1	Kathryn L. Bain, State Bar No. 15496							
2	BAIN MAZZA & DEBSKI LLP 10300 W. Charleston Blvd., Ste. 13-1	01						
3	Las Vegas, NV 89135	91						
4	Telephone: (702) 919-1090							
5	Fax: (650) 763-3933 Email: kbain@bmdlegal.com							
6	Monique Olivier (<i>Pro Hac Vice</i> to be	Submitted)						
7	Cassidy Clark (<i>Pro Hac Vice</i> to be Su OLIVIER & SCHREIBER LLP	ibmitted)						
8	475 14th Street, Suite 250 Oakland, CA 94612							
9	Tel: (415) 484-0980							
10	Fax: (415) 658-7758 Email: <u>monique@os-legal.com</u> <u>cassidy@os-legal.com</u>							
11	Anna D'Agostino (<i>Pro Hac Vice</i> to be	- Submitted)						
12	MILLER SHAH LLP 225 Broadway, Suite 1830							
13	New York, NY 10007 Tel: (866) 540-5505							
14								
15	Zinani <u>anaagoomio (e minoronamoon</u>	<u>.</u>						
16	Attorneys for Plaintiff and the Prop	osed Class						
17								
18	IN THE UNITED ST	ATES DISTRICT COURT						
19	EOD THE DISTRICT OF MENADA							
20	MICHAEL WARWAS, on behalf) CASE NO.: 2:23-cv-1367						
21	of himself and all others similarly situated,	CLASS ACTION COMPLAINT						
22	Plaintiff,	(1) Interference in Violation						
23	ranitini,	of the FMLA (2) Retaliation in Violation of						
24	v.	the FMLA						
25	SPIRIT AIRLINES, INC.,	DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL						
26	Defendant.	}						
27)						
28								

CLASS ACTION COMPLAINT

Plaintiff, Michael Warwas ("Plaintiff" or "Warwas") brings this action against Defendant, Spirit Airlines, Inc. ("Defendant" or "Spirit"), on behalf of himself and those similarly situated ("Class" as defined below), and alleges as follows:

NATURE OF THE ACTION

- 1. Spirit, a major commercial airline, maintains policies, practices and procedures that violate the Family and Medical Leave Act ("FMLA"), 29 U.S.C. § 2601, *et seq.* and effectively interfere with, restrain, and deny the exercise of or the attempt to exercise FMLA benefits by flight attendants ("FAs"). Moreover, when Plaintiff opposed Spirit's unlawful policies, practices, and procedures, it retaliated against and eventually terminated him.
- 2. Accordingly, Plaintiff brings this class action seeking damages and declaratory relief on behalf of himself and all other similarly situated Spirit FAs. Plaintiff also brings individual claims to redress his own wrongful termination.

PARTIES

- 3. Plaintiff is an adult man, a U.S. citizen, and a resident of the State of Minnesota.
- 4. Defendant is a Delaware corporation with its principal place of business in Miramar, Broward County, Florida.
- 5. Defendant is a major commercial airline and purports to serve "more than 90 destinations across the U.S., Latin America and the Caribbean." *See*https://www.spirit.com/about-us. At all relevant times, Defendant has maintained a base of operations in Las Vegas, Nevada.
- 6. Defendant employs more than 50 people for each working day during each of 20 or more calendar workweeks during the applicable time period, is engaged in commerce or in an industry or activity affecting commerce, and thus, is an employer as defined under the FMLA. 29 C.F.R. § 825.104.

JURISDICTION AND VENUE

- 7. This Court has original jurisdiction pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1331 because Plaintiff brings this class action based on federal questions under the FMLA, 29 U.S.C. § 2601, *et seq*.
- 8. Venue is proper in this District under 28 U.S.C. § 1391 because Spirit resides, transacts business, or has offices in this District, and a substantial part of the acts and omissions alleged herein took place in this District.

SUBSTANTIVE ALLEGATIONS

A. Spirit's Leave Policies Violate the FMLA

- 9. At all relevant times herein, Spirit has implemented and enforced certain family and medical leave policies that violate the FMLA.
- 10. The FMLA entitles eligible employees of covered employers like Spirit to take unpaid job-protected leave for specified family and medical reasons.
- 11. Among other things, FAs must meet the FMLA's "hours of service requirement" to be entitled to FMLA leave. Airline flight crew personnel are subject to special FMLA eligibility rules. *See* 29 C.F.R. § 825.801.
- 12. Specifically, under the FMLA as it pertains to flight crew personnel, a FA will meet the "hours of service requirement," if during the previous twelve (12) months, he or she has:
 - a. Worked or been paid for not less than 60 percent of the employee's applicable monthly guarantee; and
 - b. Worked or been paid for not less than 504 hours. *Id.*
- 13. The hours an employee has "worked" are the employee's "duty hours," which are all hours during which an employee is designated to work, and "encompass time spent performing a variety of support duties that begin before a plane takes flight and end after it lands." *See* FMLA FAQ https://www.dol.gov/agencies/whd/fmla/faq.

14. In addition, "[i]n the event an employer of airline flight crew employees does not maintain an accurate record of hours worked or hours paid, the employer has the burden of showing that the employee has not worked or been paid for the requisite hours. Specifically, an employer must be able to clearly demonstrate that an airline flight crew employee has not worked or been paid for 60 percent of his or her applicable monthly guarantee or for 504 hours during the previous 12 months in order to claim that the airline flight crew employee is not eligible for FMLA leave." 29 C.F.R. § 825.801(d).

i. Spirit's FMLA Eligibility Policy Excludes Certain Hours Worked.

- 15. Duty hours include all pre- and post-flight time during which FAs perform duties.
- 16. Spirit requires Plaintiff and the Class members to report to the airport or designated location sixty (60) minutes prior to scheduled departure if the flight is departing from the FA's home base, or fifty (50) minutes prior to scheduled departure if the flight is departing outside of the FA's home base. During this time, Plaintiff and the Class members are required to attend pre-flight briefings and remain on board to greet and assist passengers during the entire boarding process. Spirit also requires Plaintiff and the Class members to stay on board for at least thirty (30) minutes after the aircraft is secured at the unloading point to assist passengers during the entire deplaning process.
- 17. Spirit, however, does not include all duty hours when calculating the "hours of service requirement" for FMLA eligibility. Instead, Spirit uses "credit hours" to calculate the hours-of-service requirement. Credit hours omit most of the pre- and post-flight duty hours; credit hours are comprised of "block hours," i.e., the time beginning when an aircraft first moves for the purpose of a flight (that is, is moved off the ramp blocks) and ending when the aircraft is next secured back onto the ramp blocks at the destination point.

- 18. Because Spirit uses only block hours, rather than duty hours, to calculate the hours-of-service requirement for FMLA eligibility, Spirit unlawfully fails to include the time FAs are working pre- and post- flight which is at a minimum eighty (80) to ninety (90) minutes of time per flight. In this way, Spirit excludes certain hours worked when calculating the hours-of-service requirement, in violation of the FMLA.
- 19. As a result of this unlawful policy and practice, Spirit regularly interferes with, restrains, or denies the exercise of or the attempt to exercise the FMLA benefits by FAs. Plaintiff and members of the Class have been denied FMLA leave based on these policies and practices that do not comply with the FMLA.
 - ii. Spirit's FMLA Eligibility Policy Requires a Higher Number of Hours than the FMLA Permits.
- 20. In addition, Spirit has a consistent policy and/or practice of requiring FAs to maintain a higher number of hours than required under the law to qualify for FMLA. For example, Spirit tells its FAs that 520 credit hours, rather than 504 duty hours, are required for FMLA eligibility.
- 21. Further, Spirit has a policy and/or practice of deducting more hours from FAs' available FMLA leave hours than the FAs request, resulting in deficient leave hours available to FAs.
- 22. As a result of these unlawful policies and practices, Spirit regularly interferes with, restrains, or denies the exercise of or the attempt to exercise the FMLA benefits by FAs. Plaintiff and members of the Class have been denied FMLA leave based on these policies and practices that do not comply with the FMLA.

iii. Spirit Fails to Count the Paid 36 Hours Per Month Toward FMLA Eligibility Requirement

- 23. Starting in March 2020, Spirit issued several Memorandums of Understanding ("MOU(s)") in response to the novel coronavirus ("COVID-19").
- 24. On March 27, 2020, "to implement a temporary and voluntary program to reduce [FA] headcount given the challenging market conditions caused by COVID-19," Spirit offered certain eligible FAs, "COVID-19 Voluntary Time Off ('CVTO') leaves."
- 25. Pursuant to the CVTO, among other promises, Spirit agreed to pay each FA on CVTO leave for an entire bid month, "paid and credited thirty-six (36) hours (which [was] considered compensation) at the [FA's] applicable hourly rate, payable on the first pay period of the month." *See* COVID MOUs dated March 27, 2020 and August 12, 2020, https://spiritafa.org/loas.
- 26. As discussed above, pursuant to the FMLA, an FA meets the hours-of-service requirement if the FA, *inter alia*, "has worked **or** been paid for not less than 504 hours." 29 C.F.R. § 825.801 (emphasis added); 29 U.S.C. § 2611.
- 27. Despite having paid FAs 36 hours per month while on CVTO, Spirit refused to count those hours toward the FA's hours-of-service requirement for FMLA eligibility.
- 28. As a result, Spirit routinely denied FMLA leave to FAs who have taken CVTO, on the basis that they do not have the necessary hours of service for FMLA eligibility.
- 29. Spirit's enforcement of the CVTO policy interferes with, restrains, and/or denies the exercise of or the attempt to exercise the FMLA benefits Plaintiff and members of the Class.

PLAINTIFF'S EXPERIENCE

A. Warwas's Employment with Spirit

- 30. Warwas was employed by Defendant as a FA on or around November 11, 2013 until he was terminated on or around September 4, 2021.
- 31. A FA's base airport is known as the "domicile" or "home base." Plaintiff's "home base" was Las Vegas, Nevada throughout the entire period of his employment with Defendant.
- 32. At all relevant times herein, Warwas was eligible for FMLA because he worked for a FMLA-covered employer and at all relevant times met the hours-of-service requirement.

B. Spirit Improperly Denies FMLA Coverage to Warwas

- 33. On or about January 12, 2019, Plaintiff contacted Spirit's third-party FMLA administrator, Unum, and requested intermittent FMLA leave pursuant to his doctor's suggestion and medical needs.
- 34. At all times herein mentioned, Unum was the agent or employee of Spirit and was acting within the course and scope of such agency or employment.
- 35. Spirit approved and Plaintiff utilized intermittent and continuous FMLA leave at several points throughout 2019 and 2020, while continuing to work as a FA for Defendant.
- 36. On June 21, 2019, Spirit issued Plaintiff a final disciplinary warning based on Plaintiff's attendance record.
- 37. Plaintiff's attendance record included dates Spirit recorded as "Sick Calls." Several of those dates were not "Sick Calls," but were, in fact, protected leave under the FMLA.

C. Plaintiff Files a Complaint with the DOL, Which Determines That Spirit Violated the FMLA

38. Because Spirit incorrectly recorded several of Plaintiff's absences as Sick Calls when they should have been covered by his FMLA leave, Plaintiff

9

7

17 18

20

19

22

23

21

24

25 26

27 28

contacted the Department of Labor ("DOL") in or about December 2019 and requested that the DOL investigate potential FMLA violations by Spirit.

- On or about August 13, 2020, the DOL informed Plaintiff of its 39. findings, inter alia, that Spirit violated the FMLA when it failed to apply Plaintiff's FMLA leave to certain past absences.
- On or about August 27, 2020, Spirit informed the DOL that it would 40. revise Plaintiff's FMLA balance, treating several of his past absences as FMLA protected.
- 41. In Spirit's August 27, 2020 communication to the DOL, Defendant confirmed that Plaintiff had FMLA leave hours available at the time.

D. Spirit Improperly Denies FMLA Leave of Warwas

- On or about September 9, 2020, Unum sent Plaintiff a letter stating 42. that Plaintiff did not have any FMLA hours available, despite Spirit's statement to the DOL on August 27, 2020, that Plaintiff had FMLA leave hours available.
- On or about September 26, 2020, Plaintiff submitted a new request 43. for FMLA leave to Spirit pursuant to his doctor's suggestion and medical needs.
- In or around September 2020, Sedgwick took over as Spirit's third-44. party FMLA administrator for Unum.
- At all times herein mentioned, Sedgwick was the agent or employee 45. of Spirit and was acting within the course and scope of such agency or employment.
- On or about October 20, 2020, Sedgwick sent Plaintiff a letter stating 46. that Plaintiff did not meet the FMLA's eligibility requirements because he did not have the requisite number of hours worked to establish eligibility. Spirit, through Sedwick, denied Plaintiff's FMLA request. As a result, his subsequent absences were erroneously coded as Sick Calls instead of FMLA leave.
- However, as of October 20, 2020, Plaintiff had, in fact, the requisite 47. hours-of-service necessary for FMLA leave.

7

10 11

12 13

14 15

16

17 18

19

20 21

22

23 24

25 26

27

28

Further, on more than one occasion, Spirit deducted more hours 48. from Plaintiff's available FMLA leave than he had requested and/or was reasonably necessary in light of his medical needs.

- Additionally, Plaintiff bid for and was granted CVTO from April 49. through August 2020. During this time, Plaintiff was paid 36 hours per month while on CVTO leave.
- Although Warwas was paid 36 hours per month while he was on 50. CVTO leave, those hours were not counted towards his "hours of service" requirement to be eligible for FMLA leave.
- On or about March 10, 2021, Plaintiff made a second complaint to the 51. DOL and again requested that the DOL investigate potential FMLA violations by Spirit.
- On or about June 15, 2021, the DOL issued its findings, inter alia, 52. that Spirit violated the FMLA when it failed to keep accurate records regarding Plaintiff.

E. Spirit Retaliates Against Plaintiff for Making Complaints about Spirit's FMLA Non-Compliance and Eventually Terminates Him.

- On or about March 4, 2021, Spirit required Plaintiff to attend an 53. "investigatory meeting" based on his absence from work on December 4, 2020. Plaintiff had requested to use FMLA leave on this date, but Spirit denied his request, citing insufficient hours of service. Thus, Spirit counted this absence as a "Sick Call." Plaintiff's absence on December 4, 2020 was due to the same medical condition for which he had requested and been denied FMLA leave on or about September 9, 2020 and October 20, 2020.
 - Plaintiff in fact had sufficient hours of service for FMLA eligibility. 54.
- On June 22, 2021, Spirit required Plaintiff to attend an investigatory 55. meeting based on his absences from work between March 13, 2021 and May 7, 2021. Plaintiff's absences during this period were due to the same medical

All current and former flight attendants who were employed by Spirit and based in the United States, at any time during the period from three years prior to the filing of the original complaint in this action through the date of final judgment.

- Class as defined herein are so numerous that joinder would be impracticable. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and thereon allege, the Class are comprised of hundreds, if not thousands, of persons and is so numerous that joinder of all members is impracticable. The exact size of the Class and the identity of the members of the Class are ascertainable from the business records maintained by Defendant. The Class may be notified of the pendency of this action by mail, or other appropriate media, using the notice similar to that which is customarily used in wage and hour class actions.
- **Commonality:** There is a well-defined community of interest and 60. common questions of law and fact that predominate over any question affecting only individual members of the Class. These common legal and factual questions, which do not vary from members of the Class, and which may be determined

28

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

without reference to the individual circumstances of any members of the Class, include, but are not limited, to the following:

- a. Whether Spirit has a policy and/or practice of requiring FAs to accrue more than the hours required by the FMLA to be eligible for leave under the FMLA;
- Whether Spirit has a policy and/or practice of excluding certain hours worked in violation of the FMLA's hours-ofservice requirement;
- c. Whether Spirit has a policy and/or practice of excluding certain hours paid in violation of the FMLA's hours-of-service requirement;
- d. Whether, as a result of Spirit's misconduct as alleged herein, members of the Class and Subclass are entitled to damages, restitution, declaratory relief, and other remedies, and, if so, the amount and nature of such relief.
- 61. **Typicality:** Plaintiff' claims are typical of the claims of the members of the Class as all members of the Class are similarly affected by Defendant's wrongful conduct in violation of federal law that are complained of herein. The claims arise from the same course of conduct, and the relief sought is common.
- 62. **Adequacy of Representation:** Plaintiff is a member of the Class and will fairly and adequately protect the interests of the members of the Class because: (1) his interests do not conflict with the interest of the individual members of the Class he seeks to represent; (2) he has retained counsel competent and experienced in employment class action litigation; and (3) he intends to prosecute this action vigorously.
- 63. **Superiority:** A class action is superior to all other available methods for the fair and efficient adjudication of this controversy. The expense and burden of individual litigation would make it impracticable or impossible for members of

1	the Class to prosecute their claims individually. The litigation and trial of the
2	class-wide claims are manageable. Questions of law and fact common to the
3	predominate over any questions affecting only individual members of the Clas
4	Each member of the Class has suffered injury and is entitled to recover by reas
5	of Defendant's unlawful conduct. Common proof as to Defendant's conduct,
6	including Defendant's own documents will be available to demonstrate the
7	uniformity of Defendant's conduct.

class-wide claims are manageable. Questions of law and fact common to the Class predominate over any questions affecting only individual members of the Class. Each member of the Class has suffered injury and is entitled to recover by reason of Defendant's unlawful conduct. Common proof as to Defendant's conduct, including Defendant's own documents will be available to demonstrate the uniformity of Defendant's conduct.

8 9

10 11

12 13

14 15

16

17

18 19

20 21

22

23

24 25

26

27

28

COUNT I Interference in Violation of the FMLA (On Behalf of Plaintiff and the Class)

- Plaintiff repeats and realleges the allegations in paragraphs 1 through 64. 63 above as though fully set forth herein.
- The FMLA provides that flight crew personnel are entitled to FMLA 65. leave benefits and, specifically, job-protected leave, if they meet the hours-ofservice requirement of having worked or been paid for not less than 60 percent of the employee's applicable guarantee and having worked or been paid for not less than 504 hours in the twelve-month period preceding the request for leave. 29 C.F.R. § 825.801.
- The FMLA further provides that "[i]t shall be unlawful for any 66. employer to interfere with, restrain, or deny the exercise of or the attempt to exercise, any right provided under" the FMLA. 29 U.S.C.A. § 2615.
- At all relevant times herein, Plaintiff and the members of the FMLA 67. Class were employed by Spirit, a FMLA-covered employer.
- At all relevant times herein, Plaintiff and the members of the FMLA 68. Class were entitled to protections afforded under the FMLA and have a right to be free of policies that interfere with, restrain, or deny the exercise of or the attempt to exercise lawful use of FMLA benefits.

10

11 12

14

15

13

16 17

18

19 20

21

22 23

24 25

26

2.7

28

- As described above, Spirit has committed violations of the FMLA 69. against Plaintiff and the Class members by, *inter alia*, failing to appropriately credit hours worked and hours paid when establishing FAs FMLA eligibility.
- In addition, Spirit has committed violations of the FMLA against Plaintiff and the Class members by routinely deducting more hours from FAs' available FMLA leave hours than the FAs request, resulting in deficient leave hours available to FAs.
- As a result, Spirit has a practice of interfering with, retraining, and/or 71. denying the exercise of or the attempt of exercise of lawful use of FMLA benefits.
- As a direct and proximate cause of Spirit's FMLA violations, Plaintiff 72. and the Class suffered and continue to suffer damages, and seek, inter alia: back pay, front pay, compensatory damages, special damages, general damages, attorney's fees and costs.
- Spirit's unlawful conduct in violation of the FMLA was intentional 73. and/or was not carried out in good faith, and therefore, Plaintiff and the FMLA Class members are entitled to an award of liquidated damages.

COUNT II Retaliation in Violation of the FMLA (On behalf of Warwas)

- Warwas repeats and realleges the allegations in paragraphs 1 through 74. 73 as though fully set forth herein.
- The FMLA provides that "[i]t shall be unlawful for any employer 75. to . . . discriminate against any individual for opposing any practice made unlawful by this subchapter." 29 U.S.C.A. § 2615.
- The FMLA provides that "[i]t shall be unlawful for any employer to 76. discharge . . . any individual for opposing any practice made unlawful by this subchapter." 29 U.S.C.A. § 2615.

Reasonable attorneys' fees and costs pursuant to applicable law;

28

7.

1	8.	Costs of suit her	rein; and			
2	9.	For such other	relief as the Court may deem just and proper.			
3	JURY DEMAND					
4	Plaintiff demands a trial by jury on all issues so triable.					
5	Dated: Sep	tember 1, 2023	/s/ Kathryn L. Bain			
6			Vothman I Doin State Don No. 15406			
7			Kathryn L. Bain, State Bar No. 15496 BAIN MAZZA & DEBSKI LLP			
8			10300 W. Charleston Blvd., Ste. 13-191 Las Vegas, NV 89135			
9			Tel: (702) 919-1090			
9			Fax: (650) 763-3933			
10			Email: <u>kbain@bmdlegal.com</u>			
11			Monique Olivier (<i>Pro Hac Vice</i> to be Submitted)			
12			Cassidy Clark (<i>Pro Hac Vice</i> to be Submitted)			
13			OLIVIER & SCHREIBER LLP 475 14th Street, Suite 250			
			Oakland, CA 94612			
14			Tel: (415) 484-0980			
15			Fax: (415) 658-7758			
1.6			Email: monique@os-legal.com			
16			cassidy@os-legal.com			
17			Anna D'Agostino (<i>Pro Hac Vice</i> to be Submitted)			
18			MILLER SHAH LLP			
19			225 Broadway, Suite 1830 New York, NY 10007			
20			Tel: (866) 540-5505			
			Fax: (866) 300-7367			
21			Email: akdagostino@millershah.com			
22			Attorneys for Plaintiff and the Proposed			
23			Class			
24						
25						
26						
27						
28						
	I .					

Case 2:23-cv-01367 Document 1-1 Filed 09/01/23 Page 1 of 2

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 de	ocket sheet. (SEE INSTRUC	TIONS ON NEXT PAGE OI	F THIS FO	RM.)			
. (a) PLAINTIFFS			DEFENDANTS				
MICHAEL WAR similarly situated	MICHAEL WARWAS, on behalf of himself and all others similarly situated			SPIRIT AIRLINES, INC.,			
` '				County of Residence of First Listed Defendant (IN U.S. PLAINTIFF CASES ONLY) NOTE: IN LAND CONDEMNATION CASES, USE THE LOCATION OF THE TRACT OF LAND INVOLVED.			
(c) Attorneys (Firm Name, Address, and Telephone Number) Kathryn L. Bain, Bain Mazza & Debski LLP, 10300 W. Charleston Blvd., Ste. 13-191, Las Vegas, NV 89135, 702-919-1090				Attorneys (If Known)			
II. BASIS OF JURISDI	CTION (Place an "X" in O	ne Box Only)			PRINCIPAL PARTIE	(Place an "X" in One Box for Plaint	
☐ 1 U.S. Government Plaintiff	⊠ 3 Federal Question (U.S. Government)	Not a Party)			TF DEF 1 1 Incorporated or of Business I	and One Box for Defendant) PTF DEF Principal Place	
☐ 2 U.S. Government Defendant	☐ 4 Diversity (Indicate Citizenshi)	ip of Parties in Item III)	Citize	en of Another State		nd Principal Place 5 5 5 In Another State	
				en or Subject of a Ereign Country	1 3	□ 6 □ 6	
IV. NATURE OF SUIT		nly) ORTS	F(ORFEITURE/PENALTY	Click here for: Nature BANKRUPTCY	re of Suit Code Descriptions. OTHER STATUTES	
□ 110 Insurance □ 120 Marine □ 130 Miller Act □ 140 Negotiable Instrument □ 150 Recovery of Overpayment & Enforcement of Judgment □ 151 Medicare Act □ 152 Recovery of Defaulted Student Loans (Excludes Veterans) □ 153 Recovery of Overpayment of Veteran's Benefits □ 160 Stockholders' Suits □ 190 Other Contract □ 195 Contract Product Liability □ 196 Franchise □ REAL PROPERTY □ 210 Land Condemnation □ 220 Foreclosure □ 230 Rent Lease & Ejectment □ 240 Torts to Land □ 245 Tort Product Liability □ 290 All Other Real Property	PERSONAL INJURY 310 Airplane 315 Airplane Product Liability 320 Assault, Libel &	PERSONAL INJURY PRESONAL INJURY 365 Personal Injury - Product Liability Brandle Fersonal Injury - Product Liability Personal Injury Product Liability Product Liability PERSONAL PROPER 370 Other Fraud 371 Truth in Lending 380 Other Personal Property Damage 70 385 Property Damage 70 385 Property Damage 71 Truth in Lending 72 385 Property Damage 73 385 Property Damage 73 385 Property Damage 75 30 General 75 30 General 75 30 General 75 35 Death Penalty 75 Other: 75 40 Mandamus & Othe 75 50 Civil Rights 75 Prison Condition 75 Confinement	TTY	5 Drug Related Seizure of Property 21 USC 881 0 Other LABOR 0 Fair Labor Standards Act 0 Labor/Management Relations 0 Railway Labor Act 1 Family and Medical Leave Act 0 Other Labor Litigation 1 Employee Retirement Income Security Act IMMIGRATION 2 Naturalization Application 5 Other Immigration Actions	□ 422 Appeal 28 USC 158 □ 423 Withdrawal 28 USC 157 PROPERTY RIGHTS □ 820 Copyrights □ 830 Patent □ 835 Patent - Abbreviated New Drug Application □ 840 Trademark SOCIAL SECURITY □ 861 HIA (1395ff) □ 862 Black Lung (923) □ 863 DIWC/DIWW (405(g) □ 864 SSID Title XVI □ 865 RSI (405(g)) FEDERAL TAX SUITS □ 870 Taxes (U.S. Plaintiff or Defendant) □ 871 IRS—Third Party 26 USC 7609	□ 375 False Claims Act □ 376 Qui Tam (31 USC 3729(a)) □ 400 State Reapportionment □ 410 Antitrust □ 430 Banks and Banking □ 450 Commerce □ 460 Deportation □ 470 Racketeer Influenced and Corrupt Organizations □ 480 Consumer Credit □ 485 Telephone Consumer Protection Act	
	moved from	Appellate Court	•	pened Anoth (specify	er District Litigati y) Transfe	ion - Litigation -	
VI. CAUSE OF ACTIO	DN 29 U.S.C. § 2601, of Brief description of ca	iuse:	e filing (I	Oo not cite jurisdictional sta	ututes unless diversity):		
VII. REQUESTED IN COMPLAINT:		I Leave Act ("FMLA") IS A CLASS ACTION 3, F.R.Cv.P.		EMAND \$ BD	CHECK YES or JURY DEMAN	nly if demanded in complaint: ID:	
VIII. RELATED CASI IF ANY	(See instructions):	JUDGE			DOCKET NUMBER		
DATE September 1, 2023 FOR OFFICE USE ONLY		SIGNATURE OF ATT /s/ Kathryn L. E		OF RECORD			
	MOUNT	APPLYING IFP		JUDGE _	MAG. J	UDGE	

INSTRUCTIONS FOR ATTORNEYS COMPLETING CIVIL COVER SHEET FORM JS 44

Authority For Civil Cover Sheet

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

- **I.(a) Plaintiffs-Defendants.** Enter names (last, first, middle initial) of plaintiff and defendant. If the plaintiff or defendant is a government agency, use only the full name or standard abbreviations. If the plaintiff or defendant is an official within a government agency, identify first the agency and then the official, giving both name and title.
- **(b)** County of Residence. For each civil case filed, except U.S. plaintiff cases, enter the name of the county where the first listed plaintiff resides at the time of filing. In U.S. plaintiff cases, enter the name of the county in which the first listed defendant resides at the time of filing. (NOTE: In land condemnation cases, the county of residence of the "defendant" is the location of the tract of land involved.)
- (c) Attorneys. Enter the firm name, address, telephone number, and attorney of record. If there are several attorneys, list them on an attachment, noting in this section "(see attachment)".
- II. Jurisdiction. The basis of jurisdiction is set forth under Rule 8(a), F.R.Cv.P., which requires that jurisdictions be shown in pleadings. Place an "X" in one of the boxes. If there is more than one basis of jurisdiction, precedence is given in the order shown below.

United States plaintiff. (1) Jurisdiction based on 28 U.S.C. 1345 and 1348. Suits by agencies and officers of the United States are included here. United States defendant. (2) When the plaintiff is suing the United States, its officers or agencies, place an "X" in this box.

Federal question. (3) This refers to suits under 28 U.S.C. 1331, where jurisdiction arises under the Constitution of the United States, an amendment to the Constitution, an act of Congress or a treaty of the United States. In cases where the U.S. is a party, the U.S. plaintiff or defendant code takes precedence, and box 1 or 2 should be marked.

Diversity of citizenship. (4) This refers to suits under 28 U.S.C. 1332, where parties are citizens of different states. When Box 4 is checked, the citizenship of the different parties must be checked. (See Section III below; **NOTE: federal question actions take precedence over diversity cases.**)

- **III. Residence (citizenship) of Principal Parties.** This section of the JS 44 is to be completed if diversity of citizenship was indicated above. Mark this section for each principal party.
- IV. Nature of Suit. Place an "X" in the appropriate box. If there are multiple nature of suit codes associated with the case, pick the nature of suit code that is most applicable. Click here for: Nature of Suit Code Descriptions.
- V. Origin. Place an "X" in one of the seven boxes.

Original Proceedings. (1) Cases which originate in the United States district courts.

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

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

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

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

Multidistrict Litigation – Direct File. (8) Check this box when a multidistrict case is filed in the same district as the Master MDL docket. **PLEASE NOTE THAT THERE IS NOT AN ORIGIN CODE 7.** Origin Code 7 was used for historical records and is no longer relevant due to changes in statue.

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

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

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

for the District of Nevada

MICHAEL WARWAS, on behalf of himself and all others similarly situated, Plaintiff(s) V. SPIRIT AIRLINES, INC.,)))) Civil Action No. 2:23-cv-1367)			
Defendant(s)		<i>)</i>			
	SUMMONS IN	NA CIVIL ACTION			
To: (Defendant's name and address)	SPIRIT AIRLINES, IN CORPORATION SER 1201 HAYS ST TALLAHASSEE, FL 32	VICE COMPANY			
A lawsuit has been filed	against you.				
Within 21 days after service of this summons on you (not counting the day you received it) — or 60 days if you are the United States or a United States agency, or an officer or employee of the United States described in Fed. R. Civ. P. 12 (a)(2) or (3) — you must serve on the plaintiff an answer to the attached complaint or a motion under Rule 12 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure. The answer or motion must be served on the plaintiff or plaintiff's attorney, whose name and address are: Kathryn L. Bain					
	Bain Mazza & Debski LLI 10300 W. Charleston Blvo				
	Las Vegas, NV 89135 (702) 919-1090				
If you fail to respond, judgment by default will be entered against you for the relief demanded in the complaint. You also must file your answer or motion with the court.					
		CLERK OF COURT			
Date:	_	Signature of Clerk or Deputy Clerk			

AO 440 (Rev. 06/12) Summons in a Civil Action (Page 2)

Civil Action No.

PROOF OF SERVICE

(This section should not be filed with the court unless required by Fed. R. Civ. P. 4 (1))

		ne of individual and title, if any)						
was rec	ceived by me on (date)	· · ·						
	☐ I personally served the summons on the individual at (place)							
			on (date)	; or				
	I left the summons at the individual's residence or usual place of abode with (name) , a person of suitable age and discretion who resides the on (date) , and mailed a copy to the individual's last known address; or							
	☐ I served the summo	, who is						
	designated by law to a	accept service of process on beha						
			on (date)	; or				
	☐ I returned the sumn	nons unexecuted because		; or				
	☐ Other (specify):							
	My fees are \$	for travel and \$	for services, for a total of \$	0.00				
	I declare under penalty	of perjury that this information	is true.					
Date:								
Bute.			Server's signature					
			Printed name and title					
			Server's address					

Additional information regarding attempted service, etc: