CT Corporation

Service of Process Transmittal 06/02/2011 CT Log Number 518612338

TO:	Tammy Rhoades
	Buffets, Inc. 405 Lancaster Ave.
	Greer, SC 29650

RE: Process Served in Michigan

FOR: Buffets, Inc. (Domestic State: MN)

ENCLOSED ARE COPIES OF LEGAL PROCESS RECEIVED BY THE STATUTORY AGENT OF THE ABOVE COMPANY AS FOLLOWS:				
TITLE OF ACTION:	Robert Craig, Pltf. vs. Buffets, Inc., Dft.			
DOCUMENT(S) SERVED:	Summons, Proof of Service Form, Copy of Complaint, Demand for Pre-Trial Conference, Jury Demand			
COURT/AGENCY:	10th Circuit Court, Saginaw County, MI Case # 110012886CZ4			
NATURE OF ACTION:	Employee Litigation - Discrimination - On the basis of age			
ON WHOM PROCESS WAS SERVED:	The Corporation Company, Bingham Farms, MI			
DATE AND HOUR OF SERVICE:	By Certified Mail on 06/02/2011 postmarked on 05/31/2011			
JURISDICTION SERVED :	Michigan			
APPEARANCE OR ANSWER DUE:	Within 28 days			
ATTORNEY(S) / SENDER(S):	Victor J. Mastromarco, Jr. The Mastromarco Firm 1024 N. Michigan Ave. Saginaw, MI 48602 989-752-1414			
ACTION ITEMS:	CT has retained the current log, Retain Date: 06/02/2011, Expected Purge Date: 06/07/2011 Image SOP Email Notification, Tammy Rhoades tammy.rhoades@buffetsinc.com Email Notification, Paul Holovnia paul.holovnia@buffetsinc.com			
BIGNED: PER: ADDRE\$9: TELEPHONE:	The Corporation Company Stephanie Hendrickson 30600 Telegraph Road Suite 2345 Bingham Farms, MI 48025-5720 248-646-9033			

Dockets.Justia.com

Page 1 of 1 / AD

Information displayed on this transmittal is for CT Corporation's record keeping purposes only and is provided to the recipient for quick reference. This information does not constitute a legal opinion as to the nature of action, the amount of damages, the answer date, or any information contained in the documents themselves. Recipient is responsible for interpreting said documents and for taking appropriate action. Signatures on certified mail receipts confirm receipt of package only, not contents.

Approved, SCAO	Origina 1st cor	al - Court by - Defendant	2nd copy - Plaintiff 3rd copy - Return
STATE OF MICHIGAN JUDICIAL DISTRICT 10th JUDICIAL CIRCUIT	SUMMONS AND COMPLAINT		CASE NO. 11- 11- 11- 12886-CZ-
COUNTY PROBATE	[Note that the second	Court telephone no
11 S. Michigan Ave., Saginaw, MI 4860	2		(989) 790-5540
Plaintiff name(s), address(es), and telephone ROBERT CRAIG	no(s).	PUEFETS INC	address(es), and telephone no(s).
Plaintiff attorney, bar no., address, and telephy VICTOR J. MASTROMARCO, JR.	one no. P34564	Resident Agent:	Natau
THE MASTROMARCO FIRM 1024 N. MICHIGAN AVE. SAGINAW, MI 48602 989) 752-1414		C.T. Corporation 5 30600 Telegraph F Bingham Farms, N	Road, Ste. 2345
take other lawful action (28 days if 3. If you do not answer or take other a in the complaint.	ction within the time allow	ed, judgment may be ente	ered against you for the relief demande
5/25/11 This summons is invalid unless served on or b COMPLAINT Instruction: The follow by the plaintiff. Actual allegations and Family Division Cases There is no other pending or resolve	B/25/11 efore its expirition date. ing is information that is re the claim for relief must b	e stated on additional co	mplaint pages and attached to this forn
5/25/11 This summons is invalid unless served on or b COMPLAINT Instruction: The follow by the plaintiff. Actual allegations and Family Division Cases Z There is no other pending or resolve mombers of the parties	B/25//// efore its expiration date. ing is information that is re the claim for relief must b d action within the jurisdict he family division of the c	be stated on additional co ion of the family division o ircuit court involving the	mplaint pages and attached to this form fcircuit court involving the family or famil family or family members of the parties
5/25/1/ This summons is invalid unless served on or b COMPLAINT Instruction: The follow by the plaintiff. Actual allegations and family Division Cases There is no other pending or resolve members of the parties. An action within the jurisdiction of t has been previously filed in	B/25//// efore its expiration date. Ing is information that is re- the claim for relief must b d action within the jurisdict he family division of the c longer pending. The	be stated on additional co ion of the family division o ircuit court involving the	judge assigned to the action are:
5/25/1/ This summons is invalid unless served on or b COMPLAINT Instruction: The follow by the plaintiff. Actual allegations and family Division Cases There is no other pending or resolve members of the parties. An action within the jurisdiction of t has been previously filed in	B/25//// efore its expiration date ing is information that is re- the claim for relief must b d action within the jurisdict he family division of the c	be stated on additional co ion of the family division o ircuit court involving the	mplaint pages and attached to this form fcircuit court involving the family or famil family or family members of the partie
5/25/11 This summons is invalid unless served on or b COMPLAINT Instruction: The follow by the plaintiff. Actual allegations and amily Division Cases I There is no other pending or resolve members of the parties. An action within the jurisdiction of the has been previously filed in	B 25 ///	be stated on additional co ion of the family division o ircuit court involving the e docket number and the of the same transaction o but of the transaction or o	mplaint pages and attached to this form fcircuit court involving the family or famil family or family members of the partie Court. judge assigned to the action are: Bar no. poccurrence as alleged in the complain poccurrence alleged in the complaint has Court. judge assigned to the action are:
5/25/11 This summons is invalid unless served on or b COMPLAINT Instruction: The follow by the plaintiff. Actual allegations and amily Division Cases I There is no other pending or resolve members of the parties. An action within the jurisdiction of the has been previously filed in	B/25//// efore its expirition date. ing is information that is re- the claim for relief must b d action within the jurisdict he family division of the c longer pending. The Judge ed civil action arising out of s or other parties arising out of	be stated on additional co ion of the family division o ircuit court involving the e docket number and the of the same transaction o but of the transaction or o	mplaint pages and attached to this form fcircuit court involving the family or famil family or family members of the partie Court. judge assigned to the action are: Bar no. r occurrence as alleged in the complain pocurrence alleged in the complaint ha Court.
5/25/11/ This summons is invalid unless served on or b COMPLAINT Instruction: The follow by the plaintiff. Actual allegations and amily Division Cases I There is no other pending or resolve members of the parties. An action within the jurisdiction of the action has been previously filed in There is no other pending or resolve A civil Cases I There is no other pending or resolve A civil action between these parties been previously filed in A civil action between these parties been previously filed in The action remains is no Docket no. VENUE Plaintiff(s) residence (include city, township, residence (include city, township, residence or business conduction) Place where action arose or business conduction)	B/25//// efore its expiration date. ing is information that is re- the claim for relief must b d action within the jurisdict he family division of the c longer pending. The Judge ed civil action arising out of s or other parties arising of longer pending. The Judge ar village)	ne stated on additional co ion of the family division o ircuit court involving the e docket number and the of the same transaction o out of the transaction or o e docket number and the	mplaint pages and attached to this form fcircuit court involving the family or family family or family members of the parties Court. judge assigned to the action are: Bar no. poccurrence as alleged in the complaint poccurrence alleged in the complaint has Court. judge assigned to the action are:
5/25/11 This summons is invalid unless served on or b COMPLAINT Instruction: The follow by the plaintiff. Actual allegations and amily Division Cases I There is no other pending or resolve members of the parties. An action within the jurisdiction of the action has been previously filed in	B/25//// efore its expiration date. ing is information that is re- the claim for relief must b d action within the jurisdict he family division of the c longer pending. The Judge ed civil action arising out of s or other parties arising of longer pending. The Judge ar village)	be stated on additional co ion of the family division o ircuit court involving the a docket number and the of the same transaction o out of the transaction or o e docket number and the Defendant(s) residence (inc	mplaint pages and attached to this form fcircuit court involving the family or family family or family members of the parties Court. judge assigned to the action are: Bar no. Court. judge assigned to the action are: Court. judge assigned to the action are:
5/25/11/ This summons is invalid unless served on or b COMPLAINT Instruction: The follow by the plaintiff. Actual allegations and amily Division Cases I There is no other pending or resolve members of the parties. An action within the jurisdiction of thas been previously filed in	B 25 /// efore its expiration date. ing is information that is re- the claim for relief must b d action within the jurisdict he family division of the c longer pending. The Judge ed civil action arising out of s or other parties arising of longer pending. The Judge ar village) ted	be stated on additional co ion of the family division o ircuit court involving the a docket number and the of the same transaction o out of the transaction or o a docket number and the Defendant(s) residence (inc SOUTH CAROLINA	mplaint pages and attached to this form fcircuit court involving the family or family family or family members of the parties Court. judge assigned to the action are: Bar no. r occurrence as alleged in the complaint has Court. judge assigned to the action are: Bar no. Bar no.

MC 01 (6/04) SUMMONS AND COMPLAINT MCR 2.102(B)(11), MCR 2.104, MCR 2.105, MCR 2.107, MCR 2.113(C)(2)(a), (b), MCR 3.206(A)

	PROOF OF SERVICE	SUMMONS AND COMPLAINT Case No.
of expiration on the order for second summ	ve the summons and complaint not later than ons. You must make and file your return with the	91 days from the date of filing or the date e court clerk. If you are unable to complete
service you must return this original and a	all copies to the court clerk. ICATE / AFFIDAVIT OF SERVICE / NON-SE	RVICE
OFFICER CERTIFICA I certify that I am a sheriff, deputy sheriff court officer, or attorney for a party [MCR that: (notarization not required)	, bailiff, appointed Being first duly swo	IT OF PROCESS SERVER m, I state that I am a legally competent inty or an officer of a corporate party, and required)
I served personally a copy of the summ I served by registered or certified mail	nons and complaint, (copy of return receipt attached) a copy of the	e summons and complaint,
together withList all documents served with	the Summons and Complaint	
		on the defendant(s)
Defendant's name	Complete address(es) of service	Day, date, time
I have personally attempted to serve the and have been unable to complete ser	e summons and complaint, together with any a vice.	ttachments on the following defendant(s
Defendant's name	Complete address(es) of service	Day, date, time
		ł
ervice fee Miles traveled Mileage fee	Total fee Signature	
₿\$	\$ Title	
Subscribed and sworn to before me on	ate 1	County, Michigar
Ay commission expires:	Signature: Deputy court clerk/Notary	nublic
Date lotary public, State of Michigan, County o		public
totally public, orace of miningun, occurry a	ACKNOWLEDGMENT OF SERVICE	
acknowledge that I have received servic	e of the summons and complaint, together w	Attachments
	on	
	Day, date, time on behalf of	
lignature	on behalf of	

STATE OF MICHIGAN

IN THE CIRCUIT COURT FOR THE COUNTY OF SAGINAW

ROBERT CRAIG,

Plaintiff,

FILE NO .: 11-D12886-CZ-4

HONORABLE

VS.

JAMES T. BORCHARD P27015

BUFFETS, INC.

Defendant.

THE MASTROMARCO FIRM VICTOR J. MASTROMARCO, JR. (P34564) MANDA L. DANIELESKI (P62597) Attorneys for Plaintiff 1024 North Michigan Ave. Saginaw, Michigan 48602 (989) 752-1414 vmastromar@aol.com westervm@gmail.com

	K
A TRUE	CONN
Susan Kaltan	ibanh, Chillio

There is no other pending or resolved civil action arising out of the transaction or occurrence alleged in the complaint.

COMPLAINT, DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL AND PRE-TRIAL CONFERENCE

NOW COMES the Plaintiff, ROBERT CRAIG, by and through his attorneys, THE

MASTROMARCO FIRM, and hereby complains against the Defendant by stating more

fully as following:

COMMON ALLEGATIONS

1.

That at all times material hereto, Plaintiff, ROBERT CRAIG, is a resident of the County of Saginaw, State of Michigan.

2.

That at all times material hereto, the Defendant, BUFFETS, INC., is a corporation with its headquarters and principal place of business located in South Carolina.

3.

That the amount in controversy exceeds the sum of \$75,000.00 (SEVENTY FIVE THOUSAND DOLLARS), exclusive of costs, interest and attorney fees.

4.

That at all times material hereto, Defendant is guilty of discrimination based on Plaintiff's age in violation of State law.

5.

That Plaintiff alleges violations of the Elliot Larsen Civil Rights Act otherwise found at MCL 37.2101, et seq.

. 6.

That at all times material hereto, Defendant was the employer of the Plaintiff.

7.

That Defendant did employ the Plaintiff beginning in 1990 as a "Manager" and during such time, Plaintiff continued in uninterrupted employment, and prior to his

termination, the Plaintiff performed in satisfactory or above-satisfactory manner and met all of the standard performance standards of the Defendant.

8.

That at the time of his wrongful termination, Plaintiff was employed as an "Area Director."

9.

That Plaintiff in fact received his annual performance review in late-November or early-December, prior to his March, 2011 discharge, and at that time, received a satisfactory performance review.

10.

That subsequent to his performance review, and in December of 2010, Plaintiff did receive a merit increase for good performance.

11.

That in fact, Defendant did terminate the Plaintiff based on his age, and replaced him with a younger, less qualified individual who was in his mid-30's, and had only worked as an "Area Director" for approximately a year and a half.

12.

That in contrast, Plaintiff had worked as an "Area Director" for 19 years.

13.

That the reasons given for Plaintiff's termination were "pretextual" and in fact the Defendant turned over the Plaintiff's business area to the younger, less-qualified employee, Nick Kagay.

14.

That furthermore, Plaintiff's employment was governed by Policy and Procedure Manuals, rules and requirements, which he was required to follow as per Policy of the Defendant.

15.

That likewise, the Defendant was required to enforce said policies and procedures and follow them in the event of a termination as it would relate to the Plaintiff.

16,

That Defendants did violate their policies and procedures when they terminated the Plaintiff.

17.

That specifically Defendant's employment policies and certain written agreements signed by the Defendant indicated that the Plaintiff would be provided equal treatment as to all employees, and would enjoy the benefits of his employment without regard to his age.

That under Michigan Common Law, Defendants are required to follow their policies and procedures then and there in effect at the time of Plaintiff's termination.

19.

That as a result of Defendant's unlawful acts in violation of the Michigan Statute says they relate to age discrimination and the Defendant's own policies as they would

THE MASTROMARCO FIRM, 1024 N. Michigan Avenue, Saginaw, Michigan, 48602 (989) 752-1414

relate to Plaintiff's employment separation and/or discrimination, the Plaintiff has been severely damaged.

20.

That as a result of Defendant's unlawful acts, Plaintiff has suffered economic damages including lost wages, back pay, future pay, future raises and all other benefits provided and further Plaintiff was forced to suffer a loss of health benefits, vacation pay, holiday pay and all other fringe benefits, and also suffered non-economic damages including mental anguish, nervousness as well as humiliation and embarrassment.

COUNT I - AGE DISCRIMINATION

21.

The Plaintiff hereby incorporates, by reference hereto, paragraphs 1 through 20 of his common allegations, word for word, and paragraph by paragraph as if restated herein.

22.

That as indicated above, Plaintiff is a member of a protected class by virtue of his age, with is date of birth being March 17, 1952.

23.

That during the course of Plaintiff's employment, Plaintiff was targeted because of his age, and was in fact terminated and replaced by a younger employee.

24.

That at all times material hereto, Plaintiff was qualified for the position that he held, and had just previously been evaluated as performing satisfactorily.

25.

That similarly situated individuals, outside of Plaintiff's protected class were treated more favorably than the Plaintiff.

26.

That Defendants actions did affect a term, condition and privilege of the Plaintiff's employment because of his age and has resulted in Plaintiff's suffering from economic loss in the form of back pay, future pay, overtime pay, bonuses, sick pay, vacation pay and all other fringe benefits together with all interest on all monies outstanding along with mental anguish, nervousness as well as humiliation and embarrassment damages.

27.

That pursuant to the Michigan Elliot Larsen Civil Rights Act, otherwise found at MCL 37.2101, et seq., the Plaintiff requests an award of his attorney fees and costs against the Defendant.

COUNT II - BREACH OF POLICY

28.

The Plaintiff hereby incorporates, by reference hereto, paragraphs 1 through 20 of his common allegations and paragraphs 21 through 27 of Count I, word for word, and paragraph by paragraph as if restated herein.

29.

That during the course of Plaintiff's employment with the Defendant, there were specific rules, regulations, handbooks and other documents that formed not only

agreements, but also policies and procedures that would be followed during the course of Plaintiff's employment.

30.

That Plaintiff was required to follow said procedures or policies or rules and regulations or agreements as more specifically set forth in the immediately preceding paragraph as a condition of his employment.

31.

That as such, Plaintiff had a right to rely under Michigan Law that said policies, procedures, regulations, rules and agreements would be followed.

32.

That there were certain rules and regulations that Plaintiff would be treated fairly and that he would not be discriminated against or singled out because of his age.

33.

That Defendant did violate said procedures and policies as outlined and referred to generically above.

34.

That Defendants actions have resulted in Plaintiff suffering from economic loss and non-economic loss as more fully set forth in Count I and the Common Allegations.

WHEREFORE, the Plaintiff, ROBERT CRAIG, hereby requests that this Honorable Court grant him an award of an amount in excess of SEVENTY FIVE THOUSAND and NO/100 DOLLARS (\$75,000.00) to fully compensate him for all his economic and non-economic damages, which he has sustained as a direct and proximate

result of Defendant's wrongful actions. That Plaintiff likewise seeks recovery for his actual attorney fees and costs. The Plaintiff likewise seeks whatever equitable relief the Court deems just.

Respectfully submitted,

THE MASTROMARCO FIRM

Dated: 5-24-11

D VICTOR J. MASTROMARCO, JR. (P34564) Attorneys for Plaintiff

Attorneys for Plaintiff 1024 N. Michigan Ave. Saginaw, Michigan 48602 (989) 752-1414 <u>vmastromar@aol.com</u>

DEMAND FOR PRE-TRIAL CONFERENCE

NOW COMES the Plaintiff, ROBERT CRAIG, by and through his attorneys,

THE MASTROMARCO FIRM, and hereby demands a Pre-Trial Conference.

. . .

Dated: 5.24.11

Respectfully submitted,

THE MASTROMARCO FIRM

VIĆTOR J. MASTROMARCO, JR. (P34564) Attorneys for Plaintiff 1024 N. Michigan Ave. Saginaw, Michigan 48602 (989) 752-1414 vmastromar@aol.com

DEMAND FOR TRIAL BY JURY

NOW COMES the Plaintiff, ROBERT CRAIG, by and through his attorneys, THE MASTROMARCO FIRM, and hereby demands a trial by jury of all issues in this cause of action unless expressly waived.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: 5-24-11

THE MASTROMARCO FIRM ston

VICTOR J. MASTROMARCO, JR. (P34564) Attorneys for Plaintiff 1024 N. Michigan Ave. Saginaw, Michigan 48602 (989) 752-1414 <u>vmastromar@aol.com</u>

- 10 -

