COFFEY KAYE MYERS & OLLEY

BY: ROBERT E. MYERS, ESQUIRE

**IDENTIFICATION NO. 23762** 

BY: MICHAEL J. OLLEY, ESQUIRE

**IDENTIFICATION NO. 56118** 

Suite 718, Two Bala Plaza

Bala Cynwyd, Pennsylvania 19004

(610) 668-9800

Attorneys For: Plaintiffs

## IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA

BRUCE A. PHILLIPS AND

KALITA PHILLIPS (H/W)

2819 S. 67<sup>th</sup> Street

Philadelphia, PA 19142

•

**Plaintiffs** 

JURY TRIAL DEMANDED

CIVIL ACTION

VS.

NATIONAL RAILROAD PASSENGER

CORPORATION (AMTRAK)

NO.:

Defendant

### COMPLAINT

#### COUNT I - FELA

- 1. The plaintiff herein is Bruce A. Phillips, a citizen and resident of the State of Pennsylvania, residing therein at 2819 S. 67<sup>th</sup> Street, Philadelphia, PA 19142.
- 2. This action arises under the Act of Congress, April 22, 1908, c. 149, 35 Stat. 65, and amendments thereto, U.S.C.A. Title 45, § 51 et seq., and further amended by the Act of

Congress, approved by the President of the United States on August 11, 1939, Chapter 685 - First Session of the 76th Congress, known and cited as "The Federal Employers' Liability Act".

- 3. The defendant is a corporation duly organized and existing under and by virtue of the laws of the United States of America and regularly does business in the Eastern District of Pennsylvania.
- 4. At the time and place hereinafter mentioned and for a long time prior thereto, the defendant, as a common carrier, operated trains carrying passengers, freight, express packages, baggage and foreign and domestic mail, in commerce, between the different states of the United States and its territories.
- 5. At the time and place hereinafter mentioned, the acts of omission and commission, causing the injuries to the plaintiff, were done by the defendant, its agents, servants, workmen and/or employees, acting in the course and scope of their employment with and under the control of the defendant.
- 6. At the time and place hereinafter mentioned, the plaintiff and the defendant were engaged in interstate commerce between the different states of the United States and its territories.
- 7. At all times material hereto, plaintiff was employed by defendant National Railroad Passenger Corporation.
- 8. All of the property, equipment and operations involved in the accident herein referred to were owned by and under the control of the defendant, its agents, servants, workmen and/or employees.
- 9. As a result of the accident herein referred to, plaintiff has suffered a loss and impairment of earnings and earning power and will suffer the same for an indefinite time in the

future; has undergone great physical pain and mental anguish and will undergo the same for an indefinite time in the future; has been obliged to and will have to continue to expend large sums of money in the future in an effort to effect a cure of his aforesaid injuries; has been unable to attend to his usual duties and occupation and will be unable to attend to the same for an indefinite time in the future, all to his great detriment and loss.

- 10. The accident herein referred to was caused solely and exclusively by the negligence of the defendant, its agents, servants, workmen and/or employees, and was due in no manner whatsoever to any act or failure to act on the part of the plaintiff.
- 11. On or about May 12, 2015, at or about 9:23 p.m., the plaintiff was employed by Amtrak.
- 12. On the aforementioned date and at the aforementioned time, plaintiff was dead-heading from Philadelphia to New York City and was located on Amtrak's Northeast Regional Train No. 188.
- 13. On the aforementioned date and at the aforementioned time, plaintiff was located on train No 188 for the convenience of Amtrak and to promote Amtrak's interstate railroad transportation services.
- 14. On the aforementioned date and at the aforementioned time, plaintiff was located on train No 188 for Amtrak's benefit and in furtherance of Amtrak's operational activities.
- 15. On the aforementioned date and at the aforementioned time, plaintiff was located in one of the rear railcars of train No. 188.
- 16. On the aforementioned date and at the aforementioned time, as a result of Amtrak's negligence and carelessness, and further as a result of its violation of federal statutes, federal

regulations, local statutes and ordinances, local regulations, and accepted industry rules, regulations, standards, and practices, train No. 188 and all of the cars of that train derailed at or near the Frankford Junction in or near the Port Richmond section of Philadelphia, Pennsylvania.

- 17. As a result of the aforementioned derailment, plaintiff was violently hurled about the railcar, striking his body on numerous parts of the railcar interior, before slamming onto the floor, as a result of which he sustained the serious and permanent personal injuries set forth herein.
- 18. At no time did the plaintiff act in a negligent, careless, or improper manner and the entire accident and derailment was caused by Amtrak's actions and inactions.
- 19. The negligence of Amtrak, individually and/or through its agents, servants, workmen and/or employees, included but is not limited to, failing to properly and safely operate the train, operating the train at an excessive speed; operating the train at a speed and in a manner that was unsafe in light of the geographic conditions and the train and track configuration; failing to have sufficient personnel to safely operate the train; failing to provide available, necessary and appropriate systems to slow and/or stop the train, if and/or when the engineer failed to properly operate the train and/or failed to operate it at a safe speed under the circumstances and/or when other circumstances caused the train to operate at an unsafe speed; failing to properly promulgate and enforce necessary timetables, bulletins, rules and instructions for the safe operation of the train; its failure to make certain that the train was being operated safely; its failure to properly train and instruct the train crew on safe train operations, particularly at or near the accident site; its failure to properly oversee and control the movement of the train; operating the train in an area of curved track at twice the legal track speed limit; and failure to warn plaintiff of these dangerous conditions.

- 20. The aforesaid accident was caused by the negligence of the defendant, its agents, servants, workmen and/or employees, and by the defendant's violation of "The Federal Employers' Liability Act," the Federal Locomotive Inspection Act and the Federal Safety Appliances Act, and was due in no manner whatsoever to any act or failure to act on the part of the plaintiff.
- As a result of the aforesaid accident, plaintiff sustained severe injuries to his body. More specifically, plaintiff sustained traumatic brain injury, multiple contusions and lacerations of the body, and multiple orthopedic and neurological injuries. Furthermore, plaintiff has sustained emotional trauma. The full extent of plaintiff's injuries is not presently known.

**WHEREFORE**, plaintiff claims of the defendant, a sum in excess of One Hundred Fifty Thousand Dollars (\$150,000.00).

### COUNT II- BRUCE A. PHILLIPS - COMMON LAW CLAIMS

- 22. The plaintiff herein is Bruce A. Phillips, a citizen and resident of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania residing therein at 2819 S. 67<sup>th</sup> Street, Philadelphia, PA 19142.
- 23. The defendant is a corporation duly organized and existing under and by virtue of the laws of the United States of America with its principal place of business located in Washington, D.C.
- 24. The jurisdiction of this Court is based upon 28 U.S.C. § 1331, federal question jurisdiction, because Amtrak was created and is regulated by the laws of the United States.

- 25. The jurisdiction of this Court is further based upon 28 U.S.C. § 1332, diversity of citizenship jurisdiction, because the plaintiffs are citizens of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania and the defendant is a citizen of the District of Columbia.
- 26. The defendant is a corporation duly organized and existing under and by virtue of the laws of the United States of America and regularly does business in the Eastern District of Pennsylvania.
- 27. At all times material hereto Amtrak was a common carrier for hire and plaintiff was an employee, passenger and business invitee on its train.
- 28. At the time and place hereinafter mentioned, the acts of omission and commission, causing the injuries to the plaintiff, were done by the defendant, its agents, servants, workmen and/or employees, acting in the course and scope of their employment with and under the control of the defendant.
- 29. All of the property, equipment and operations involved in the accident herein referred to were owned by and under the control of the defendant, its agents, servants, workmen and/or employees.
- 30. As a result of the accident herein referred to, plaintiff has suffered a loss and impairment of earnings and earning power and will suffer the same for an indefinite time in the future; has undergone great physical pain and mental anguish and will undergo the same for an indefinite time in the future; has been obliged to and will have to continue to expend large sums of money in the future in an effort to effect a cure of his aforesaid injuries; has been unable to attend to his usual duties and occupation and will be unable to attend to the same for an indefinite time in the future, all to his great detriment and loss.

- 31. The accident herein referred to was caused solely and exclusively by the negligence of the defendant, its agents, servants, workmen and/or employees, and was due in no manner whatsoever to any act or failure to act on the part of the plaintiff.
- 32. On or about May 12, 2015, at or about 9:23 p.m., the plaintiff was employed by Amtrak.
- 33. On the aforementioned date and at the aforementioned time, plaintiff was dead-heading from Philadelphia to New York City and was located on Amtrak's Northeast Regional Train No. 188.
- 34. On the aforementioned date and at the aforementioned time, plaintiff was located on train No 188 for the convenience of Amtrak and to promote Amtrak's interstate railroad transportation services.
- 35. On the aforementioned date and at the aforementioned time, plaintiff was located on train No 188 for Amtrak's benefit and in furtherance of Amtrak's operational activities.
- 36. On the aforementioned date and at the aforementioned time, plaintiff was located in one of the rear railcars of train No. 188.
- 37. On the aforementioned date and at the aforementioned time, as a result of Amtrak's negligence and carelessness, and further as a result of its violation of federal statutes, federal regulations, local statutes and ordinances, local regulations, and accepted industry rules, regulations, standards, and practices, train No. 188 and all of the cars of that train derailed at or near the Frankford Junction in or near the Port Richmond section of Philadelphia, Pennsylvania.

- 38. As a result of the aforementioned derailment, plaintiff was violently hurled about the railcar, striking his body on numerous parts of the railcar interior, before slamming onto the floor, as a result of which he sustained the serious and permanent personal injuries set forth herein.
- 39. At no time did the plaintiff act in a negligent, careless, or improper manner and the entire accident and derailment was caused by Amtrak's actions and inactions.
- 40. The negligence of Amtrak, individually and/or through its agents, servants, workmen and/or employees, included but is not limited to, failing to properly and safely operate the train, operating the train at an excessive speed; operating the train at a speed and in a manner that was unsafe in light of the geographic conditions and the train and track configuration; failing to have sufficient personnel to safely operate the train; failing to provide available, necessary and appropriate systems to slow and/or stop the train, if and/or when the engineer failed to properly operate the train and/or failed to operate it at a safe speed under the circumstances and/or when other circumstances caused the train to operate at an unsafe speed; failing to properly promulgate and enforce necessary timetables, bulletins, rules and instructions for the safe operation of the train; its failure to make certain that the train was being operated safely; its failure to properly train and instruct the train crew on safe train operations, particularly at or near the accident site; its failure to properly oversee and control the movement of the train; operating the train in an area of curved track at twice the legal track speed limit; and failure to warn plaintiff of these dangerous conditions.
- 41. The aforesaid accident was caused by the negligence of the defendant, its agents, servants, workmen and/or employees, and by the defendant's violation of the Federal Locomotive

Inspection Act and the Federal Safety Appliance Act, and was due in no manner whatsoever to any act or failure to act on the part of the plaintiff.

42. As a result of the aforesaid accident, plaintiff sustained severe injuries to his body. More specifically, plaintiff sustained traumatic brain injury, multiple contusions and lacerations of the body, and multiple orthopedic and neurological injuries. Furthermore, plaintiff has sustained emotional trauma. The full extent of plaintiff's injuries is not presently known.

**WHEREFORE**, plaintiff claims of the defendant, a sum in excess of One Hundred Fifty Thousand Dollars (\$150,000.00).

#### COUNT III - KALITA PLAINTIFF - LOSS OF CONSORTIUM

- 43. All the averments contained in Count II are incorporated herein as if set forth at length.
- 44. The plaintiff herein is Kalita Phillips, a citizen and resident of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, residing therein at 2819 S. 67<sup>th</sup> Street, Philadelphia, PA 19142.
- 45. The defendant is a corporation duly organized and existing under and by virtue of the laws of the United States of America with its principal place of business located in Washington, D.C.
- 46. The jurisdiction of this Court is based upon 28 U.S.C. § 1331, federal question jurisdiction, because Amtrak was created and is regulated bpy the laws of the United States.
- 47. The jurisdiction of this Court is further based upon 28 U.S.C. § 1332, diversity of citizenship jurisdiction, because the plaintiffs are citizens of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania and the defendant is a citizen of the District of Columbia.

48. As a result of the injuries sustained by husband-plaintiff as aforesaid, wife-plaintiff has been deprived of the society, companionship and consortium of her husband-plaintiff herein, and she will be deprived of the same for an indefinite time in the future, to her great detriment and loss.

**WHEREFORE**, plaintiff claims of the defendant, a sum in excess of One Hundred Fifty Thousand Dollars (\$150,000.00).

### **COUNT IV – HUSBAND AND WIFE – PUNITIVE DAMAGES**

- 45. The plaintiffs incorporate the averments contained in Counts II and III as set forth herein at length.
- 46. At all times material hereto, the defendant, acted in an outrageous, willful and grossly reckless manner.
- 47. At all times material hereto, the defendant, acted with a wanton disregard and reckless indifference to the rights and welfare of the plaintiffs herein, including but not limited to operating the train on curved track at twice the legal track speed limit.
- 48. At all times material hereto, the defendant, acted with a wanton disregard and reckless indifference to the rights and welfare of the passengers located on train No. 118 on or about May 12, 2015 at or about 9:23 p.m.
- 49. As a result of the outrageous, willful and grossly reckless conduct of the defendant, in which there was a wanton disregard and reckless indifference to the rights and welfare of the plaintiff herein, plaintiff is entitled to punitive damages against the defendant.

## Case 2:15-cv-02694-LDD Document 1 Filed 05/14/15 Page 11 of 11

WHEREFORE, plaintiffs each claim of the defendant, a sum in excess of One Hundred Fifty Thousand Dollars (\$150,000.00).

BY:

Respectfully submitted,

COFFEY KAYE MYERS & OLLEY

ROBERTE MYERS ESQUIRE

Counsel for Plaintiffs

COFFEY KAYE MYERS & OLLEY

Y: \_\_\_\_\_\_MICHAEL J. ØLLEY, ESQUIRE

Counsel for Plaintiffs

JS 44 (Rev. 12/12)

## 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.)

backage at any and any	acenter sileet:	CHOILD ON MENT THEE C	31 1111010	71GH.)					
I. (a) PLAINTIFFS				DEFENDANT	TS.			one a 10 111 a /// / bio /o	***************************************
BRUCE A. PHILLIPS AND KALITA PHILLIPS (H/W)				AMTRAK					
(b) County of Residence of First Listed Plaintiff PHILADELPHIA (EXCEPT IN U.S. PLAINTIFF CASES)				County of Residence of First Listed Defendant PHILADELPHIA  (IN U.S. PLAINTIFF CASES ONLY)  NOTE: IN LAND CONDEMNATION CASES, USE THE LOCATION OF THE TRACT OF LAND INVOLVED.					
(c) Attorneys (Firm Name Robert E. Myers, Esquir Coffee Kaye Myers & Ol 718 Two Bala Plaza, Ba	llie			Attorneys (If Know.	n)				
II. BASIS OF JURISD			III. CI	 TIZENSHIP OF	PRINCIPA	AL PARTIES	(Place an "X" in t	One Box J	for Plaintif
☐ 1 U.S. Government Plaintiff	☑ 3 Federal Question (U.S. Government)	Not a Party)			) PTF DEF 	Incorporated or Proof Business In T		r Defende PTF 4	ant) DEF   4
☐ 2 U.S. Government Defendant	☐ 4 Diversity (Indicate Citizensi	hip of Parties in Item III)	Citizo	en of Another State	O 2 O 2	Incorporated and I		<b>o</b> 5	<b>1</b> 5
W. MARONE OF CAN				en or Subject of a reign Country	<b>3 3</b>	Foreign Nation		□ 6	□ 6
IV. NATURE OF SUI		nly) DRTS	1 180	RFEITURE/PENALTY	RAN	KRUPTCY	OTHER S	TATHT	FS
□ 110 Insurance □ 120 Marine □ 130 Miller Act □ 140 Negotiable Instrument □ 150 Recovery of Overpayment ∞ Enforcement of Judgmen □ 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    REAL PROPERTY   □ 210 Land Condemnation □ 220 Foreclosure □ 230 Rent Lease & Ejectment □ 245 Tort Product Liability □ 290 All Other Real Property	PERSONAL INJURY  310 Airplane  315 Airplane Product Liability  320 Assault, Libel &	PERSONAL INJUR  365 Personal Injury - Product Liability 367 Health Care/ Pharmaceutical Personal Injury Product Liability 368 Asbestos Personal Injury Product Liability PERSONAL PROPER 370 Other Fraud 371 Truth in Lending 380 Other Personal Property Damage Product Liability PERSONAL PROPER 370 Other Fraud 371 Truth in Lending 485 Property Damage Product Liability PRISONER PETITION Habeas Corpus: 463 Alien Detainee 510 Motions to Vacate Sentence 530 General 535 Death Penalty Other: 540 Mandamus & Othe 550 Civil Rights	Y	5 Drug Related Seizure of Property 21 USC 881 Other  LABOR D Fair Labor Standards Act D Labor/Management Relations Railway Labor Act Family and Medical Leave Act Other Labor Litigation Employee Retirement Income Security Act  IMMIGRATION Naturalization Application Other Immigration Actions	422 Appe	eal 28 USC 158 drawal ISC 157  RTY RIGHTS Trights at emark  SECURITY (1395ff) C Lung (923) C/DIWW (405(g)) Title XVI 405(g))  LTAX SUITS 6 (U.S. Plaintiff efendant)	☐ 375 False Cla ☐ 400 State Res ☐ 410 Antitrust ☐ 430 Banks ar ☐ 450 Commer ☐ 460 Deportat ☐ 470 Racketes	aims Act apportion  I d Bankin  I d Bankin  I f Influence  I f Inf	ced and ions  odities/ etions  atters nation
	moved from 3 1 3 1 1 1 2 1 2 1 2 1 2 1 2 1 2 1 2 1	Appellate Court tute under which you are	4 Reinst Reope	ned Anothe (specify	er District )	□ 6 Multidistri Litigation	ct		
VI. CAUSE OF ACTIO	N 28 U.S.C. Section	1332; Amtrak enab	ling stati	ute		V.			
VII. REQUESTED IN COMPLAINT:		IS A CLASS ACTION		MAND \$	CF	HECK YES only i VRY DEMAND:		omplaint 🗇 No	F
VIII. RELATED CASE IF ANY	(See instructions):	JUDGE			DOCKET	NUMBER			
DATE 05/14/2015		SIGNATURE OF ATTO	0-1						***************************************
FOR OFFICE USE ONLY	THE PERSON OF TH	Ka	1.N	< 11/11/18					
RECEIPT# AM	IOUNT	APPLYING IFP		JUDGE		MAG. JUD	GE		

## Case 2:15-cv-02694-LDD Document 1-2 Filed 05/14/15 Page 1 of 1

#### UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA — DESIGNATION FORM to be used by counsel to indicate the category of the case for the purpose of assignment to appropriate calendar.

4

assignment to appropriate calendar.					
Address of Plaintiff: 2819 S. 67th Street, Philadel	phia,PA 19142				
Address of Defendant: 30th St. Station 2nd. Floor	, 30th & Market St., Phila. PA 1910				
Place of Accident, Incident or Transaction: Frankford Junction (Use Reverse Side For	- Port Richmand, Phila., PA Additional Space)				
Does this civil action involve a nongovernmental corporate party with any parent corporation	and any publicly held corporation owning 10% or more of its stock?				
(Attach two copies of the Disclosure Statement Form in accordance with Fed.R.Civ.P. 7.1(a	Yes□ No <mark>X</mark>				
Does this case involve multidistrict litigation possibilities?	Yes□X No□				
RELATED CASE, IF ANY: None Known	X				
Case Number: Judge	Date Terminated:				
Civil cases are deemed related when yes is answered to any of the following questions:					
1. Is this case related to property included in an earlier numbered suit pending or within one y	year previously terminated action in this court?				
	Yes□ No X				
2. Does this case involve the same issue of fact or grow out of the same transaction as a prior action in this court?	suit pending or within one year previously terminated				
	Yes□ No-X				
3. Does this case involve the validity or infringement of a patent already in suit or any earlier					
terminated action in this court?	Yes□ NoQ				
4. Is this case a second or successive habeas corpus, social security appeal, or pro se civil righ	nts case filed by the same individual?				
	Yes□ No₩				
CIVIL: (Place / in one category only)					
A. Federal Question Cases:	B. Diversity Jurisdiction Cases:				
1. □ Indemnity Contract, Marine Contract, and All Other Contracts	1. Insurance Contract and Other Contracts				
2. X FELA	2. □ Airplane Personal Injury				
3. □ Jones Act-Personal Injury	3. □ Assault, Defamation				
4. Antitrust	4.   Marine Personal Injury				
5. □ Patent	5.  Motor Vehicle Personal Injury				
6. □ Labor-Management Relations	6. □ Other Personal Injury (Please specify)				
7. □ Civil Rights	7. □ Products Liability				
8.   Habeas Corpus	8. □ Products Liability — Asbestos				
9. □ Securities Act(s) Cases	9. □ All other Diversity Cases				
10. □ Social Security Review Cases	(Please specify)				
11. □ All other Federal Question Cases (Please specify)					
ARBITRATION CERT (Check Appropriate Co	ategory)				
I, Robert E. Myers Esq., counsel of record do hereby certifully Pursuant to Local Civil Rule 53.2, Section 3(c)(2), that to the best of my knowledge and \$150,000.00 exclusive of interest and costs;  Relief other than monetary damages is sought.					
NATE.	11/1				
DATE: 5/14/15	Attorney I.D.#				
NOTE: A trial de novo will be a trial by jury only if the	re has been compliance with F.R.C.P. 38.				
I certify that, to my knowledge, the within case is not related to any case now pending or	within one year previously terminated action in this court				
except as noted above.	757/7				
DATE: 5/19/1) < a full < [M]	1				
Attorney-at-Law	Attorney I.D.#				

CIV. 609 (5/2012)

# IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA

## **CASE MANAGEMENT TRACK DESIGNATION FORM**

	:	CIVIL ACTION				
BRUCE A. PHILLLIPS AND	:					
KALITA PHILLÝPS (H/W)	•					
VS.	:	: NO.				
AMTRAK In accordance with the Civil Justice Expe plaintiff shall complete a Case Managemen filing the complaint and serve a copy on all side of this form.) In the event that a de designation, that defendant shall, with its f the plaintiff and all other parties, a Case M to which that defendant believes the case s	at Track Designation defendants. (See § 1: fendant does not agrirst appearance, submanagement Track De	Form in all civil cases at the tin 03 of the plan set forth on the re ee with the plaintiff regarding nit to the clerk of court and ser	me of verse said ve on			
SELECT ONE OF THE FOLLOWING	CASE MANAGEMI	ENT TRACKS:				
(a) Habeas Corpus – Cases brought under 28 U.S.C. § 2241 through § 2255.						
(b) Social Security – Cases requesting revi and Human Services denying plaintiff			( )			
(c) Arbitration – Cases required to be design	nated for arbitration	under Local Civil Rule 53.2.	( )			
(d) Asbestos – Cases involving claims for exposure to asbestos.	personal injury or pro	pperty damage from	( )			
(e) Special Management – Cases that do not commonly referred to as complex and the court. (See reverse side of this form	hat need special or in	tense management by				
management cases.)			( )			
(f) Standard Management – Cases that do i	•	of the other tracks.	( <sub>X</sub> )			
Koh	X EMM					
Date Robert E Attorney	Myers, Esq at-law	Plaintiffs Attorney for				
610-668-9800 610-66	57-3352					
Telephone FAX Nu	nber	E-Mail Address				
(6), (60) 10/02						

(Civ. 660) 10/02