MICHAEL FAILLACE & ASSOCIATES, P.C. 60 East 42nd Street, Suite 4510 New York, New York 10165 Telephone: (212) 317-1200 Facsimile: (212) 317-1620

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

Attorneys for Plaintiffs

ISRAEL GONZALEZ ORTEGA and CHALO LOPIC SEQUEC, individually and on behalf of others similarly situated,

EASTERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK

Plaintiffs,

-against-

COLLECTIVE ACTION UNDER 29 U.S.C. § 216(b)

COMPLAINT

1903 UP CORP. (D/B/A NIKITAS PLACE), NIKITAS SPARAGIS, and LOUIE SPARAGIS,

ECF Case

Defendants.	
Σ	K

Plaintiffs Israel Gonzalez Ortega and Chalo Lopic Sequec, individually and on behalf of others similarly situated (collectively, "Plaintiffs"), by and through their attorneys, Michael Faillace & Associates, P.C., upon their knowledge and belief, and as against 1903 UP Corp. (d/b/a Nikitas Place), ("Defendant Corporation"), Nikitas Sparagis and Louie Sparagis ("Individual Defendants") (collectively, "Defendants"), allege as follows:

NATURE OF ACTION

- 1. Plaintiffs are former employees of Defendants 1903 UP Corp. (d/b/a Nikitas Place), Nikitas Sparagis, and Louie Sparagis.
- 2. Defendants own, operate, or control a Mediterranean restaurant, located at 1903 Utopia Pkwy, Flushing, New York 11357 under the name "Nikitas Place".

- 3. Upon information and belief, individual Defendants Nikitas Sparagis and Louie Sparagis, serve or served as owners, managers, principals, or agents of Defendant Corporation and, through this corporate entity, operate or operated the restaurant as a joint or unified enterprise.
 - 4. Plaintiffs were employees of Defendants.
- 5. Plaintiffs were employed as cooks at the restaurant located at 1903 Utopia Pkwy, Flushing, New York 11357.
- 6. At all times relevant to this Complaint, Plaintiffs worked for Defendants in excess of 40 hours per week, without appropriate overtime and spread of hours compensation for the hours that they worked.
- 7. Rather, Defendants failed to pay Plaintiffs appropriately for any hours worked, either at the straight rate of pay or for any additional overtime premium.
- 8. Further, Defendants failed to pay Plaintiffs the required "spread of hours" pay for any day in which they had to work over 10 hours a day.
- 9. Defendants' conduct extended beyond Plaintiffs to all other similarly situated employees.
- 10. At all times relevant to this Complaint, Defendants maintained a policy and practice of requiring Plaintiffs and other employees to work in excess of forty (40) hours per week without providing the overtime compensation required by federal and state law and regulations.
- 11. Plaintiffs now bring this action on behalf of themselves, and other similarly situated individuals, for unpaid overtime wages pursuant to the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, 29 U.S.C. § 201 *et seq.* ("FLSA"), and for violations of the N.Y. Labor Law §§ 190 *et seq.* and 650 *et seq.* (the "NYLL"), and the "spread of hours" and overtime wage orders of the New York Commissioner of Labor codified at N.Y. COMP. CODES R. & REGS. tit. 12, § 146-1.6 (herein the

"Spread of Hours Wage Order"), including applicable liquidated damages, interest, attorneys' fees and costs.

12. Plaintiffs seek certification of this action as a collective action on behalf of themselves, individually, and all other similarly situated employees and former employees of Defendants pursuant to 29 U.S.C. § 216(b).

JURISDICTION AND VENUE

- 13. This Court has subject matter jurisdiction under 28 U.S.C. § 1331 (federal question) and the FLSA, and supplemental jurisdiction over Plaintiffs' state law claims under 28 U.S.C. § 1367(a).
- 14. Venue is proper in this district under 28 U.S.C. § 1391(b) and (c) because all, or a substantial portion of, the events or omissions giving rise to the claims occurred in this district, Defendants maintain their corporate headquarters and offices within this district, and Defendants operate a Mediterranean restaurant located in this district. Further, Plaintiffs were employed by Defendants in this district.

PARTIES

Plaintiffs

- 15. Plaintiff Israel Gonzalez Ortega ("Plaintiff Gonzalez" or "Mr. Gonzalez") is an adult individual residing in Queens County, New York. Plaintiff Gonzalez was employed by Defendants at Nikitas Place from approximately September 2014 until on or about March 2, 2018.
- 16. Plaintiff Chalo Lopic Sequec ("Plaintiff Lopic" or "Mr. Lopic") is an adult individual residing in Queens County, New York. Plaintiff Lopic was employed by Defendants at Nikitas Place from approximately June 2015 until on or about September 2016 and then from January 2018 until on or about March 28, 2018.

Defendants

- 17. At all relevant times, Defendants own, operate, or control a Mediterranean restaurant, located at 1903 Utopia Pkwy, Flushing, New York 11357 under the name "Nikitas Place".
- 18. Upon information and belief, 1903 UP Corp. (d/b/a Nikitas Place) is a domestic corporation organized and existing under the laws of the State of New York. Upon information and belief, it maintains its principal place of business at 1903 Utopia Pkwy, Flushing, New York 11357.
- 19. Defendant Nikitas Sparagis is an individual engaging (or who was engaged) in business in this judicial district during the relevant time period. Defendant Nikitas Sparagis is sued individually in his capacity as owner, officer and/or agent of Defendant Corporation. Defendant Nikitas Sparagis possesses operational control over Defendant Corporation, an ownership interest in Defendant Corporation, and controls significant functions of Defendant Corporation. He determines the wages and compensation of the employees of Defendants, including Plaintiffs, establishes the schedules of the employees, maintains employee records, and has the authority to hire and fire employees.
- 20. Defendant Louie Sparagis is an individual engaging (or who was engaged) in business in this judicial district during the relevant time period. Defendant Louie Sparagis is sued individually in his capacity as owner, officer and/or agent of Defendant Corporation. Defendant Louie Sparagis possesses operational control over Defendant Corporation, an ownership interest in Defendant Corporation, and controls significant functions of Defendant Corporation. He determines the wages and compensation of the employees of Defendants, including Plaintiffs, establishes the schedules of the employees, maintains employee records, and has the authority to hire and fire employees.

FACTUAL ALLEGATIONS

Defendants Constitute Joint Employers

- 21. Defendants operate a Mediterranean restaurant located in the Clearview section of Queens in New York City.
- 22. Individual Defendants, Nikitas Sparagis and Louie Sparagis, possess operational control over Defendant Corporation, possess ownership interests in Defendant Corporation, and control significant functions of Defendant Corporation.
- 23. Defendants are associated and joint employers, act in the interest of each other with respect to employees, pay employees by the same method, and share control over the employees.
- 24. Each Defendant possessed substantial control over Plaintiffs' (and other similarly situated employees') working conditions, and over the policies and practices with respect to the employment and compensation of Plaintiffs, and all similarly situated individuals, referred to herein.
- 25. Defendants jointly employed Plaintiffs (and all similarly situated employees) and are Plaintiffs' (and all similarly situated employees') employers within the meaning of 29 U.S.C. 201 *et seq.* and the NYLL.
- 26. In the alternative, Defendants constitute a single employer of Plaintiffs and/or similarly situated individuals.
- 27. Upon information and belief, Individual Defendants Nikitas Sparagis and Louie Sparagis operate Defendant Corporation as either an alter ego of themselves and/or fail to operate Defendant Corporation as an entity legally separate and apart from themselves, by among other things:

- a) failing to adhere to the corporate formalities necessary to operate Defendant Corporation as a Corporation,
- b) defectively forming or maintaining the corporate entity of Defendant Corporation,
 by, amongst other things, failing to hold annual meetings or maintaining appropriate corporate records,
- c) transferring assets and debts freely as between all Defendants,
- d) operating Defendant Corporation for their own benefit as the sole or majority shareholders,
- e) operating Defendant Corporation for their own benefit and maintaining control over this corporation as a closed Corporation,
- f) intermingling assets and debts of their own with Defendant Corporation,
- g) diminishing and/or transferring assets of Defendant Corporation to avoid full liability as necessary to protect their own interests, and
- h) Other actions evincing a failure to adhere to the corporate form.
- 28. At all relevant times, Defendants were Plaintiffs' employers within the meaning of the FLSA and New York Labor Law. Defendants had the power to hire and fire Plaintiffs, controlled the terms and conditions of employment, and determined the rate and method of any compensation in exchange for Plaintiffs' services.
- 29. In each year from 2014 to 2018, Defendants, both separately and jointly, had a gross annual volume of sales of not less than \$500,000 (exclusive of excise taxes at the retail level that are separately stated).

30. In addition, upon information and belief, Defendants and/or their enterprise were directly engaged in interstate commerce. As an example, numerous items that were used in the restaurant on a daily basis are goods produced outside of the State of New York.

Individual Plaintiffs

- 31. Plaintiffs are former employees of Defendants who were employed as cooks.
- 32. Plaintiffs seek to represent a class of similarly situated individuals under 29 U.S.C. 216(b).

Plaintiff Israel Gonzalez Ortega

- 33. Plaintiff Gonzalez was employed by Defendants from approximately September 2014 until on or about March 2, 2018.
 - 34. Defendants employed Plaintiff Gonzalez as a cook.
- 35. Plaintiff Gonzalez regularly handled goods in interstate commerce, such as food and other supplies produced outside the State of New York.
- 36. Plaintiff Gonzalez's work duties required neither discretion nor independent judgment.
- 37. Throughout his employment with Defendants, Plaintiff Gonzalez regularly worked in excess of 40 hours per week.
- 38. From approximately September 2014 until on or about March 2, 2018, Plaintiff Gonzalez worked as a cook from approximately 10:00 a.m. until on or about 10:15 p.m., 4 days a week, from approximately 10:00 a.m. until on or about 11:15 p.m., 2 days a week, and from approximately 11:00 a.m. until on or about 10:00 p.m., one extra day for approximately 20 weeks throughout his employment (typically 75.5 to 86.5 hours per week).

- 39. Throughout his employment, Defendants paid Plaintiff Gonzalez his wages in a combination of check and cash.
- 40. From approximately September 2014 until on or about November 2017, Defendants paid Plaintiff Gonzalez \$13 per hour for 74 hours worked.
- 41. From approximately November 2017 until on or about March 2, 2018, Defendants paid Plaintiff Gonzalez \$15.50 per hour for 74 hours worked.
- 42. Plaintiff Gonzalez's pay did not vary even when he was required to stay later or work a longer day than his usual schedule.
- 43. For example, Defendants required Plaintiff Gonzalez to work an additional 10 to 15 minutes past his scheduled departure time every day, and did not pay him for the additional time he worked.
 - 44. Defendants never granted Plaintiff Gonzalez any breaks or meal periods of any kind.
- 45. Defendants required Plaintiff Gonzalez to sign a document, the contents of which he was not allowed to review in detail, in order to release his weekly pay.
- 46. In addition, in order to get paid, Plaintiff Gonzalez was required to sign a document falsely stating the hours that he worked per week.
- 47. No notification, either in the form of posted notices or other means, was ever given to Plaintiff Gonzalez regarding overtime and wages under the FLSA and NYLL.
- 48. Defendants did not provide Plaintiff Gonzalez an accurate statement of wages, as required by NYLL 195(3).
- 49. In fact, Defendants adjusted Plaintiff Gonzalez's paystubs so that they reflected inaccurate wages and hours worked.

- 50. Defendants did not give any notice to Plaintiff Gonzalez, in English and in Spanish (Plaintiff Gonzalez's primary language), of his rate of pay, employer's regular pay day, and such other information as required by NYLL §195(1).
- 51. Defendants required Plaintiff Gonzalez to purchase "tools of the trade" with his own funds—including four pairs of shoes per year and five pants.

Plaintiff Chalo Lopic Sequec

- 52. Plaintiff Lopic was employed by Defendants from approximately June 2015 until on or about September 2016 and then from January 2018 until on or about March 28, 2018.
 - 53. Defendants employed Plaintiff Lopic as a cook.
- 54. Plaintiff Lopic regularly handled goods in interstate commerce, such as food and other supplies produced outside the State of New York.
 - 55. Plaintiff Lopic's work duties required neither discretion nor independent judgment.
- 56. Throughout his employment with Defendants, Plaintiff Lopic regularly worked in excess of 40 hours per week.
- 57. From approximately June 2015 until on or about September 2016 and then from approximately January 2018 until on or about March 28, 2018, Plaintiff Lopic worked as a cook from approximately 12:00 p.m. until on or about 10:20 p.m., three days a week and from approximately 12:00 p.m. until on or about 11:20 p.m., three days a week (typically 64.8 hours per week).
 - 58. Throughout his employment, Defendants paid Plaintiff Lopic his wages in cash.
- 59. From approximately June 2015 until on or about September 2016, Defendants paid Plaintiff Lopic \$9.50 per hour for 60 hours worked.

- 60. From approximately January 2018 until on or about February 28, 2018, Defendants paid Plaintiff Lopic \$12 per hour for 60 hours worked.
- 61. Plaintiff Lopic's pay did not vary even when he was required to stay later or work a longer day than his usual schedule.
- 62. For example, Defendants required Plaintiff Lopic to work an additional 20 minutes past his scheduled departure time every day, and did not pay him for the additional time he worked.
 - 63. Defendants never granted Plaintiff Lopic any breaks or meal periods of any kind.
- 64. No notification, either in the form of posted notices or other means, was ever given to Plaintiff Lopic regarding overtime and wages under the FLSA and NYLL.
- 65. Defendants did not provide Plaintiff Lopic an accurate statement of wages, as required by NYLL 195(3).
- 66. Defendants did not give any notice to Plaintiff Lopic, in English and in Spanish (Plaintiff Lopic's primary language), of his rate of pay, employer's regular pay day, and such other information as required by NYLL §195(1).
- 67. Defendants required Plaintiff Lopic to purchase "tools of the trade" with his own funds—including three pairs of pants and a pair of non-slip kitchen shoes.

Defendants' General Employment Practices

68. At all times relevant to this Complaint, Defendants maintained a policy and practice of requiring Plaintiffs (and all similarly situated employees) to work in excess of 40 hours a week without paying them appropriate spread of hours pay and overtime compensation as required by federal and state laws.

- 69. Plaintiffs were victims of Defendants' common policy and practices which violate their rights under the FLSA and New York Labor Law by, *inter alia*, not paying them the wages they were owed for the hours they worked.
- 70. Defendants habitually required Plaintiffs to work additional hours beyond their regular shifts but did not provide them with any additional compensation.
- 71. Defendants' time keeping system did not reflect the actual hours that Plaintiffs worked.
- 72. Defendants required Plaintiffs to sign a document the contents of which they were not allowed to review in order to release their wages.
- 73. Defendants required Plaintiffs to sign a document that reflected inaccurate or false hours worked.
 - 74. Plaintiffs were paid their wages in a combination of personal checks and cash.
- 75. Defendants failed to post at the workplace, or otherwise provide to employees, the required postings or notices to employees regarding the applicable wage and hour requirements of the FLSA and NYLL.
- 76. Upon information and belief, these practices by Defendants were done willfully to disguise the actual number of hours Plaintiffs (and similarly situated individuals) worked, and to avoid paying Plaintiffs properly for their full hours worked.
- 77. Defendants engaged in their unlawful conduct pursuant to a corporate policy of minimizing labor costs and denying employees compensation by knowingly violating the FLSA and NYLL.
- 78. Defendants' unlawful conduct was intentional, willful, in bad faith, and caused significant damages to Plaintiffs and other similarly situated former workers.

- 79. Defendants failed to provide Plaintiffs and other employees with accurate wage statements at the time of their payment of wages, containing: the dates of work covered by that payment of wages; name of employee; name of employer; address and phone number of employer; rate or rates of pay and basis thereof, whether paid by the hour, shift, day, week, salary, piece, commission, or other; gross wages; deductions; allowances, if any, claimed as part of the minimum wage; net wages; the regular hourly rate or rates of pay; the overtime rate or rates of pay; the number of regular hours worked; and the number of overtime hours worked, as required by NYLL \$195(3).
- 80. Defendants failed to provide Plaintiffs and other employees, at the time of hiring and on or before February 1 of each subsequent year, a statement in English and the employees' primary language, containing: the rate or rates of pay and basis thereof, whether paid by the hour, shift, day, week, salary, piece, commission, or other; allowances, if any, claimed as part of the minimum wage, including tip, meal, or lodging allowances; the regular pay day designated by the employer; the name of the employer; any "doing business as" names used by the employer; the physical address of the employer's main office or principal place of business, and a mailing address if different; and the telephone number of the employer, as required by New York Labor Law §195(1).

FLSA COLLECTIVE ACTION CLAIMS

81. Plaintiffs bring their FLSA overtime compensation and liquidated damages claims as a collective action pursuant to FLSA Section 16(b), 29 U.S.C. § 216(b), on behalf of all similarly situated persons (the "FLSA Class members"), i.e., persons who are or were employed by Defendants or any of them, on or after the date that is three years before the filing of the complaint in this case (the "FLSA Class Period").

- 82. At all relevant times, Plaintiffs and other members of the FLSA Class were similarly situated in that they had substantially similar job requirements and pay provisions, and have been subject to Defendants' common practices, policies, programs, procedures, protocols and plans including willfully failing and refusing to pay them the required overtime pay at a one and one-half their regular rates for work in excess of forty (40) hours per workweek under the FLSA.
 - 83. The claims of Plaintiffs stated herein are similar to those of the other employees.

FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION

VIOLATION OF THE OVERTIME PROVISIONS OF THE FLSA

- 84. Plaintiffs repeat and reallege all paragraphs above as though fully set forth herein.
- 85. At all times relevant to this action, Defendants were Plaintiffs' employers (and employers of the putative FLSA Class members) within the meaning of the Fair Labor Standards Act. 29 U.S.C. § 203(d). Defendants had the power to hire and fire Plaintiffs (and the FLSA Class members), controlled the terms and conditions of employment, and determined the rate and method of any compensation in exchange for their employment.
- 86. At all times relevant to this action, Defendants were engaged in commerce or in an industry or activity affecting commerce.
- 87. Defendants constitute an enterprise within the meaning of the Fair Labor Standards Act. 29 U.S.C. § 203 (r-s).
- 88. Defendants, in violation of 29 U.S.C. § 207(a)(1), failed to pay Plaintiffs (and the FLSA Class members) overtime compensation at a rate of one and one-half times the regular rate of pay for each hour worked in excess of forty hours in a work week.
- 89. Defendants' failure to pay Plaintiffs (and the FLSA Class members), overtime compensation was willful within the meaning of 29 U.S.C. § 255(a).

90. Plaintiffs (and the FLSA Class members) were damaged in an amount to be determined at trial.

SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION

VIOLATION OF THE OVERTIME PROVISIONS

OF THE NEW YORK STATE LABOR LAW

- 91. Plaintiffs repeat and reallege all paragraphs above as though fully set forth herein.
- 92. Defendants, in violation of N.Y. Lab. Law § 190 *et seq.*, and supporting regulations of the New York State Department of Labor, failed to pay Plaintiffs overtime compensation at rates of one and one-half times the regular rate of pay for each hour worked in excess of forty hours in a work week.
- 93. Defendants' failure to pay Plaintiffs overtime compensation was willful within the meaning of N.Y. Lab. Law § 663.
 - 94. Plaintiffs were damaged in an amount to be determined at trial.

THIRD CAUSE OF ACTION

VIOLATION OF THE SPREAD OF HOURS WAGE ORDER OF THE NEW YORK COMMISSIONER OF LABOR

- 95. Plaintiffs repeat and reallege all paragraphs above as though fully set forth herein.
- 96. Defendants failed to pay Plaintiffs one additional hour's pay at the basic minimum wage rate before allowances for each day Plaintiffs' spread of hours exceeded ten hours in violation of NYLL §§ 650 *et seq.* and 12 N.Y.C.R.R. §§ 146-1.6.
- 97. Defendants' failure to pay Plaintiffs an additional hour's pay for each day Plaintiffs' spread of hours exceeded ten hours was willful within the meaning of NYLL § 663.
 - 98. Plaintiffs were damaged in an amount to be determined at trial.

FOURTH CAUSE OF ACTION

VIOLATION OF THE WAGE STATEMENT PROVISIONS

OF THE NEW YORK LABOR LAW

- 99. Plaintiffs repeat and reallege all paragraphs above as though fully set forth herein.
- 100. With each payment of wages, Defendants failed to provide Plaintiffs with an accurate statement listing each of the following: the dates of work covered by that payment of wages; name of employee; name of employer; address and phone number of employer; rate or rates of pay and basis thereof, whether paid by the hour, shift, day, week, salary, piece, commission, or other; gross wages; deductions; allowances, if any, claimed as part of the minimum wage; net wages; the regular hourly rate or rates of pay; the overtime rate or rates of pay; the number of regular hours worked; and the number of overtime hours worked, as required by NYLL 195(3).
- 101. Defendants are liable to each Plaintiff in the amount of \$5,000, together with costs and attorneys' fees.

FIFTH CAUSE OF ACTION

VIOLATION OF THE NOTICE AND RECORDKEEPING REQUIREMENTS OF THE NEW YORK LABOR LAW

- 102. Plaintiffs repeat and reallege all paragraphs above as though fully set forth herein.
- 103. Defendants failed to provide Plaintiffs with a written notice, in English and in Spanish (Plaintiffs' primary language), containing: the rate or rates of pay and basis thereof, whether paid by the hour, shift, day, week, salary, piece, commission, or other; allowances, if any, claimed as part of the minimum wage, including tip, meal, or lodging allowances; the regular pay day designated by the employer; the name of the employer; any "doing business as" names used by the employer; the physical address of the employer's main office or principal place of business, and a

mailing address if different; and the telephone number of the employer, as required by NYLL \$195(1).

104. Defendants are liable to each Plaintiff in the amount of \$5,000, together with costs and attorneys' fees.

SIXTH CAUSE OF ACTION

RECOVERY OF EQUIPMENT COSTS

- 105. Plaintiffs repeat and reallege all paragraphs above as though fully set forth herein.
- 106. Defendants required Plaintiffs to pay, without reimbursement, the costs and expenses for purchasing and maintaining equipment and "tools of the trade" required to perform their jobs, further reducing their wages in violation of the FLSA and NYLL. 29 U.S.C. § 206(a); 29 C.F.R. § 531.35; N.Y. Lab. Law §§ 193 and 198-b.
 - 107. Plaintiffs were damaged in an amount to be determined at trial.

PRAYER FOR RELIEF

WHEREFORE, Plaintiffs respectfully request that this Court enter judgment against Defendants by:

- (a) Designating this action as a collective action and authorizing prompt issuance of notice pursuant to 29 U.S.C. § 216(b) to all putative class members apprising them of the pendency of this action, and permitting them to promptly file consents to be Plaintiffs in the FLSA claims in this action;
- (b) Declaring that Defendants violated the overtime wage provisions of, and associated rules and regulations under, the FLSA as to Plaintiffs and the FLSA Class members;

- (c) Declaring that Defendants violated the recordkeeping requirements of, and associated rules and regulations under, the FLSA with respect to Plaintiffs' and the FLSA Class members' compensation, hours, wages, and any deductions or credits taken against wages;
- (d) Declaring that Defendants' violations of the provisions of the FLSA were willful as to Plaintiffs and the FLSA Class members;
- (e) Awarding Plaintiffs and the FLSA Class members damages for the amount of unpaid overtime compensation and damages for any improper deductions or credits taken against wages under the FLSA as applicable;
- (f) Awarding Plaintiffs and the FLSA Class members liquidated damages in an amount equal to 100% of their damages for the amount of unpaid overtime compensation, and damages for any improper deductions or credits taken against wages under the FLSA as applicable pursuant to 29 U.S.C. § 216(b);
- (g) Declaring that Defendants violated the overtime wage provisions of, and rules and orders promulgated under, the NYLL as to Plaintiffs;
- (h) Declaring that Defendants violated the spread-of-hours requirements of the NYLL and supporting regulations as to Plaintiffs;
- (i) Declaring that Defendants violated the notice and recordkeeping requirements of the NYLL with respect to Plaintiffs' compensation, hours, wages and any deductions or credits taken against wages;
- (j) Declaring that Defendants' violations of the New York Labor Law and Spread of Hours Order were willful as to Plaintiffs;
- (k) Awarding Plaintiffs damages for the amount of unpaid overtime compensation, and for any improper deductions or credits taken against wages, as well as awarding spread of hours

Case 1:18-cv-01572 Document 1 Filed 03/14/18 Page 18 of 20 PageID #: 18

pay under the NYLL as applicable

(1) Awarding Plaintiffs liquidated damages in an amount equal to one hundred percent

(100%) of the total amount of overtime compensation and spread of hours pay shown to be owed

pursuant to NYLL § 663 as applicable; and liquidated damages pursuant to NYLL § 198(3);

Awarding Plaintiffs and the FLSA Class members pre-judgment and post-judgment (m)

interest as applicable;

Awarding Plaintiffs and the FLSA Class members the expenses incurred in this (n)

action, including costs and attorneys' fees;

(o) Providing that if any amounts remain unpaid upon the expiration of ninety days

following issuance of judgment, or ninety days after expiration of the time to appeal and no appeal

is then pending, whichever is later, the total amount of judgment shall automatically increase by

fifteen percent, as required by NYLL § 198(4); and

All such other and further relief as the Court deems just and proper. (p)

JURY DEMAND

Plaintiffs demand a trial by jury on all issues triable by a jury.

Dated: New York, New York

March 14, 2018

MICHAEL FAILLACE & ASSOCIATES, P.C.

By:

/s/ Michael Faillace

Michael Faillace [MF-8436] 60 East 42nd Street, Suite 4510

New York, New York 10165

Telephone: (212) 317-1200

Facsimile: (212) 317-1620

Attorneys for Plaintiffs

- 18 -

Michael Faillace & Associates, P.C.

Employment and Litigation Attorneys

Telephone: (212) 317-1200 60 E 42nd Street, Suite 4510 New York, New York 10165 Facsimile: (212) 317-1620 Faillace@employmentcompliance.com March 9, 2018 BY HAND Clerk of Court, TO: I hereby consent to join this lawsuit as a party plaintiff. (Yo, por medio de este documento, doy mi consentimiento para formar parte de la demanda como uno de los demandantes.) Israel Gonzalez Ortega Name / Nombre: Michael Faillace & Associates, P.C. Legal Representative / Abogado: Signature / Firma: 9 de Marzo 2018

Date / Fecha:

Michael Faillace & Associates, P.C.

Employment and Litigation Attorneys

60 E 42nd Street, Suite 4510 New York, New York 10165 Telephone: (212) 317-1200 Facsimile: (212) 317-1620

Faillace@employmentcompliance.com

BY HAND	March 9, 2018
TO: Clerk of Court,	
I hereby consent to join this lawsuit as a p (Yo, por medio de este documento, doy demanda como uno de los demandantes	mi consentimiento para formar parte de la
Name / Nombre:	Chalo Lopic Sequec
Legal Representative / Abogado:	Michael Faillace & Associates, P.C.
Signature / Firma:	- Aurol
Date / Fecha:	09 de marzo de 2018

 $_{
m JS~44~(Rev.~1/2013)}$ Case 1:18-cv-01572 Document 1 VEIRO 03/14/18 Page 1 of 2 PageID #: 21

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.)

purpose of initiating the civil de	ocket sheet. (SEE INSTRUCT	IONS ON NEXT PAGE OF	THIS FO	RM.)					
I. (a) PLAINTIFFS ISRAEL GONZALEZ OR LOPIC SEQUEC, individuated, others similarly situated, (b) County of Residence of (EZ) (c) Attorneys (Firm Name, Z) Michael A. Faillace. Mich 60 East 42nd Suite 4510 New York, NY 10165	ually and on behalf of First Listed Plaintiff ACEPT IN U.S. PLAINTIFF CAS Address, and Telephone Number,	·)			IS, and LOUIE	dant <u>Q</u> CASES ON S, USE THI)F	
II. BASIS OF JURISDI	CTION (Place an "X" in Or	ne Box Only)	III. CI	TIZENSHIP OF PI	RINCIPAL PAI	RTIES (P	Place an "X" in t	One Box fo	or Plaintii
				(For Diversity Cases Only)			and One Box fo	r Defendar	nt)
□ 1 U.S. Government Plaintiff	■ 3 Federal Question (U.S. Government N	ot a Party)	Citize	en of This State	1 🗖 1 Incorpor	rated or Princ siness In Thi		PTF □ 4	DEF □ 4
☐ 2 U.S. Government Defendant	☐ 4 Diversity (Indicate Citizenship	o of Parties in Item III)	Citize	en of Another State		rated and Pri siness In An		5	□ 5
				en or Subject of a reign Country	3 🗖 3 Foreign	Nation		□ 6	□ 6
IV. NATURE OF SUIT			EC	DEFITIDE/DENALTY	DANIZDIIDTO	777	OTHER	TATITE	70
□ 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	□ 315 Airplane Product Liability □ 320 Assault, Libel & Slander □ 330 Federal Employers' Liability □ 340 Marine □ 345 Marine Product Liability □ 350 Motor Vehicle □ 355 Motor Vehicle □ roduct Liability □ 360 Other Personal Injury □ 362 Personal Injury - Medical Malpractice CIVIL RIGHTS □ 440 Other Civil Rights □ 441 Voting □ 442 Employment □ 443 Housing/ Accommodations □ 445 Amer. w/Disabilities - Employment □ 446 Amer. w/Disabilities - Other □ 448 Education	PERSONAL INJURY 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 PRISONER PETITION Habeas Corpus: 463 Alien Detainee 510 Motions to Vacate Sentence 530 General 535 Death Penalty Other: 540 Mandamus & Othe 550 Civil Rights 555 Prison Condition 560 Civil Detainee - Conditions of Confinement	7	DRFEITURE/PENALTY 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	BANKRUPTO □ 422 Appeal 28 USC □ 423 Withdrawal 28 USC 157 PROPERTY RIG □ 820 Copyrights □ 840 Trademark SOCIAL SECURI □ 861 HIA (1395ff) □ 862 Black Lung (92 □ 863 DIWC/DIWW □ 864 SSID Title XV: □ 865 RSI (405(g)) FEDERAL TAX S □ 870 Taxes (U.S. Pla or Defendant) □ 871 IRS—Third Pa 26 USC 7609	TY 23) (405(g)) I SUITS suintiff	□ 480 Consum □ 490 Cable/S □ 850 Securiti □ Exchan □ 890 Other St □ 891 Agricult □ 893 Environ □ 895 Freedon □ Act □ 896 Arbitrat □ 899 Adminis Act/Rev	aims Act apportion t nd Banking ree tion er Influenc Organizati er Credit at TV es/Common ge aututory Ac ural Acts mental Ma n of Inform ion strative Pro iew or App Decision titionality o	ment g ced and ions dities/ ctions atters nation occedure peal of
	cite the U.S. Civil State	Appellate Court ute under which you an aid overtime wage: use:	Reop	stated or 5 Transfe bened Another (specify) On not cite jurisdictional state ant to The Fair Labor	r District I	Multidistric Litigation of 1938, 2			seq.
VII. REQUESTED IN COMPLAINT:	UNDER RULE 23	S A CLASS ACTION , F.R.Cv.P.	D	EMAND \$	CHECK Y JURY DE	•	demanded in Yes	complain No	ıt:
VIII. RELATED CASI IF ANY	(See instructions):	JUDGE			DOCKET NUMI	BER			
DATE 03/14/2018 FOR OFFICE USE ONLY		signature of att /s/ Michael Faill		OF RECORD					
	MOUNT	APPLYING IFP		JUDGE		MAG. JUDO	GE		

CERTIFICATION OF ARBITRATION ELIGIBILITY

Local Arbitration Rule 83.10 provides that with certain exceptions, actions seeking money damages only in an amount not in excess of \$150,000, exclusive of interest and costs, are eligible for compulsory arbitration. The amount of damages is presumed to be below the threshold amount unless a certification to the contrary is filed.

I Michael	aillace counsel for Plaintiff do hereby certify that the above cantioned civil action is
ineligib	counsel for Plaintiff , counsel for Plaintiff , do hereby certify that the above captioned civil action is the for compulsory arbitration for the following reason(s):
	monetary damages sought are in excess of \$150,000, exclusive of interest and costs,
	☐ the complaint seeks injunctive relief,
	the matter is otherwise ineligible for the following reason
	DISCLOSURE STATEMENT - FEDERAL RULES CIVIL PROCEDURE 7.1
	Identify any parent corporation and any publicly held corporation that owns 10% or more or its stocks:
	RELATED CASE STATEMENT (Section VIII on the Front of this Form)
provides to because the same judg case: (A)	all cases that are arguably related pursuant to Division of Business Rule 50.3.1 in Section VIII on the front of this form. Rule 50.3.1 (a) at "A civil case is "related" to another civil case for purposes of this guideline when, because of the similarity of facts and legal issues or e cases arise from the same transactions or events, a substantial saving of judicial resources is likely to result from assigning both cases to the and magistrate judge." Rule 50.3.1 (b) provides that "A civil case shall not be deemed "related" to another civil case merely because the civil revolves identical legal issues, or (B) involves the same parties." Rule 50.3.1 (c) further provides that "Presumptively, and subject to the power to determine otherwise pursuant to paragraph (d), civil cases shall not be deemed to be "related" unless both cases are still pending before the
	NY-E DIVISION OF BUSINESS RULE 50.1(d)(2)
	s the civil action being filed in the Eastern District removed from a New York State Court located in Nassau or Suffolk County: No
•	f you answered "no" above:) Did the events or omissions giving rise to the claim or claims, or a substantial part thereof, occur in Nassau or Suffolk County? NO
	Did the events or omissions giving rise to the claim or claims, or a substantial part thereof, occur in the Eastern District? Yes
Suffolk (swer to question 2 (b) is "No," does the defendant (or a majority of the defendants, if there is more than one) reside in Nassau or ounty, or, in an interpleader action, does the claimant (or a majority of the claimants, if there is more than one) reside in Nassau County? N/A
	(Note: A corporation shall be considered a resident of the County in which it has the most significant contacts).
	BAR ADMISSION
I am curi	ently admitted in the Eastern District of New York and currently a member in good standing of the bar of this court. Yes No
Are you	urrently the subject of any disciplinary action (s) in this or any other state or federal court? Yes (If yes, please explain) No
I certify	ne accuracy of all information provided above.
Signatui	.:_/s/ Michael Faillace

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

for the

Eastern District of New York					
Israel Gonzalez Ortega, et al Plaintiff v. 1903 UP CORP. (d/b/a NIKITAS PLACE), et al Defendant SUMMONS))) Civil Action No.))) IN A CIVIL ACTION				
To: (Defendant's name and address) 1903 UP Corp. (d/b/a N 1903 Utopia Pkwy Flushing, New York 113	likitas Place)				
are the United States or a United States agency, or an of P. 12 (a)(2) or (3) — you must serve on the plaintiff an	uite 4510				
If you fail to respond, judgment by default will You also must file your answer or motion with the cour	be entered against you for the relief demanded in the complaint. t.				
CLERK OF COURT					
Date:	Signature of Clerk or Deputy Clerk				

AO 440 (Rev. 12/09) 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 (l))

was re	This summons for (nanceived by me on (date)	ne of individual and title, if an	· · ·			
	•	the summons on the ind				
				on (date)	; or	
	☐ I left the summons	at the individual's reside	-	e age and discretion who residual	des the	
	on (date)			idual's last known address; or		,
		ons on (name of individual) accept service of process		ne of organization)		, who is
	,			on (date)	; or	
	☐ I returned the sumr	mons unexecuted because	2			; or
	☐ Other (specify):					
	My fees are \$	for travel and \$	i	for services, for a total of \$		0.00 .
	I declare under penalty	y of perjury that this info	rmation is true.			
Date:				Server's signature		
				Server's signature		
				Printed name and title		
				Server's address		

Additional information regarding attempted service, etc:

Print Save As... Reset

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

for the

Eastern District of New York

Eastern District of New York				
Israel Gonzalez Ortega, et al)			
v.) Civil Action No.			
1903 UP CORP. (d/b/a NIKITAS PLACE), et al))			
	_ ´)			
SUMMON	S IN A CIVIL ACTION			
To: (Defendant's name and address) Nikitas Sparagis 1903 Utopia Pkwy Flushing, New York 1	1357			
are the United States or a United States agency, or an P. 12 (a)(2) or (3) — you must serve on the plaintiff a the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure. The answer or whose name and address are: Michael A. Faillace				
If you fail to respond, judgment by default wi You also must file your answer or motion with the con	ll be entered against you for the relief demanded in the complaint. urt.			
	CLERK OF COURT			
Date:	Signature of Clerk or Deputy Clerk			

AO 440 (Rev. 12/09) 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 (l))

	This summons for (nar	ne of individual and title, if any)			
was re	ceived by me on (date)				
	☐ I personally served	the summons on the individual a	at (place)		
			on (date)	; or	
	☐ I left the summons	at the individual's residence or u	usual place of abode with (name)		
		, a person o	of suitable age and discretion who resid	des there,	
	on (date)	, and mailed a copy to	the individual's last known address; or		
	☐ I served the summo	ons on (name of individual)		, \	who is
	designated by law to a	accept service of process on beha			
			on (date)	; or	
	☐ I returned the sumr	mons unexecuted because			; or
	☐ Other (specify):				_
	My fees are \$	for travel and \$	for services, for a total of \$	0.00	
	I declare under penalty	y of perjury that this information	is true.		
Date:			Server's signature		
			20		
			Printed name and title		
			Server's address		

Additional information regarding attempted service, etc:

Print Save As... Reset

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

for the

Eastern District of New York

Israel Gonzalez O	tega, et al)	
Plaintiff)	
V.	IT. 0 D. 1 0 D. 1)	Civil Action No.
1903 UP CORP. (d/b/a NIK	ITAS PLACE), et al)	
Defendant)	
	SUMMONS I	N A CIV	IL ACTION
To: (Defendant's name and address)	Louie Sparagis 1903 Utopia Pkwy Flushing, New York 113	57	
are the United States or a Unite P. 12 (a)(2) or (3) — you must	rvice of this summons on d States agency, or an off serve on the plaintiff an a	icer or en nswer to tion must ASSOCIA te 4510	counting the day you received it) — or 60 days if you apployee of the United States described in Fed. R. Civ. the attached complaint or a motion under Rule 12 of be served on the plaintiff or plaintiff's attorney, ATES, P.C.
If you fail to respond, jour answer	•		against you for the relief demanded in the complaint.
			CLERK OF COURT
Date:			
			Signature of Clerk or Deputy Clerk

Civil Action No.

PROOF OF SERVICE

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

was re	This summons for (nanceived by me on (date)	ne of individual and title, if an	· · ·			
	•	the summons on the ind				
				on (date)	; or	
	☐ I left the summons	at the individual's reside	-	e age and discretion who residual	des the	
	on (date)			idual's last known address; or		,
		ons on (name of individual) accept service of process		ne of organization)		, who is
	,			on (date)	; or	
	☐ I returned the sumr	mons unexecuted because	2			; or
	☐ Other (specify):					
	My fees are \$	for travel and \$	i	for services, for a total of \$		0.00 .
	I declare under penalty	y of perjury that this info	rmation is true.			
Date:				Server's signature		
				Server's signature		
				Printed name and title		
				Server's address		

Additional information regarding attempted service, etc:

Print Save As... Reset

ClassAction.org

This complaint is part of ClassAction.org's searchable class action lawsuit database and can be found in this post: Owners and Operators of Nikitas Place Facing Lawsuit Alleging Wage and Hour Violations