a national corporation whose businesses consists of offering package delivery and pick-up service to its customers using a single integrated nationwide network of transportation, sorting and communication facilities and integrating Plaintiff into those existing network operations. Defendant hired Plaintiffs to timely deliver and pick up packages based at times, locations and for amounts determined solely by Defendant.

20. Each pick-up and delivery driver (referred to by Defendant as a “P&D contractor”) must sign a “Pick-Up and Delivery Contractor Operating Agreement” and Addenda thereto (referred to hereinafter as “OA” or the “Operating Agreement” or the “Agreement”) as a mandatory condition of employment. The date, time and place of execution of each driver’s Operating Agreement is within the knowledge of Defendant as each Agreement is maintained in the driver files described above, in the regular course of business. The Operating Agreement between each Plaintiff and Defendant is the same in all material respects. The Operating

Agreement between Plaintiffs and FEG and between Plaintiffs and FHD contain all of the same identical material terms with only a few, minor and insubstantial differences.

21. The Operating Agreement contains various statements purporting to classify Plaintiffs as independent contractors. At the same time, the Operating Agreement retains to the company, inter alia, the right to approve or disapprove any vehicle used to provide service, the right to approve or disapprove any driver or helper who provides service, the right to approve or disapprove the purchase or sale of any vehicle, the right to assign pickup and delivery stops to each driver, the right to temporarily or permanently transfer portions of any route to another with or without compensation, the right to determine when a driver has “too few” or “too many” packages to deliver on a given day, the right to inspect vehicles and drivers for compliance with Company-promulgated appearance standards, the right to terminate the contract upon thirty days notice or whenever the company unilaterally determines that any provision of the contract has been “violated” amounting to the right to terminate at will, the right to require the use of communication equipment and the wearing of Company uniforms, the right to take a vehicle out of service, the right to review and evaluate “customer service” and to set and change standards of such service, the right to require drivers to perform service at “times” requested by customers and determined by Defendant, the right to withhold pay for certain specified expenses, the right to require purchase of specified insurance and numerous other purchases by drivers, the right to require completion of specified paperwork, and other rights reserved to Defendant.

22. The Operating Agreement is and at all relevant times has been a contract of adhesion, drafted exclusively by Defendant and/or its legal counsel, with no negotiation with drivers, who are required to sign the Agreement as a condition of employment. Plaintiffs are required to sign the form contract as is, without any changes made to the terms contained therein.

Each year, drivers are required to sign additional Addenda which are likewise not subject to negotiation and are unilaterally drafted adhesion contract provisions. The Agreement is, and at all material times has been unlawful, unconscionable and fraudulent in form and effect.

23. Defendant's right of control over Plaintiffs is also retained and/or exercised by Defendant as demonstrated by concealed and/or undisclosed extra- contractual sources such as Company written rules and policies described above and unwritten practices which supplement and fill gaps in the written contract.

24. Defendant has created and regularly updated a large number of written policies and procedures outside of the Operating Agreement that drivers are never given, but nonetheless are required to follow in their work. Defendant's written policies are contained in the FedEx Ground Manual, Operations Management Handbook, Settlement Manual and numerous other written and extra-contractual policies that are actively concealed from drivers and which Defendant fails to disclose and/or provide to drivers that govern the relationship between Defendant and the drivers. The other written handbooks and manuals and additional extra-contractual sources include, but are not limited, to written rules on "contractor" termination, directives and training provided to terminal managers, written rules on driver appearance (with illustrative poster), written and oral complaint procedures, memorandum and directives to terminal management and other rules concealed from and not provided to the drivers. When drivers do not follow an FEG or FHD rule, whether disclosed or undisclosed, known or unknown, they are subject to various types of punishment, some financial and some disciplinary, up to and including contract termination and/or non-renewal. Defendant documents such so-called violations of such rules on forms referred to as "Business Discussion Notes" and retains

these documents in secret driver files called “DOT” files, along with myriad other documents which are likewise concealed from and not disclosed to the drivers.

25. Defendant retains the right to control the manner and means by which Plaintiffs perform their jobs. Drivers work from a terminal, where they are assigned packages for delivery and locations for pickups each day. Defendant employs a variety of managers at its terminals who have supervisory responsibility over the drivers, their daily assignments and paperwork. Drivers also interact with other personnel of Defendant on a daily basis.

26. Defendant unilaterally sets the compensation to be paid to the drivers. Defendant pays drivers for the number of stops, deliveries and pickups made, as well as daily compensation for making themselves available for pickup and delivery work in a geographic areas solely determined by Defendant. Defendant pays its drivers for the number of stops, deliveries and pick-ups made. If a driver fails to check out with a terminal supervisor, he or she does not get paid for that day’s work.

27. Defendant unilaterally sets the prices charged to its customers for the services rendered by Plaintiffs. Defendant has a wide array of written and unwritten policies and procedures that drivers are trained in and required to follow in their work. When drivers do not follow Defendant’s rules, they suffer various types of punishment, some financial, and some disciplinary including loss of their route.

28. Plaintiffs provide service which is an integral part of Defendant’s business enterprise and they have no separate or distinct occupation or business. By providing vehicles with required Defendant colors, logos and advertising, by reliably serving Defendant’s customers, by following Defendant’s controlled delivery routes and delivery and pick up methods, by providing Defendant with customer leads, by using Defendant’s scanners which

enable Defendant's customers to track their packages, and in other material ways, Plaintiffs have rendered and continue to render services to Defendant which are integral to the Defendant's nationwide package delivery system.

29. Defendant through the representations contained in the Agreement and other documents given to Plaintiffs, induced Plaintiffs to enter into the Agreements in the belief that each Plaintiff would own his own business as an independent contractor. In reliance on those representations Plaintiff incurred substantial debt to purchase trucks and made to spend large sums of money for uniforms, insurance and expenses of owning, operating and maintaining their trucks. Defendant's representations to Plaintiffs in the Agreement were and are fraudulent and intended to mislead Plaintiffs into believing that Plaintiffs were independent businessman when the reality was that the Defendant retained such control over the Plaintiffs' work that they own virtually nothing except the obligation to continue to incur expenses for which they receive no reimbursement.

**FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION**  
**Failure to Pay Overtime and to Provide Meal Breaks**

Plaintiffs incorporate by reference Paragraphs 1 through 29 of this complaint as if fully set forth, and for a cause of action, allege as follows:

30. Plaintiffs operate vehicles with a gross vehicle weight rating of less than 10,001 pounds, including but not limited to P350 and P400 package van. Persons who operate such vehicles are not subject to the maximum hours regulations promulgated pursuant to the Federal Motor Carrier Safety Act and are therefore not exempt from the overtime requirements established by NH RSA 279:29VIII.

31. Defendant required Plaintiffs to work without any thirty minute unpaid meal period for every 5 hours worked as required by NH RSA 275:30a.

32. Defendant has not paid Plaintiffs at the rate of time and a half for hours worked by Plaintiffs in excess of 40 hours per week as required by NH RSA 279:21VIII. The failure by Defendant to make such payments to Plaintiffs is also a violation of the employer's obligation under NH RSA 275:43, to pay employees on a weekly basis.

33. As a direct and proximate result of Defendant's conduct as alleged, Plaintiffs have suffered substantial monetary losses, according to proof, plus interest, costs and reasonable attorney fees as provided for under NH RSA 279:29.

**SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION**  
**Conversion;**  
**Unauthorized Deductions from Compensation**

Plaintiffs incorporate by reference Paragraphs 1 through 33 of this complaint as if fully set forth, and for a cause of action, allege as follows:

34. Defendant has unlawfully withheld monies from the compensation earned by Plaintiffs for business expenses of Defendant, including but not limited to cargo claims and insurance claims in violation of NH RSA 275:48.

35. Defendant has withheld said funds unlawfully without even providing Plaintiffs with advance notice of the amounts, reasons or documentation of any justification for such deductions and absent any lawfully sufficient reason for such conduct in violation of NH RSA 275:49.

36. As a direct and proximate result of Defendant's conduct as alleged, Plaintiffs have suffered substantial monetary losses, according to proof, plus interest, costs and reasonable attorney fees as provided for under NH RSA 275:53.

**THIRD CAUSE OF ACTION**

**Fraud**

Plaintiffs incorporate by reference Paragraphs 1 through 36 of this complaint as if fully set forth, and for a cause of action, allege as follows:

37. Plaintiffs were purportedly hired by Defendant to work as “independent contractors” pursuant to the terms of the OA described above. In fact, Defendant knew or should have known, at all times, that the “independent contractor” classification in the Operating Agreement was improper and that Plaintiffs and all persons similarly situated were “employees” entitled to the benefits and protections of all laws enacted for employees. Plaintiffs are informed, believe and on that basis allege, that through the OA Defendant intentionally misled Plaintiffs as to their employment status, or made such representations to Plaintiffs recklessly and/or negligently, and deliberately concealed from and/or failed to disclose to the pick-up and delivery drivers the extra contractual sources (including but not limited to the FedEx Ground Manual, Operation Management Handbook and Settlement Manual, other policies and secret driver files described above) that defined the employment relationship between Plaintiffs and Defendant, all for the purpose of realizing unjust profits from Plaintiffs’ work and/or to avoid paying for its operating costs and payroll taxes to increase its competitiveness.

38. At all material times, Defendant either knew, or should have known, that the material representation made to Plaintiffs in the OA concerning their employment status, and the concealment and/or non-disclosure of material facts to Plaintiffs concerning their employment status and Plaintiffs’ corresponding obligation to assume responsibility for all of their “own” employment-related expenses including but not limited to purchasing or leasing, operating and maintaining expensive trucks were false and fraudulent.

39. At all material times, Defendant intended to and did induce Plaintiffs to reasonably and justifiably rely to their detriment on the false and fraudulent representations made to them by Defendant in the OA concerning their employment status and obligation to assume responsibility for all of employment related expenses including but not limited to purchasing or leasing, operating and maintaining expensive trucks and suffered damage as a direct and proximate result.

40. By its aforesaid conduct, Defendant is guilty of oppression, fraud and malice in violating Plaintiff rights and protections guaranteed by New Hampshire law and other applicable law.

**FOURTH CAUSE OF ACTION**  
**Unfair Business Practices**  
**in Violation of New Hampshire RSA §§358-A, et. seq.**

Plaintiffs incorporate by reference Paragraphs 1 through 40 of this complaint as if fully set forth, and for a cause of action, allege as follows:

41. The New Hampshire Consumer Protection Act RSA §358-A *et. seq.*, prohibits any legal entity, including corporations and natural persons from using “any unfair method of competition or any unfair or deceptive act or practice in the conduct of any trade or commerce within” New Hampshire. By failing and refusing to provide Plaintiffs with workers compensation insurance in violation of RSA §§281-A:1 *et seq.* and unemployment insurance benefits in violation of RSA §§282-A:1 *et seq.*, and by engaging in the other acts and conduct alleged above, Defendant has committed, and are continuing to commit, ongoing unfair business practices within the meaning of RSA 358A:2

42. The unfair business practices described above have proximately resulted in damages to Plaintiffs.

43. Pursuant to RSA 358-A:10, Plaintiffs, are entitled to: (a) damages in amounts not yet ascertained but to be ascertained at trial; and equitable relief including: (i) injunctive relief against Defendant's continuation of their unfair business practices, and (ii) a declaration that Defendant's business practices are unfair within the meaning of the statute.

**FIFTH CAUSE OF ACTION**  
**Rescission of Contract**

Plaintiffs hereby incorporate by reference paragraphs 1 through 43 of this complaint as if fully set forth herein, and, for a cause of action allege as follows:

44. Despite the express terms of the Operating Agreement, Plaintiffs' relationship with Defendant satisfies every aspect of the test for employment, and not for independent contractor status.

45. Defendant controls virtually every aspect of the Plaintiffs' work and earnings, as set forth in the general allegations hereof at paragraphs 1 through 21.

46. Despite this control and the actual status of the drivers as employees, Defendant mischaracterizes the Plaintiffs as independent contractors. As a result, these drivers must pay substantial sums of their own money for work-related expenses, including but not limited to the purchase or lease of vehicles meeting company specifications, and all costs of operating, insuring and maintaining those vehicles.

47. The Operating Agreement illegally and unfairly advantages Defendant, by mischaracterizing the status of the Plaintiffs in that Defendant evades employment related obligations, such as social security contributions, workers' compensation coverage, and state disability and unemployment compensation, illegally shifting the expense of workers' compensation coverage and other expenses to Plaintiffs.

48. The Operating Agreement between Defendant and each Plaintiff is void as against public policy and therefore unenforceable, as failing to recognize the employment status of the Plaintiffs, and therefore denying them the legally cognizable benefits of employment.

49. The Operating Agreement between Defendant and each Plaintiff is an unconscionable contract of adhesion, which is unenforceable as contrary to the public interest, policy and law.

50. The Operating Agreement illegally shifts the burden of certain costs that an employer must pay.

51. While acting on the direct instruction of Defendant and discharging their duties for Defendant, Plaintiffs incurred expenses for, *inter alia*, the purchase or lease, maintenance, operating costs and adornment of vehicles; insurance; and uniforms. Plaintiffs incurred these substantial expenses as a direct result of performing their job duties.

52. By misclassifying its employees as “independent contractors,” and further by contractually requiring those employees to pay Defendant’s own expenses, Defendant has been unjustly enriched.

53. As a direct and proximate result of Defendant’s conduct, Defendant has received substantial benefits to which it had no entitlement, at Plaintiffs’ expense, including lost profits, self-employment taxes, premiums for insurance to replace workers compensation and disability benefits, business expenses, compensation of replacement workers, and other expenses.

54. Plaintiffs are entitled to compensation for all of the business expenses they were illegally required by Defendant to bear, for all of the employment taxes, unemployment compensation and workers compensation the Defendant should have but did not pay, and Plaintiffs are entitled to the quantum meruit value of their services as employees.

**SIXTH CAUSE OF ACTION**  
**For an Accounting**

Plaintiffs incorporate Paragraphs 1 through 54 of this complaint as though fully set forth herein, and for a cause of action, allege as follows:

55. Plaintiffs are owed unpaid overtime compensation and unauthorized deductions from their compensation as detailed above.

56. Plaintiffs do not know the precise amount of compensation due them. Upon information and belief, Defendant possesses business records from which the amount of compensation due and owing to Plaintiffs can be determined.

**SEVENTH CAUSE OF ACTION**  
**Declaratory Judgment**

Plaintiffs incorporate Paragraphs 1 through 56 of this complaint as though fully set forth herein, and for a cause of action, allege as follows:

57. An actual controversy has arisen between the Plaintiffs, on the one hand, and Defendant, on the other hand, relating to the following matters:

- a. Whether Defendant has unlawfully misclassified Plaintiffs as independent contractors, and have thus denied Plaintiffs of the common benefits of employee status, such as
  - i. wages;
  - ii. holiday pay;
  - iii. workers' compensation;
  - iv. unemployment insurance;
  - v. contributions to the Defendant's retirement plan;
  - vi. income tax withholding; and
  - vii. meal, break and rest periods.
- b. What amounts Plaintiffs are entitled to receive in compensation and benefits.

- c. What amounts Plaintiffs are entitled to receive in interest on unpaid compensation due and owing.
- d. What amounts Plaintiffs are entitled to receive from Defendant in statutory penalties and interest.

58. Plaintiffs further seek entry of a declaratory judgment in their favor which declares Defendant's practices as heretofore alleged to be unlawful and which provides for recovery of all sums determined by this Court to be owed by Defendant to the Plaintiffs.

**EIGHTH CAUSE OF ACTION**  
**Failure to Reimburse Employee Expenses Under**  
**New Hampshire Rev. Stat. § 275:57**

Plaintiffs incorporate Paragraphs 1 through 58 of this complaint as though fully set forth herein, and for a cause of action, allege as follows:

59. Plaintiffs are "employees" as defined in New Hampshire Rev. Stat. § 275:42 and are not free from the control and direction of Defendant.

60. Defendant unlawfully has failed to reimburse Plaintiffs for expenses incurred at the request of Defendant, and which were not expenses normally borne as a precondition for employment.

61. Defendant has willfully violated New Hampshire Rev. State § 275:57.

62. As a direct and proximate result of Defendant's conduct, Plaintiffs suffered substantial losses and have been deprived of compensation to which they were entitled, including monetary damages, civil penalties, pre-judgment interest, costs and reasonable attorney fees.

**PRAYER FOR RELIEF**

Plaintiffs, jointly and severally pray for judgment as follows:

- A. For an order certifying the class as described with the named Plaintiffs as class representatives;

- B. For an order by the Court restoring and/or returning to Plaintiffs all of the Defendant's unfairly or illegally gotten profits measured by un-reimbursed expenses, workers compensation premiums, and/or unpaid unemployment insurance benefits incurred, together with interest thereon, as well as any other monetary damages caused by Defendant;
- C. For an order by the Court enjoining Defendant from continuing its unfair and/or unlawful conduct;
- D. For a declaration that Defendant's conduct is unfair and/or unlawful;
- E. For an order by the Court rescinding the Operating Agreement, and awarding restitution compensating for the reasonable value of the benefit provided to Defendant;
- F. For punitive damages in an amount to be determined at trial;
- G. For an accounting;
- H. For an award to Plaintiffs of their costs and expenses incurred in this action, including reasonable attorneys' and experts' fees pursuant to applicable New Hampshire law; and,
- I. For such other and further relief as this Court deems just and proper.

Dated: December 1, 2006

Respectfully submitted,

LOCKRIDGE GRINDAL NAUEN P.L.L.P.

s/ Susan E. Ellingstad

Susan E. Ellingstad  
100 Washington Avenue South  
Suite 2200  
Minneapolis, MN 55401  
Tel: (612) 339-6900  
Fax: (612) 339-0981

Lynn Rossman Faris  
LEONARD CARDER, LLP  
1330 Broadway, Suite 1450  
Oakland, CA 94612  
Tel: (510) 272-0169  
Fax: (510) 272-0174

Robert I. Harwood  
WECHSLER HARWOOD LLP  
488 Madison Avenue, 8th Floor  
New York, NY 10022  
Tel: (212) 935-7400  
Fax: (212) 753-3630

**PLAINTIFFS' CO-LEAD COUNSEL**

Robert E. McDaniel  
THE McDANIEL LAW OFFICES  
755 North Main Street  
Laconia, NH 03246  
Tel: (603) 527-0520  
Fax: (603) 527-0560

**ATTORNEY FOR PLAINTIFFS**

**CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

I, Susan E. Ellingstad, hereby certify that on December 1, 2006, I electronically filed the foregoing document with the Clerk of Court using the CM/ECF system which sent notification of such filings to the following:

<b>George A Barton</b>	<a href="mailto:gbarton@birch.net">gbarton@birch.net</a>
<b>Evelyn L. Becker</b>	<a href="mailto:ebecker@omm.com">ebecker@omm.com</a>
<b>Kenneth Lee Blalack II</b>	<a href="mailto:lblalack@omm.com">lblalack@omm.com</a>
<b>Darcie R. Brault</b>	<a href="mailto:dbrault@dibandfagan.com">dbrault@dibandfagan.com</a>
<b>Laura C. Bremer</b>	<a href="mailto:lbremer@omm.com">lbremer@omm.com</a>
<b>Guy Brenner</b>	<a href="mailto:gbrenner@omm.com">gbrenner@omm.com</a>
<b>Thomas J. Brunner Jr</b>	<a href="mailto:Tom.Brunner@bakerd.com">Tom.Brunner@bakerd.com</a> ; <a href="mailto:Alicia.cummins@bakerd.com">Alicia.cummins@bakerd.com</a> ; <a href="mailto:Melissa.bozzuto@bakerd.com">Melissa.bozzuto@bakerd.com</a> ; <a href="mailto:amy.ricks@bakerd.com">amy.ricks@bakerd.com</a>
<b>Michael C. Camunez</b>	<a href="mailto:mcamunez@omm.com">mcamunez@omm.com</a> ; <a href="mailto:cgreenberg@omm.com">cgreenberg@omm.com</a>
<b>David G. Caperton</b>	<a href="mailto:dcaperton@omm.com">dcaperton@omm.com</a>
<b>Jerald R. Cureton</b>	<a href="mailto:jcureton@curetoncaplan.com">jcureton@curetoncaplan.com</a>
<b>Edward J Efkeman</b>	<a href="mailto:eefkeman@fedex.com">eefkeman@fedex.com</a>
<b>Barry S. Fagan</b>	<a href="mailto:bfagan@dibandfagan.com">bfagan@dibandfagan.com</a>
<b>Lynn R. Faris</b>	<a href="mailto:lfaris@leonardcarder.com">lfaris@leonardcarder.com</a> ; <a href="mailto:lbadar@leonardcarder.com">lbadar@leonardcarder.com</a> ; <a href="mailto:efink@leonardcarder.com">efink@leonardcarder.com</a> ; <a href="mailto:kzgerger@leonardcarder.com">kzgerger@leonardcarder.com</a>
<b>Lee K. Fink</b>	<a href="mailto:lfink@omm.com">lfink@omm.com</a>
<b>Robert K. Firsten</b>	<a href="mailto:rfirsten@firstenlaw.com">rfirsten@firstenlaw.com</a>
<b>Wood R. Foster Jr</b>	<a href="mailto:woodfoster@sbgdf.com">woodfoster@sbgdf.com</a> ; <a href="mailto:heidifurlong@sbgdf.com">heidifurlong@sbgdf.com</a>
<b>Alison G. Fox</b>	<a href="mailto:Alison.Fox@bakerd.com">Alison.Fox@bakerd.com</a> ; <a href="mailto:alicia.cummins@bakerd.com">alicia.cummins@bakerd.com</a> ; <a href="mailto:Melissa.bozzuto@bakerd.com">Melissa.bozzuto@bakerd.com</a> ; <a href="mailto:amy.ricks@bakerd.com">amy.ricks@bakerd.com</a>

**Philip Stephen Fuoco** [pfuoco@msn.com](mailto:pfuoco@msn.com)

**Martin S. Garfinkel** [garfinkel@sgb-law.com](mailto:garfinkel@sgb-law.com); [rwhite@sgb-law.com](mailto:rwhite@sgb-law.com); [bloch@sgb-law.com](mailto:bloch@sgb-law.com)

**Michael W. Garrison, Jr.** [mgarrison@omm.com](mailto:mgarrison@omm.com)

**R. Christopher Gilreath** [chrisgil@sidgilreath.com](mailto:chrisgil@sidgilreath.com)

**John C. Hamilton** [jch@hamiltonfirm.com](mailto:jch@hamiltonfirm.com); [hamiltonfirm@sbcglobal.net](mailto:hamiltonfirm@sbcglobal.net)

**Robert I. Harwood** [rharwood@whesq.com](mailto:rharwood@whesq.com)

**Stacy J. Hauf** [shauf@omm.com](mailto:shauf@omm.com); [swickcliffe@omm.com](mailto:swickcliffe@omm.com)

**Dmitri Iglitzin** [iglitzin@workerlaw.com](mailto:iglitzin@workerlaw.com)

**Dorothy Anne Jarrell** [dajarrell@omm.com](mailto:dajarrell@omm.com); [prowen@omm.com](mailto:prowen@omm.com); [jdonovan@omm.com](mailto:jdonovan@omm.com)

**Tom A. Jerman** [tjerman@omm.com](mailto:tjerman@omm.com)

**Victor H. Jih** [vjih@omm.com](mailto:vjih@omm.com)

**Thomas P. Jirgal** [tjirgal@omm.com](mailto:tjirgal@omm.com); [jbanks@omm.com](mailto:jbanks@omm.com)

**Aparna B. Joshi** [ajoshi@omm.com](mailto:ajoshi@omm.com); [jdonovan@omm.com](mailto:jdonovan@omm.com)

**Michael W. Kopp** [mkopp@omm.com](mailto:mkopp@omm.com)

**Steve D. Larson** [slarson@ssbls.com](mailto:slarson@ssbls.com); [dcerdas@ssbls.com](mailto:dcerdas@ssbls.com); [aardley@ssbls.com](mailto:aardley@ssbls.com)

**Jordan M. Lewis** [jordanlewis@sbgdf.com](mailto:jordanlewis@sbgdf.com)

**Shannon Liss-Riordan** [sliss@prle.com](mailto:sliss@prle.com); [blarmier@prle.com](mailto:blarmier@prle.com); [syoung@prle.com](mailto:syoung@prle.com)

**Anh-Nguyet Tran  
LyJordan** [alyjordan@omm.com](mailto:alyjordan@omm.com)

**Gary F. Lynch** [glynch@carlsonlynch.com](mailto:glynch@carlsonlynch.com)

**Michael G. McGuinness** [mmcguinness@omm.com](mailto:mmcguinness@omm.com)

**Matthew J. Merrick** [mmerrick@omm.com](mailto:mmerrick@omm.com)

**Jennifer Lee Merzon** [jmerzon@omm.com](mailto:jmerzon@omm.com)

**Raquel A. Millman** [rmillman@omm.com](mailto:rmillman@omm.com)

**Daniel O. Myers** [dmyers@rpwb.com](mailto:dmyers@rpwb.com); [wking@rpwb.com](mailto:wking@rpwb.com);  
[sgiddens@rpwb.com](mailto:sgiddens@rpwb.com); [mbrown@rpwb.com](mailto:mbrown@rpwb.com)

**Peter W. Overs Jr.** [povers@whesq.com](mailto:povers@whesq.com)

**Richard T. Phillips** [flip@smithphillips.com](mailto:flip@smithphillips.com); [tresahharden@smithphillips.com](mailto:tresahharden@smithphillips.com)

**D. Lucetta Pope** [Lucetta.Pope@bakerd.com](mailto:Lucetta.Pope@bakerd.com); [Alicia.cummins@bakerd.com](mailto:Alicia.cummins@bakerd.com);  
[Melissa.bozzuto@bakerd.com](mailto:Melissa.bozzuto@bakerd.com);  
[amy.ricks@bakerd.com](mailto:amy.ricks@bakerd.com)

**Nora M Puckett** [npuckett@omm.com](mailto:npuckett@omm.com); [dmeredith@omm.com](mailto:dmeredith@omm.com)

**Charles Victor Pyle III** [victor.pyle@ogletreedeakins.com](mailto:victor.pyle@ogletreedeakins.com);  
[Meredith.smith@ogletreedeakins.com](mailto:Meredith.smith@ogletreedeakins.com);  
[ted.speth@ogletreedeakins.com](mailto:ted.speth@ogletreedeakins.com);  
[Linda.lyday@ogletreedeakins.com](mailto:Linda.lyday@ogletreedeakins.com)

**Anne T. Regan** [atr@zimmreed.com](mailto:atr@zimmreed.com); [kmh@zimmreed.com](mailto:kmh@zimmreed.com)

**Robert G. Rikard** [rrikard@attorneysc.com](mailto:rrikard@attorneysc.com)

**J. Gordon Rudd** [jgr@zimmreed.com](mailto:jgr@zimmreed.com)

**Theodore B. Schroeder** [tschroeder@omm.com](mailto:tschroeder@omm.com)

**Robert M. Schwartz** [rschwartz@omm.com](mailto:rschwartz@omm.com)

**R. Jay Taylor Jr.** [jtaylor@scopelitis.com](mailto:jtaylor@scopelitis.com); [lnewton@scopelitis.com](mailto:lnewton@scopelitis.com)

**Matthew T. Tobin** [matt@matthewtobinlaw.com](mailto:matt@matthewtobinlaw.com)

**Jeffrey A. Trimarchi** [jtrimarchi@omm.com](mailto:jtrimarchi@omm.com)

**Michael J Watton** [jdrewicz@Wattongroup.com](mailto:jdrewicz@Wattongroup.com)

I also certify that on December 1, 2006, I mailed by United States Postal Service the foregoing document to the following non CM/ECF participants:

John H. Beisner  
O'MELVENY & MYERS, LLP  
1625 Eye Street, N.W.  
Washington, D.C. 20006-4001

Joree Brownlow  
LAW OFFICE OF JOREE G BROWNLOW  
1444 Gillham Drive  
Suite 200  
Bartlett, TN 38134

R Bruce Carlson  
CARLSON LYNCH LTD  
231 Melville Lane  
PO Box 367  
Sewickley, PA 15143

Jack D Hilmes  
Kevin J Driscoll  
FINLEY ALT SMITH SCHARNBERT  
CRAIG HILMES & GAFFNEY PC  
699 Walnut Street  
1900 Hub Tower  
Des Moines, IA 50309

Eric E Hobbs  
Eric H Rumbaugh  
MICHAEL BEST & FRIEDRICH LLP  
100 E Wisconsin Ave  
Suite 3300  
Milwaukee, WI 53202-4108

Donald B Lewis  
5 Cynwyd Road  
Bala Cynwyd, PA 19004

Robert E McDaniel  
THE MCDANIEL LAW OFFICES  
4 Bicentennial Square  
Concord, NH 03301  
(New address:  
755 North Main Street  
Laconia, NH 03246)

Carla D Macaluso  
JACKSON LEWIS LLP  
220 Headquarters Plaza  
7th Floor East Tower  
Morristown, NJ 07960

Paula R Markowitz  
MARKOWITZ & RICHMAN  
1100 North American Building  
121 S Broad St  
Philadelphia, PA 19107

Kenneth E Milam  
WATKINS & EAGER  
PO Box 650  
Jackson, MS 39205-0650

James R Mulroy II  
William T Fiala  
LEWIS FISHER HENDERSON  
CLAXTON & MULROY  
6410 Poplar Ave  
Suite 300  
Memphis, TN 38119

Joseph A. Osefchen  
LAW FIRM OF PHILIP STEPHEN FUOCO  
24 Wilkins Place  
Haddonfield, NJ 08033

Alan M Purdie  
PURDIE & METZ  
P.O. Box 2659  
Ridgeland, MS 39158  
INCORRECT ADDRESS  
402 Legacy  
Ridgeland, MS 39157

Michael R Reck  
BELIN LAMSON MCCORMICK  
ZUMBACH FLYNN  
666 Walnut Street  
Suite 2000  
Des Moines, IA 50309-3989

Jennifer Rygiel Boyd  
OGLETREE DEAKINS NASH  
SMOAK & STEWART PC  
10 Madison Avenue  
Suite 402  
Morristown, NJ 07960

Richard Tanenbaum  
1131 McDonald Avenue  
Brooklyn, NY 11230

Donald R. Taylor  
TAYLOR & DUNHAM  
327 Congress Ave #600  
Austin, TX 78701  
New address:  
TAYLOR DUNHAM AND BURGESS LLP  
301 Congress Avenue, Suite 1050  
Austin, TX 78701

Peter N Wasylyk  
LAW OFFICES OF PETER N. WASYLYK  
1307 Chalkstone Avenue  
Providence, RI 02908

Aaron Roblan  
Karen P Kruse  
JACKSON LEWIS LLP  
One Union Square  
600 University Street, Suite 2900  
Seattle, WA 98101

Beth A Ross  
LEONARD CARDER LLP  
1330 Broadway, Suite 1450  
Oakland, CA 94612

Dan S Smith  
DAN SOLOMON SMITH LLC  
339 Main Street Suite 2D  
Orange, NJ 07050

Patricia A Sullivan  
EDWARDS ANGELL PALMER  
& DODGE LLP  
2800 Financial Plaza  
Providence, RI 02903

Charles W Whetstone Jr.  
Cheryl F Perkins  
WHETSTONE MYERS PERKINS  
AND YOUNG LLC  
PO Box 8086  
Columbia, SC 29202

Clayton D. Halunen  
Joni M. Thome  
HALUNEN & ASSOCIATES  
220 South Sixth Street  
Suite 2000  
Minneapolis, MN 55402

Dated: December 1, 2006

Respectfully submitted,

LOCKRIDGE GRINDAL NAUEN P.L.L.P.

**s/Susan E. Ellingstad**

---

Susan E. Ellingstad  
100 Washington Avenue South  
Suite 2200  
Minneapolis, MN 55401  
Tel: (612) 339-6900  
Fax: (612) 339-0981