UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT DISTRICT OF MASSACHUSETTS

FILED MOLERKS OFFICE

705 MAY 20 A H: 05

MARK JOHNSON, on behalf of himself and all others similarly situated,

05 11058 MW

Plaintiffs.

MORTON'S RESTAURANT GROUP, INC.,

v.

Defendant.

COMPLAINT

JURY DEMANDED

AMOUNT \$ 250.05

SUMMONS ISSUED____

LOCAL RULE 4.1___

WAIVER FORM __ MCF ISSUED___

BY DPTY. CLK.

DATE

I. <u>INTRODUCTION</u>

MAGISTRATE JUDGE

1. This is an action brought under the Fair Labor Standards Act,

29 U.S.C. §§ 201 et seq., by Mark Johnson on behalf of himself and other current and former waitstaff employees at Morton's of Chicago restaurants throughout the United States, which are owned and operated by Defendant Morton's Restaurant Group, Inc. ("Morton's"), an upscale steakhouse chain. As set forth below, Morton's has had a longstanding national policy throughout its restaurants under which its waitstaff employees have not been permitted to retain all of their tips and yet have received less than the permissible standard minimum wage, as the defendant has improperly taken a "tip credit" against the minimum wage for these employees. On behalf of himself and all others similarly situated who may choose to opt-in to this action, plaintiff Mark Johnson now seeks restitution for the tips they have not been permitted to retain, as well as the portion of the minimum wage that they did not receive in base pay, liquidated damages,

attorneys' fees and costs, and any other damages to which they may be entitled under law.

II. **PARTIES**

- Plaintiff Mark Johnson is an adult resident of Cambridge, Massachusetts. 2. Mr. Johnson worked as a waiter at Morton's of Chicago in Boston, Massachusetts, from May 1998 until July 2002.
- 3. Mr. Johnson brings this action on his own behalf and on behalf of all others similarly situated, who may choose to opt-in to this case. This opt-in class may exclude waiters who have participated in similar actions that have resolved or are currently pending.
- 4. Defendant Morton's Restaurant Group, Inc., is a Delaware corporation that operates more than 60 Morton's of Chicago restaurants throughout the United States.

III. JURISDICTIONAL STATEMENT

5. The jurisdiction of this court is invoked pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1331. This case arises under the laws of the United States of America.

IV. STATEMENT OF FACTS

6. In its restaurants throughout the United States (with a few limited exceptions), Morton's waitstaff have received a base pay which is less than the standard federal minimum wage, currently \$5.15 per hour. Morton's waitstaff are generally paid the "service minimum wage" applicable in each state. For states that do not have their own service minimum wage, Morton's waitstaff are paid the federal service minimum wage, which is currently \$2.13 per hour. In some states, the state minimum wage rate which the waitstaff receive is somewhat higher, but still less than the standard federal

minimum wage. For example, in Massachusetts, Morton's waitstaff, including Mr. Johnson, received the state service minimum wage, which is currently \$2.63 per hour.

Document 1

- 7. Morton's employees have not been permitted to retain all of their tips.
- 8. Instead, under a formula devised by management, tipped employees are required to "tip out" various other employees from the tips they receive from customers, including a percentage of their tips to management.
- 9. In each Morton's restaurant, there is a set percentage of tips that waitstaff employees are expected to pay to their managers. These managers are not traditionally tipped employees. The managers whom waitstaff are expected to tip out include General Managers, as well as other managers. The managers whom waitstaff are expected to tip out include those who have power to hire and fire and who would be classified as "employers" under the FLSA.
- 10. Morton's does not explain to its waitstaff employees that it intends to take a "tip credit" against the minimum wage, that it intends to treat tips as satisfying part of their minimum wage obligation, nor does it explain anything to its waitstaff about a "tip credit" or what a "tip credit" is.
- 11. Morton's has been subjected to a number of investigations and legal actions regarding its tip policy in certain parts of the country, which should have placed it on notice of its legal violation, but Morton's has nevertheless maintained this policy as a general policy throughout the country.
- 12. Morton's violation of the minimum wage and "tip credit" requirements of the FLSA in requiring or expecting its waitstaff employees to tip out managers and other non-traditionally tipped employees, has been knowing and willful.

COUNT I

Document 1

FAIR LABOR STANDARDS ACT, 29 U.S.C. §§ 201 et seq.

Defendant's conduct, as set forth above, in failing to pay its waitstaff employees the full federal minimum wage, in failing to allow these employees to retain all of their tips, and in failing to provide the legally required notice regarding its intention to take a "tip credit," violates the Fair Labor Standards Act, 29 U.S.C. §§ 201 et seq. As set forth above, Defendant has improperly taken a "tip credit" against the minimum wage in violation of 29 U.S.C. § 203(m).

JURY DEMAND

Plaintiffs request a trial by jury on their claims.

WHEREFORE, Plaintiffs request that this Court enter the following relief:

- 1. Opportunity to notify other similarly situated employees of their right to opt-in to this action;
- Restitution for tips that Morton's waitstaff employees have not been 2. permitted to retain;
- 3. Restitution for the portion of the minimum wage that Morton's waitstaff employees have not received in base pay;
- 4. Liquidated damages;
- 5. Attorneys' fees and costs; and

Dated: May 20, 2005

1- Hodan

6. Any other relief to which Plaintiffs may be entitled.

Respectfully submitted,

MARK JOHNSON, on behalf of himself and all others similarly situated,

By his attorney,

Shannon Liss-Riordan, Esq., BBO # 640716

PYLE, ROME, LICHTEN, EHRENBERG

& LISS-RIORDAN, P.C.

18 Tremont Street, 5th Floor

Boston, MA 02108

(617) 367-7200

_

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT DISTRICT OF MASSACHUSETTS

				Want Tahm	FILED							
1.			IAME OF FIRST PARTY ON EACH SI Restaurant Group, Inc		son, et al v. v. como or Frog							
2.	CATEGO	RY IN W	HICH THE CASE BELONGS BASED U	JPON THE NUMBERED NATU	RE OF SUIT CODE LISTED ON THE CIVIL							
	COVER SHEET. (SEE LOCAL RULE 40.1(A)(1)).											
	_	1.	160, 410, 470, R.23, REGARDLESS	OF NATURE OF SUIT.	Us History gover							
	<u>X</u>	II.	195, 368, 400, 440, 441-444, 540, 55740, 790, 791, 820*, 830*, 840*, 850,		*Also complete AO 120 or AO 121 for patent, trademark or copyright cases							
	-	III.	110, 120, 130, 140, 151, 190, 210, 23, 315, 320, 330, 340, 345, 350, 355, 36, 385, 450, 891.		1 1058 MLW							
		IV.	220, 422, 423, 430, 460, 510, 530, 6690, 810, 861-865, 870, 871, 875, 90									
		v .	150, 152, 153.									
3.	TITLE AN	ID NUMB N FILED	ER, IFANY, OF RELATED CASES. (IN THIS DISTRICT PLEASE INDICAT	SEE LOCAL RULE 40.1(G)). II E THE TITLE AND NUMBER O	F MORE THAN ONE PRIOR RELATED CASE F THE FIRST FILED CASE IN THIS COURT.							
4.	4. HAS A PRIOR ACTION BETWEEN THE SAME PARTIES AND BASED ON THE SAME CLAIM EVER BEEN FILED IN THIS COURT?											
				YES	NO							
5.			LAINT IN THIS CASE QUESTION TH T? (SEE 28 USC §2403)	E CONSTITUTIONALITY OF AI	NACT OF CONGRESS AFFECTING THE							
				YES	NO							
	IF SO, IS	THE U.S	.A. ORAN OFFICER, AGENT OR EM	PLOYEE OF THE U.S. A PART	Y?							
				YES	NO							
6.	IS THIS C		QUIRED TO BE HEARD AND DETER	MINED BY A DISTRICT COUR	OF THREE JUDGES PURSUANT TO TITLE							
			•	YES	NO							
7.	DO ALL OF THE PARTIES IN THIS ACTION, EXCLUDING GOVERNMENTAL AGENCIES OF THE UNITED STATES AND THE COMMONWEALTH OF MASSACHUSETTS ("GOVERNMENTAL AGENCIES"), RESIDING IN MASSACHUSETTS RESIDE IN THE SAME DIVISION? - (SEE LOCAL RULE 40.1(D)).											
			·	YES	NO							
	A. IF YES, IN WHICH DIVISION DO ALL OF THE NON-GOVERNMENTAL PARTIES RESIDE?											
			EASTERN DIVISION	CENTRAL DIVISION	WESTERN DIVISION							
	B. IF NO, IN WHICH DIVISION DO THE MAJORITY OF THE PLAINTIFFS OR THE ONLY PARTIES, EXCLUDING GOVERNMENTAL AGENCIES, RESIDING IN MASSACHUSETTS RESIDE?											
			EASTERN DIVISION	CENTRAL DIVISION	WESTERN DIVISION							
(P	LEASE TY	PE OR PI	RINT)									
ATTORNEY'S NAME Shannon Liss-Riordan , Pyle, Rome, Lichten, Ehrenberg & Liss-Riorda												
ADDRESS 18 Tremont Street, Ste. 500, Boston, MA 02108												
TELEPHONE NO617-367-7200												

SJS 44 (Rev. 3/99)

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 THE REVERSE OF THE FORM.)

		F . 1			rice					
I. (a) PLAI					DEFENDAN	18	_			
Mark Johnso similarly s		half of himsel	lf and all o	ther	Morton's Restaurant Group, Inc.					
(b) County	of Residence of	of First Listed Plaintiff	(iddlesev		County of Reside	ence of First Listed	p.outro			
.,		CEPT IN U.S. PLAINTIFF			(IN U.S. PLAINTIFF CASES ONLY)					
		TI.		1	D CONDEMNATION CASES, US INVOLVED.	SE THE LOCATION OF THE				
					47.075					
(c) Attorne	•	ne, Address, and Telephone	Number)	C.	Attorneys (If Kn	own) Loom & Diane Wi	ndho1z			
		, Ehrenberg &	Liss-Riorda	n (ewis EDP R				
		Ste 500, Bosto			59 Marden	Lane, New York,	NY 10038-4502			
617 - 367 - 720	0				212-343-40	DIVIGIDAL DA DELEG				
II. BASIS C)F JURISD	OICTION (Place an "X"	in One Box Only)		III. CITIZENSHIP OF PRINCIPAL PARTIES(Place an "X" in One Box for Plaintiff (For Diversity Cases On ly) and One Box for De fendant)					
П1 ИСС-		文 3 Federal Question (U.S. Govern ment Not a Party)				DEF	DEF			
□ 1 U.S. Gov Plainti				Citizen of This State 1 1 1 Incorporated or Principal Place 4 4 of Business In This State						
☐ 2 U.S. Gov Defend		☐ 4 Diversity (Indicate Citiz	enship of Parties	Ci	itizen of Another State		d Principal Place ☐ 5 ☐ 5 Another State			
		in Item III)	•	C	itizen or Subject of a	3 □ 3 Foreign Nation	□ 6 □ 6			
TS7 NIATETY	DE O E CIU				Foreign Country		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·			
IV. NAT UF		T (Place an "X" in One Box Only) TORTS		F	ORFEITURE/PENALTY	BANKRUPTCY	OTHER STATUTES			
110 Insurance		PERSONAL INJURY	PERSONAL INJU			1 422 Appeal 28 USC 158	400 State Reap portionment			
☐ 120 Marine ☐ 130 Miller Ac	t	Slander 330 Federal Employers' Liability 340 Marine 345 Marine Product Liability 350 M otor Vehicle 355 M otor Vehicle	☐ 362 Personal Injury— Med. Malpractic			423 Withdrawal	410 Antitrust 430 Banks and Banking			
☐ 140 Negotiable	e Instrument		☐ 365 Personal Injury -	- _	of Property 21 USC	28 USC 157	☐ 450 Commerce/ICC Rates/etc.☐ 460 Deportation☐ 470 Racketeer Influenced and			
	Enforcement of		Product Liability 368 Asbestos Person	nal 🗆	640 R.R. & Truck	PROPERTY RIGHTS				
☐ 154£Metticare ☐ 152 Recovery			lnjury Pæduct Liability			820 Copyrights 830 Patent	Corrupt Organizations B 810 Selective Service			
Student L (Excl. Ve			PERSONAL PROPE 370 Other Fraud		Safety/Health 690 Other	840 Trad emark	850 Securities/Commodities/			
☐ 153 Recovery	of Overpayment in's Benefits		☐ 371 Truth in Lending ☐ 380 Other Personal	; -	LABOR	SOCIAL SECURITY	875 Customer Challenge 12 USC 3410			
☐ 160 Stoc khold☐ 190 Other Cor	iers' S uits		Property Damag 385 Property Damag		710 Fair Labor Standards	□ 861 H 1A (13 95ff) □ 862 Black Lung (923) □ 863 DIW C/DIW W (405 (g)) □ 864 SSID Title XVI	12 USC 3410 ■ 891 Agricultural A cts ■ 892 Economic Stabilization Act ■ 893 Environm ental Matters ■ 894 Energy Allocation Act ■ 895 Freedom of			
195 Contract P		Product Liability 360 Other Personal Injury		,	Act 720 Labor/M gmt. Relations					
REAL PR	OPERTY	CIVIL RIGHTS	PRISONER PETIT	IONS	_					
☐ 210 Land Cor ☐ 220 Force lost		☐ 441 Voting ☐ 442 Employment	510 Motions to Vaca Sentence		& Disclosure Act	FEDERAL TAX SUITS	Information Act ☐ 900 Appeal of Fee			
230 Rent Lea	se & Ejectment	443 Housing/	Habeas Corpus:	_	_	□ 870 T axes (U.S. Plaintiff	Determinational Access to Justice			
☐ 240 Torts to I☐ 245 Tort Proc		Accommodations 444 Welfare	530 General 535 De ath Penalty		790 Other Labor Litigation	or Defendant)	950 C onstitutionality of			
290 All Other	Real Property	440 Other Civil Rights	540 Mandamus & O 550 Civil Rights 555 Prison Conditio	- 1	791 Empl. Ret. Inc. Security Act	□ 871 JRS—Third Party 26 USC 7609	State Statutes Begin and Statutory Actions			
	(PLAC	I CE AN "X" IN ONE BO	1				Appeal to			
V. ORIGIN					anothe	Transferred from District				
	□ 1 Original Proceeding State Court Proceeding State Court Appellate Court Reopened □ 4 Reinstated or □ 5 State Court Reopened □ 6 Multidistrict Litigation □ 7 Magistrate Magistrate Litigation □ 7 Magistrate Magistrate Litigation □ 7 Magistrate Magistrate State Court State Court Reopened □ 8 Multidistrict □ 1 1 Magistrate Magistrate Magistrate Magistrate State Court State Court State Court No. 1 Cite the U.S. Civil Statute under which you are filing and write bird statement of cause.									
VI. CAUSI										
		201								
VII. REQU		. 201 et seq.				OURGE VEG. 1				
	LAINT:	UNDER F.R.C	S IS A CLASS ACTI P. 23	DN	DEMAND \$	JURY DEMAND:	if demanded in complaint: : Xes □ No			
VIII. REL		(See E(S) instructions):								
IF Al	NY		JUDG E			DOCKET NUMBER				
DATE 6/2	0/		SIGNATURE OF A	TTORNE	Y OF RECORD		/			
FOR OFFICE U	U (O S		John		00	1) From	lan			
RECEIPT #		AMOUN	APPLYING IFP		JUDGE	MAG. JUI	OGE			