1	Ariadne Panagopoulou (AP - 2202)					
2	Pardalis & Nohavicka, LLP 3510 Broadway, Suite 201					
	Astoria, NY 11106					
3	Telephone: (718) 777-0400					
4	Facsimile: (718) 777-0599 Attorneys for the Plaintiff					
5						
6	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT EASTERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK					
7						
8	Roberto Rivas, on behalf of himself and) others similarly situated, Civil Case No.:					
9)					
10	Plaintiff,)					
11) <u>FLSA COLLECTIVE ACTION</u>					
) <u>COMPLAINT</u>					
12	Ripe Juice Bar & Grill, Freshark Franchise)					
13	Corp., Peter Kambitsis, Elias Kalogiros, and) Gabriel Olivera, <i>jointly and severally</i> ,					
14)					
	Defendants.)					
15)					
16						
17	NATURE OF THE ACTION					
18	1. Plaintiff Roberto Rivas, ("Plaintiff"), on behalf of himself and others similarly					
19	situated, brings this action under the Fair Labor Standards Act ("FLSA"), 29 U.S.C. §§ 201 et.					
20 21	seq. in order to remedy Defendants' wrongful withholding of Plaintiff's lawfully earned wages					
22	and overtime compensation. Plaintiff also brings these claims under New York Labor Law					
23	("NYLL"), Article 6, §§ 190 et seq., and Article 19 §§ 650 et seq. as well as the supporting					
24	New York State Department of Labor Regulations for violations of minimum wages, overtime					
25 26	wages, spread-of-hours pay, and notice and record-keeping violations.					
27	SUMMARY					
28	2. Plaintiff was employed by Defendants, Ripe Juice Bar & Grill, Freshark					

Franchise Corp., Peter Kambitsos, Elias Kalogiros, and Gabriel Olivera, as a delivery employee. However, he would also spend significant time each day working in the kitchen, cleaning the restaurant, taking out the trash and stocking supplies.

- 3. Plaintiff consistently worked for Defendants more than 40 hours per week.
- 4. Defendants consistently paid the Plaintiff below minimum wage. They also failed to pay him his due overtime wages and spread of hours premium.
- 5. 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.
- 6. As a result of Defendants' actions, Plaintiff has suffered great hardship and damages.
- 7. Defendants' conduct extended beyond the Plaintiff to all other similarly situated employees. Plaintiff seeks certification of this action as a collective action on behalf of himself individually and those other similarly situated employees and former employees of Defendants pursuant to 29 U.S.C. § 216(b).

JURISDICTION AND VENUE

Federal Question Jurisdiction and Supplemental Jurisdiction

8. This Court has original subject matter jurisdiction over this action under 28 U.S.C. § 1331 because the civil action herein arises under the laws of the United States, namely, the Fair Labor Standards Act, 29 U.S.C. §§ 201 *et seq.* Additionally, this Court also has supplemental jurisdiction over Plaintiff's state law claims under 28 U.S.C. §1367(a).

Personal Jurisdiction

9. This Court may properly maintain personal jurisdiction over Defendants under Rule 4 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure because Defendants' contacts with this state and this judicial district are sufficient for exercise of jurisdiction over Defendants so as to comply with traditional notions of fair play and substantial justice.

Venue

10. Venue is proper in the Eastern District of New York under 28 U.S.C. §§ 1391 (b) (1) and (2) because Defendants reside and conduct business in this judicial district and because a substantial part of the acts or omissions giving rise to the claims set forth herein occurred in this judicial district.

THE PARTIES Plaintiff

Roberto Rivas

- 11. Plaintiff Roberto Rivas ("Rivas") is an adult individual residing in the state of New York, County of Queens.
- 12. Rivas is a covered employee within the meaning of the FLSA, 29 U.S.C. § 203(e) and the NYLL § 190.
- 13. Rivas worked for Defendants from December 2015 to April 2016 and from August 2016 to September, 2016.
- Rivas was employed at Ripe Juice Bar & Grill, located at 70-13 Austin Street,
 Forest Hills, NY, 11375.
- 15. Rivas was employed and accounted for by the Defendants as a delivery person. However, apart from performing deliveries, he would also spend significant time cleaning the restaurant, cleaning the kitchen, taking out the trash, buying supplies, and stocking supplies.

16. Rivas regularly handled goods in interstate commerce during his employment, such as food and drinks made from ingredients that were imported from outside the State of New York.

- 17. Since starting work in December 2015 to April 2016 and from August 2016 to September 2016, Rivas worked seven days per week. Rivas' hours worked were averaging around seventy-seven (77) hours per week and approximately ten to eleven hours per day.
- 18. Throughout Rivas' employment with Defendants, Defendants did not utilize a time clock system or any other system in which to accurately keep track of Rivas' hours of work.
- 19. Rivas' weekly pay, as determined by Defendants, was One Hundred and Eighty Dollars (\$180), regardless of the actual number of hours worked. Rivas also received approximately \$400 per week in tips.
 - 20. Rivas received his pay in cash at all times.
 - 21. Defendants paid Rivas below minimum wage at all times.
- 22. Defendants repeatedly suffered or permitted Rivas to work over Forty (40) hours per week without paying him the appropriate premium overtime pay of one and one half times the statutory minimum.
- 23. Defendants have failed to pay Rivas spread-of-hours compensation of one hour's pay at the basic minimum hourly wage rate for each day during which Rivas' shift extended for more than ten (10) hours.
- 24. Rivas was not provided with a notice containing the rate and basis of his pay; the designated pay date; and the employer's name, address and telephone number at the time of hiring or at any point thereafter.

- 25. Rivas was never provided with wage statements or other records detailing dates worked, money received and the employer's details at any point during the time of his employment with Defendants.
- 26. Upon information and belief, while Defendants employed Rivas, they failed to post notices explaining the minimum wage rights of employees under the FLSA and NYLL and failed to inform Rivas of such rights.
- 27. Throughout the duration of his employment, Rivas did not have any supervisory authority over any of Defendants' employees, nor did he exercise discretion or independent judgment with respect to matters of significance.
- 28. Rivas consented in writing to be a party to the FLSA claims in this action, pursuant to 29 U.S.C. § 216(b).
- 29. Rivas has personal knowledge of other employees of Defendants who also worked hours for which they were not paid minimum and overtime wages.

Defendants

- 30. At all relevant times, Individual and Corporate Defendants were joint employers of Plaintiff, acted in the interest of each other with respect to Plaintiff's and other employees' remuneration, and had common policies and practices as to wages and hours, pursuant to 29 C.F.R. § 791.2. Factors indicating joint employment include:
 - a. Defendants all suffered or permitted Plaintiff to work.
 - b. Each of the Defendants acted directly or indirectly in the interest of one another in relation to Plaintiff and similarly situated employees.
 - c. Defendants each have an economic interest in the locations in which Plaintiff and similarly situated employees worked.
 - d. Defendants all simultaneously benefitted from Plaintiff's work.

28

- e. Defendants each had either functional and/or formal control over the terms and conditions of work of Plaintiff and similarly situated employees.
- f. Plaintiff and similarly situated employees performed work integral to each Corporate Defendant's operation.
- 31. In the alternative, all Defendants functioned together as a single integrated employer of Plaintiff within the meaning of the FLSA and NYLL.
- 32. Upon information and belief, Corporate Defendants Ripe Juice Bar & Grill, and Freshark Franchise Corp. are related entities and operate together as a single integrated enterprise. Specifically, both corporations and/or branch locations are owned, managed, and operated by the same core team of Individual Defendants; Peter Kambitsis, Elias Kalogiros, and Gabriel Olivera. They offer similar services; namely fresh juice and smoothies, and they utilize the media platforms for advertizing same purposes. See: http://www.ripejuicebar.com/location/. They have also designated the same address for service of process.
- 33. Upon information and belief, non-exempt workers associated with Ripe Juice Bar & Grill, and Freshark Franchise Corp., perform the same job duties, and are subject to the same employment policies and practices, and are directed and/or permitted by Defendants to perform work at multiple locations without retraining.
- 34. Accordingly, all non-exempt employees working at any one Corporate Defendant at a particular instance were simultaneously considered and accounted for as employees of all Corporate Defendants collectively.

Corporate Defendants

Ripe Juice Bar & Grill

- 35. Ripe Juice Bar & Grill ("Ripe") is the trade name of a domestic corporation organized and existing under the laws of the State of New York. Its principal place of business is located at 70-13 Austin Street, Forest Hills, NY 11375.
- 36. Ripe is engaged in the retail sale of food and beverage items where customers order or select items and pay before consuming them. Such items can be consumed on the premises or delivered to customer's homes via delivery employees such as Plaintiff.
- 37. Ripe is open daily seven (7) days per week and several hours per day. It employs a number of staff including cooks, waiters, cashiers, bussers, runners, and delivery employees.
- 38. At all relevant times, Ripe was a covered employer within the meaning of the FLSA, 29 U.S.C. § 203(d) and the NYLL § 190.
- 39. At all relevant times, Ripe maintained control, oversight, and direction over the Plaintiff, including timekeeping, payroll, and other employment practices that applied to him.
- 40. At all relevant times, Ripe was "an enterprise engaged in commerce" within the meaning of the FLSA, 29 U.S.C. § 203(s)(1)(A) because its employees were handling food made from ingredients imported from out of state and distributed in New York. In addition, Ripe conducted business with vendors and other businesses outside the State of New York, and engaged in credit card transactions involving banks and other institutions outside the State of New York.
- 41. Upon information and belief, at all relevant times, Ripe's annual gross volume of sales made, or business done, was not less than \$500,000.00, exclusive of separate retail

excise taxes, within the meaning of the FLSA, 29 U.S.C. § 203(s)(1)(a)(ii). In the alternative,

Ripe was part of an integrated enterprise whose annual gross volume of sales exceeded

Freshark Franchise Corp.

\$500,000.

21

22 23

24

26

25

28

27

42. Freshark Franchise Corp. ("Freshark") is a domestic corporation organized and existing under the laws of the State of New York with initial filing date of August 30, 2011.

- 43. Upon information and belief, Freshark owns and operates Ripe, a sit down restaurant serving food and drinks to customers, located at 70-13 Austin Street, Forest Hills, NY 11375.
- 44. At all relevant times, Freshark was a covered employer within the meaning of the FLSA, 29 U.S.C. § 203(d) and the NYLL § 190.
- 45. At all relevant times, Freshark maintained control, oversight, and direction over the Plaintiff, including timekeeping, payroll and other employment practices that applied to him.
- 46. At all relevant times, Freshark was "an enterprise engaged in commerce" within the meaning of the FLSA, 29 U.S.C. § 203(s)(1)(A) because its employees were handling food made from ingredients imported from out of state and distributed in New York. In addition, Freshark conducted business with vendors and other businesses outside the State of New York, and engaged in credit card transactions involving banks and other institutions outside the State of New York.
- 47. Upon information and belief, at all relevant times, Freshark's annual gross volume of sales made, or business done, was not less than \$500,000.00, exclusive of separate retail excise taxes, within the meaning of the FLSA, 29 U.S.C. § 203(s)(1)(a)(ii). In the

alternative, Freshark was part of an integrated enterprise whose annual gross volume of sales exceeded \$500,000.

Individual Defendants

Peter Kambitsis

- 48. Upon information and belief, at all relevant times, Peter Kambitsis ("Kambitsis") was, at the time of Plaintiff's employment owner, principal, authorized operator, manager, shareholder and/or agent of Corporate Defendants.
- 49. At all relevant times throughout Plaintiff's employment, Kambitsis had the discretionary power to create and enforce personnel decisions on behalf of the Corporate Defendants, including but not limited to: hiring and terminating employees; setting and authorizing issuance of wages; maintaining employee records; setting Plaintiff's schedule; instructing and supervising Plaintiff; and otherwise controlling the terms and conditions for the Plaintiff while he was employed by Defendants.
- 50. At all relevant times throughout Plaintiff's employment, Kambitsis was actively involved in the day-to-day operations of Corporate Defendants and was in charge of their finances.
- 51. At all relevant times throughout Plaintiff's employment, Kambitsis was a "covered employer" within the meaning of the FLSA and the NYLL, and employed or jointly employed Plaintiff, and is personally liable for the unpaid wages sought herein, pursuant to 29 U.S.C. § 203(d).

Elias Kalogiros

52. Upon information and belief, at all relevant times, Elias Kalogiros ("Kalogiros") was, at the time of Plaintiff's employment owner, principal, authorized operator, manager,

shareholder and/or agent of Corporate Defendants.

- 53. At all relevant times throughout Plaintiff's employment, Kalogiros had the discretionary power to create and enforce personnel decisions on behalf of the Corporate Defendant, including but not limited to: hiring and terminating employees; setting and authorizing issuance of wages; maintaining employee records; setting Plaintiff's schedule; instructing and supervising Plaintiff; and otherwise controlling the terms and conditions for the Plaintiff while he was employed by Defendants.
- 54. At all relevant times throughout Plaintiff's employment, Kalogiros was actively involved in the day-to-day operations of the Corporate Defendants and was in charge of their finances.
- 55. At all relevant times throughout Plaintiff's employment, Kalogiros was a "covered employer" within the meaning of the FLSA and the NYLL, and employed or jointly employed Plaintiff, and is personally liable for the unpaid wages sought herein, pursuant to 29 U.S.C. § 203(d).

Gabriel Olivera

- 56. Upon information and belief, at all relevant times, Gabriel Olivera ("Olivera") was, at the time of Plaintiff's employment owner, principal, authorized operator, manager, shareholder and/or agent of Corporate Defendants.
- 57. At all relevant times throughout Plaintiff's employment, Olivera had the discretionary power to create and enforce personnel decisions on behalf of the Corporate Defendant, including but not limited to: hiring and terminating employees; setting and authorizing issuance of wages; maintaining employee records; setting Plaintiff's schedule; instructing and supervising Plaintiff; and otherwise controlling the terms and conditions for the

Plaintiff while they were employed by Defendants.

- 58. At all relevant times throughout Plaintiff's employment, Olivera was interacting with the Plaintiff and other employees at Ripe, was in-charge of clocking the Plaintiff's and other employees' hours, and was responsible for interviewing, hiring, and firing them.
- 59. At all relevant times throughout Plaintiff's employment, Olivera was actively involved in the day-to-day operations of the Corporate Defendants and was in charge of their finances.
- 60. At all relevant times throughout Plaintiff's employment, Olivera was a "covered employer" within the meaning of the FLSA and the NYLL, and employed or jointly employed Plaintiff, and is personally liable for the unpaid wages sought herein, pursuant to 29 U.S.C. § 203(d).

COLLECTIVE ACTION ALLEGATIONS

61. Pursuant to 29 U.S.C. §§ 203, 206, 207, 211(c) and 216(b), Plaintiff bring his First, Second, and Third Causes of Action as a collective action under the FLSA on behalf of himself and the following collective:

All persons employed by Defendants at any time since October 25, 2013, and through the entry of judgment in this case (the "Collective Action Period") who worked as waiters, busers, runners, cashiers, delivery employees and other non-management employees (the "Collective Action Members").

62. A collective action is appropriate in these circumstances because Plaintiff and the Collective Action Members are similarly situated, in that they were all subject to Defendants' illegal policies of failing to pay minimum wage for all hours worked and overtime

premiums for work performed in excess of forty (40) hours each week. Plaintiff and the Collective Action Members have substantially similar job duties and are paid pursuant to a similar, if not the same, payment structure.

63. The claims of the Plaintiff stated herein are similar to those of the other employees.

FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION

Fair Labor Standards Act – Minimum Wages

- 64. Plaintiff, on behalf of himself and the Collective Action Members, realleges and incorporates by reference the allegations made in all preceding paragraphs as if fully set forth herein.
- 65. At all relevant times, Plaintiff and the Collective Action Members were employees and employed by Defendants within the meaning of the FLSA, 29 U.S.C. § 203(d), (e)(1), and (g).
- 66. At all times relevant, Defendants have been employers of Plaintiff and the Collective Action Members, and were engaged in commerce and/or the production of goods for commerce within the meaning of 29 U.S.C. §§ 203 (s)(1) and 206 (a).
- 67. Defendants were required to pay directly to Plaintiff and the Collective Action Members, the applicable federal minimum wage rate for all hours worked pursuant to 29 U.S.C. § 206.
- 68. Defendants failed to pay Plaintiff and the Collective Action Members, their earned minimum wages for all hours worked to which they were entitled to under the FLSA.
- 69. As a result of Defendants' violations of the FLSA, Plaintiff and the Collective Action Members have suffered damages by being denied minimum wages in accordance with

the FLSA in amounts to be determined at trial, and are entitled to recovery of such amounts, liquidated damages, reasonable attorneys' fees, costs, and other compensation pursuant to 29 U.S.C. § 216 (b).

- 70. Defendants' unlawful conduct, as described in this Complaint, has been willful and intentional. Defendants were aware, or should have been aware, that the practices described in this Complaint were unlawful.
- 71. Defendants have not made a good faith effort to comply with the FLSA with respect to the compensation of the Plaintiff and the Collective Action Members.
- 72. Defendants failed to post or keep posted conspicuous notices of Plaintiff's rights as required by the U.S. Department of Labor pursuant to 29 C.F.R. § 516.4, further evincing Defendants' lack of good faith.
- 73. Because Defendants' violations of the FLSA have been willful, a three-year statute of limitations applies pursuant to 29 U.S.C. § 255(a).

SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION

Fair Labor Standards Act – Unpaid Overtime Wages

- 74. Plaintiff and the Collective Action Members reallege and incorporate by reference the allegations made in all preceding paragraphs as if fully set forth herein.
- 75. The overtime wage provisions set forth in the FLSA, 29 U.S.C. § 207 (a)(1) and the supporting federal regulations, apply to Defendants and protect Plaintiff and the Collective Action Members.
- 76. Defendants have failed to pay Plaintiff and the Collective Action Members overtime wages at a rate of one and one-half times the regular rate at which they were employed

for but under no instance less than one and one-half times the statutory minimum wage for all of the hours that they worked in excess of forty (40) hours per workweek.

77. As a result of Defendants' violations of the FLSA, Plaintiff and the Collective Action Members have been deprived of overtime compensation and other wages in amounts to be determined at trial, and are entitled to recovery of such amounts, liquidated damages, attorneys' fees, costs, and other compensation pursuant to 29 U.S.C. § 216 (b).

THIRD CAUSE OF ACTION

Fair Labor Standards Act – Failure to Keep Accurate Records

- 78. Plaintiff and the Collective Action Members reallege and incorporate by reference all allegations in all preceding paragraphs.
- 79. Defendants were required to make, keep and preserve accurate payroll records reflecting the actual hours worked by employees and the wages received by them pursuant to the FLSA, 29 U.S.C. § 211(c) and the supporting Federal regulations, 29 C.F.R. §§ 516.2, 516.5, and 516.28.
- 80. By arbitrarily failing to count hours worked by Plaintiff and the Collective Action Members to determine their wages, Defendants also violated 29 C.F.R. § 785.47, which requires employers to compensate employees for any practically ascertainable period of time worked, however small.
- 81. As a result, Plaintiff and the Collective Action Members, have suffered damages by being deprived of their proper minimum and overtime compensation according to the actual number of hours worked.

4

5

6 7

8

9

10

11 12

13

14

15 16

17

18

19

20

21 22

23 24

25

26

27 28

FOURTH CAUSE OF ACTION

New York Labor Law – Minimum Wage

- 82. Plaintiff realleges and incorporates by reference all allegations in all preceding paragraphs.
- 83. Defendants have engaged in a widespread pattern, policy, and practice of violating the NYLL, as detailed in this Complaint.
- 84. At all relevant times referenced herein, Plaintiff has been an employee of Defendants, and Defendants have been employers of Plaintiff within the meaning of the NYLL §§ 190, 651 (5), 652, and the supporting New York State Department of Labor Regulations.
- 85. The minimum wage provisions of Article 19 of the NYLL and the supporting New York State Department of Labor Regulations apply to Defendants, and protect Plaintiff.
- 86. From December 31, 2014, to December 30, 2015 the applicable hourly minimum wage in the State of New York was \$8.75, and from December 31, 2015 onwards it was \$9.00 pursuant to NYLL § 652 and the New York State Department of Labor Regulations, 12 N.Y.C.R.R. Part 146-1.2.
- 87. Defendants were required to pay Plaintiff no less than the applicable statutory minimum wage for all hours worked under the NYLL § 652 and the supporting New York State Department of Labor regulations, 12 N.Y.C.R.R. Part 146-1.2.
- 88. Through their knowing and intentional failure to pay minimum hourly wages to Plaintiff, Defendants have violated the NYLL Article 19, §§ 650 et seq., and 12 N.Y.C.R.R. Part 146-1.2.
- 89. Defendants did not even pay Plaintiff at the lower tip-credited rate frequently claimed for food service employees.

- 90. Defendants also failed to post conspicuous notices of the Plaintiff's rights under the law, as required by the NYLL § 661 and the New York State Department of Labor Regulations, 12 N.Y.C.R.R. Part 146-2.4, further evincing Defendants' lack of good faith.
- 91. Defendants' failure to pay Plaintiff the minimum wage was willful within the meaning of NYLL § 663.
- 92. Due to Defendants' violations of the NYLL, Plaintiff is entitled to recover from Defendants his unpaid minimum wages, liquidated damages as provided for by the NYLL, reasonable attorneys' fees, costs, and pre-judgment and post-judgment interest, pursuant to NYLL § 198 (1-a).

FIFTH CAUSE OF ACTION

New York Labor Law – Unpaid Overtime Wages

- 93. Plaintiff realleges and incorporates by reference all allegations in all preceding paragraphs.
- 94. The overtime wage provisions as set forth in NYLL §§ 190 *et seq.* and the supporting New York State Department of Labor Regulations apply to Defendants and protect Plaintiff.
- 95. Defendants have failed to pay Plaintiff proper overtime which he was entitled to at a wage rate of one and one-half times his regular rate but under no instance less than one and one-half times the statutory minimum wage as defined by the New York State Department of Labor regulations, 12 N.Y.C.R.R. Part 146-1.4.
- 96. Through their knowing or intentional failure to pay Plaintiff proper overtime wages for hours worked in excess of forty (40) hours per workweek, Defendants have violated the NYLL §§ 190 *et seq.*, and the supporting New York State Department of Labor Regulations.

97. Defendants' failure to pay Plaintiff overtime compensation was willful within the meaning of NYLL § 663.

98. Due to Defendants' violations of the NYLL, Plaintiff is entitled to recover from Defendants his unpaid overtime wages, liquidated damages as provided for by the NYLL, reasonable attorneys' fees and costs of the action, pre-judgment and post-judgment interest, pursuant to NYLL § 198 (1-a).

SIXTH CAUSE OF ACTION

New York Labor Law-Spread-of-Hours Pay

- 99. Plaintiff realleges and incorporates by reference all allegations in all preceding paragraphs.
- 100. The spread-of-hours provisions as set forth in NYLL §§ 190 *et seq.* and the supporting New York State Department of Labor Regulations apply to Defendants and protect Plaintiff.
- 101. Defendants have failed to pay Plaintiff spread-of-hours compensation of one hour's pay at the basic minimum hourly wage rate for each day during which Plaintiff's shift exceeded ten (10) hours, as defined by the New York State Department of Labor regulations, 12 N.Y.C.R.R. Part 146-1.6.
- 102. Through their knowing or intentional failure to pay Plaintiff spread-of-hours compensation, Defendants have willfully violated the NYLL §§ 190 *et seq.*, and the supporting New York State Department of Labor Regulations.
- 103. Due to Defendants' violations of the NYLL, Plaintiff is entitled to recover from Defendants his unpaid spread-of-hours pay, liquidated damages as provided for by the NYLL,

7

9

11

12 13

14

15 16

17

18

19

20

21 22

23

24

25

26

27

28

reasonable attorneys' fees, costs, and pre-judgment and post-judgment interest, pursuant to NYLL § 198 (1-a).

SEVENTH CAUSE OF ACTION

New York Labor Law– Failure to Keep Accurate Records

- 104. Plaintiff realleges and incorporates by reference all allegations in all preceding paragraphs.
- 105. Defendants were required to establish, maintain and preserve for not less than six years contemporaneous, true, and accurate payroll records showing, inter alia, for each week worked the regular hourly rate of pay, the overtime rate of pay, the number of regular hours worked, and the number of overtime hours worked pursuant to NYLL §§ 195(4) and 661 and the New York Department of Labor Regulations, 12 NYCRR 146-2.1.
- 106. By intentionally failing to account for Plaintiff's entire amount of hours worked, Plaintiff has suffered damages by being deprived of his proper compensation according to the actual number of hours worked.

EIGHTH CAUSE OF ACTION

New York Labor Law– Failure to Provide Notice at the Time of Hiring

- Plaintiff realleges and incorporates by reference all allegations in all preceding 107. paragraphs.
- 108. Defendants have failed to provide Plaintiff, at the time of hiring or at any point thereafter, a notice containing the rate of pay and basis thereof, whether paid by the hour, shift, day, week, salary, piece, commission, or other; the regular pay day designated by the employer;

the physical address of the employer's main office or principal place of business; the telephone number of the employer, and anything otherwise required by law, in violation of NYLL § 195(1).

109. Due to Defendants' violations of the NYLL § 195(1), Plaintiff is entitled to recover from Defendants statutory damages of Fifty dollars (\$50) per workday that the violation occurred, up to a maximum of Five Thousand Dollars (\$5,000), pursuant to NYLL § 198 (1-b).

NINTH CAUSE OF ACTION

New York Labor Law- Failure to Provide Wage Statements

- 110. Plaintiff realleges and incorporates by reference all allegations in all preceding paragraphs.
- 111. Defendants have failed to provide Plaintiff with wage statements listing all his hours of work; rate of pay; basis of pay; the period covered; and overtime pay, in violation of NYLL § 195(3).
- 112. Due to Defendants' violations of the NYLL, Plaintiff is entitled to recover from Defendants statutory damages of Two Hundred and Fifty dollars (\$250) per workday that the violation occurred, up to a maximum of Five Thousand Dollars (\$5,000), pursuant to NYLL § 198 (1-d).

PRAYER FOR RELIEF

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff seeks the following relief:

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 collective action members, apprising them of the pendency of this action, and permitting them promptly to file consents to be Plaintiff in the FLSA claims in this action;

- B. An order tolling the statute of limitations;
- C. Issuance of a declaratory judgment that the practices complained of in this complaint are unlawful under the Fair Labor Standards Act, 29 U.S.C. §§ 201 *et seq.*, New York Labor Law, Article 6, §§ 190 *et seq.*, and Article 19, §§ 650 *et seq.*, and the supporting New York State Department of Labor Regulations;
- D. Unpaid minimum wages, and overtime pay under the FLSA and an additional and equal amount as liquidated damages pursuant to 29 U.S.C. § 216(b) and the supporting United States Department of Labor regulations;
- E. Unpaid minimum wages, overtime wages, and spread-of-hours pay under NYLL, and an additional and equal amount as liquidated damages pursuant to NYLL §198(1-a) and § 663(1);
- F. Civil penalties of One Thousand One Hundred Dollars (\$1,100) for each of Defendants' willful and repeated violations of the FLSA pursuant to 29 U.S.C. § 216(b);
- G. An award of statutory damages for Defendants' failure to provide Plaintiff with a wage notice at the time of hiring pursuant to NYLL § 198 (1-b);
- H. An award of statutory damages for Defendants' failure to provide Plaintiff with wage statements pursuant to NYLL § 198 (1-d);
- I. A permanent injunction requiring Defendants to pay all statutorily required wages pursuant to the FLSA and NYLL;
- J. If liquidated damages pursuant to FLSA, 29 U.S.C. § 216(b), are not awarded, an award of prejudgment interest pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1961;
- K. An award of pre-judgment interest of nine per centum per annum (9%) pursuant to the New York Civil Practice Law and Rules §§ 5001-5004;

1	1									
1	L.	An award of post-judgment interest pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1961 and/or the								
2	New York Civil Practice Law and Rules § 5003;									
3	M.	An award of attorney's fees, costs, and further expenses up to fifty dollars,								
4	pursuant to 29 U.S.C. § 216(b), and NYLL §§ 198 and 663(1);									
5	N. Such other relief as this Court shall deem just and proper.									
6	The Such other rener as and Sourt shart accompast and proper.									
7	Dated	l: October 25, 2016								
8										
9 10										
11		Respectfully submitted, PARDALIS & NOHAVICKA, LLP								
12										
13		By: <u>/s/Ariadne Panagopoulou</u> Ariadne Panagopoulou (AP-2202)								
14		Attorneys for the Plaintiff 35-10 Broadway, Suite 201								
15		Astoria, New York 11106 Tel: 718.777.0400 Fax: 718.777.0599								
16		Email: ari@pnlawyers.com								
17										
18										
19										
20										
21 22										
23										
24										
25										
26										
27										
28										

NOTICE OF CONSENT TO JOIN, PURSUANT TO 29 U.S.C. 216(b)

FAIR LABOR STANDARDS ACT CONSENT FORM

I consent to be a party plaintiff in a lawsuit against **Ripe Restaurant** and/or related entities and individuals in order to seek redress for violations of Fair Labor Standards Act, pursuant to 29 U.S.C. Section 216(b). I hereby designate Pardalis & Nohavicka LLP to represent me in such a lawsuit.

Dated: 9/19/2016
Astoria, New York
(Imment)
Signature
Roberto Rivas
Print Name
9814 Alstine Auc
Address
347.813.2855
Telephone

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

for the

Eastern District of New York						
Roberto Rivas, on behalf of similarly situa	himself and others ted,)))				
Plaintiff(s) v. Ripe Juice Bar & Grill, Freshark Franchise Corp., Peter Kambitsis, Elias Kalogiros, and Gabriel Olivera, jointly and severally,)) Civil Action No.)				
	<u> </u>)))				
	SUMMONS IN	A CIVIL ACTION				
7	Ripe Juice Bar & Grill, Pete 70-13 Austin Street Forest Hills, NY 11375	r Kambitsis, Gabriel Olivera				
3	Freshark Franchise Corp., Elias Kalogiros 312 Sunrise Hwy Rockville Centre, NY 11570					
A lawsuit has been filed	l against you.					
Within 21 days after service of this summons on you (not counting the day you received it) — or 60 days are the United States or a United States agency, or an officer or employee of the United States described in Fed. F. 12 (a)(2) or (3) — you must serve on the plaintiff an answer to the attached complaint or a motion under Rule the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure. The answer or motion must be served on the plaintiff or plaintiff's attorney						
;	PARDALIS & NOHAVICKA 35-10 Broadway, Suite 201 Astoria, NY 11106					
If you fail to respond, ju You also must file your answer		entered against you for the relief demanded in the complaint.				
		DOUGLAS C. PALMER CLERK OF COURT				
Date:		Signature of Clerk or Deputy Clerk				
		signature of Clerk of Deputy Clerk				

Case 1:16-cv-05935 Document 1-2 Filed 10/25/16 Page 1 of 2 PageID #: 24 CIVIL COVER SHEET

JS 44 (Rev. 07/16)

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 do	ocket sheet. (SEE INSTRUCT	TONS ON NEXT PAGE O	F THIS FU	км.)						
I. (a) PLAINTIFFS		<u> </u>		RPETENDEBAR	& GRILL, FRES	HARK FRA	NCHISE C	ORP.,		
ROBERTO RIVAS, on behalf of himself and others similarly situated,				PETER KAMBITS jointly and several	IS, ELIAS KALO)GIROS, and	d GABRIEI	L OLIV	ERA,	
(b) County of Residence o	f First Listed Plaintiff Q	ueens		County of Residence						
(EXCEPT IN U.S. PLAINTIFF CASES)				(IN U.S. PLAINTIFF CASES ONLY) NOTE: IN LAND CONDEMNATION CASES, USE THE LOCATION OF THE TRACT OF LAND INVOLVED.						
(c) Attorneys (Firm Name, A	Address and Telephone Number	•)		Attorneys (If Known))					
PARDALIS & NOHAVICK		,								
35-10 Broadway; Astoria,	NY, 11106; 718-777-	0400								
II. BASIS OF JURISDI	CTION (Place an "X" in O	ne Box Only)	III. C	TIZENSHIP OF I (For Diversity Cases Only)			ace an "X" in C and One Box for			
☐ 1 U.S. Government	3 Federal Question (U.S. Government Not a Party)			Ī	TF DEF			PTF	DEF	
Plaintiff			Citiz	en of This State		1				
2 U.S. Government Defendant	☐ 4 Diversity (Indicate Citizenship)	p of Parties in Item III)	Citiz	en of Another State		porated and Princ Business In Ano		5	5	
ı				Citizen or Subject of a 3 3 Foreign Nation				06 06		
IV. NATURE OF SUIT				4)[[2][[][[][[][[][[][[][[][[][[][[][[][[]		Ji (e4 /85 233 130 438	**************************************	98. Ve 011	is l	
□ 110 Insurance	PERSONAL INJURY	PERSONAL INJUR		25 Drug Related Seizure	☐ 422 Appeal 28 U	JSC 158	375 False Cla			
☐ 120 Marine	310 Airplane	☐ 310 Airplane ☐ 365 Personal Injury -		of Property 21 USC 881	☐ 423 Withdrawal 28 USC 15		376 Qui Tam (3729(a)		1	
☐ 130 Miller Act ☐ 140 Negotiable Instrument	☐ 315 Airplane Product Liability	Product Liability 367 Health Care/	, lo 6	90 Other	28 USC 15		3 /29(a)) 3 400 State Rea		ment	
☐ 150 Recovery of Overpayment	☐ 320 Assault, Libel &	Pharmaceutical			PROPERTYR		J 410 Antitrust J 430 Banks ar		~	
& Enforcement of Judgment 151 Medicare Act	Slander ☐ 330 Federal Employers'	Personal Injury Product Liability	Ì		☐ 820 Copyrights ☐ 830 Patent		3 450 Banks and 450 Commer		g	
☐ 151 Medicare Act ☐ 152 Recovery of Defaulted	Liability	368 Asbestos Persona	ıl		☐ 840 Trademark		J 460 Deportat			
Student Loans	☐ 340 Marine ☐ 345 Marine Product	Injury Product Liability	20000208	i Agor	TENNING ENGLISHED		J 470 Racketee	er influenc Organizati		
(Excludes Veterans) ☐ 153 Recovery of Overpayment	Liability	PERSONAL PROPE	RTY 🕇 7	10 Fair Labor Standards	☐ 861 HIA (1395f	n -	J 480 Consum	er Credit		
of Veteran's Benefits	☐ 350 Motor Vehicle	370 Other Fraud		Act 20 Labor/Management	☐ 862 Black Lung ☐ 863 DIWC/DIW	(/	J 490 Cable/Sa J 850 Securitie		dities/	
☐ 160 Stockholders' Suits ☐ 190 Other Contract	☐ 355 Motor Vehicle Product Liability	☐ 371 Truth in Lending ☐ 380 Other Personal	· '	Relations	☐ 864 SSID Title		Exchang		, G11105/	
☐ 195 Contract Product Liability	☐ 360 Other Personal	Property Damage		40 Railway Labor Act	□ 865 RSI (405(g)		3 890 Other St		ctions	
☐ 196 Franchise	Injury	 385 Property Damage Product Liability 		51 Family and Medical Leave Act			J 891 Agricult J 893 Environ		atters	
	☐ 362 Personal Injury - Medical Malpractice	Floddet Liability		90 Other Labor Litigation			3 895 Freedom			
	Philippi, (Median, 1877)	Managamente	NS 7	91 Employee Retirement	FEDERAL II		Act			
210 Land Condemnation	☐ 440 Other Civil Rights ☐ 441 Voting	Habeas Corpus: ☐ 463 Alien Detainee		Income Security Act	☐ 870 Taxes (U.S or Defenda		3 896 Arbitrati3 899 Adminis		ocedure	
☐ 220 Foreclosure ☐ 230 Rent Lease & Ejectment	441 Voting 442 Employment	510 Motions to Vacat	te		☐ 871 IRS—Third	′		iew or Ap		
☐ 240 Torts to Land	☐ 443 Housing/	Sentence			26 USC 76		Agency I 950 Constitu	Decision	n.f	
☐ 245 Tort Product Liability ☐ 290 All Other Real Property	Accommodations 445 Amer. w/Disabilities -	530 General 535 Death Penalty		\$\$\$\$\\\\\\(e\;\\\\\(o\)\\$\\\\\			State Sta)I	
1 290 An Other Real Property	Employment	Other:	□ 4	62 Naturalization Application	on					
	446 Amer. w/Disabilities -	☐ 540 Mandamus & Oti ☐ 550 Civil Rights	her 🛭 🗗 4	65 Other Immigration Actions						
	Other 448 Education	555 Prison Condition	.	Actions						
		☐ 560 Civil Detainee -								
		Conditions of Confinement								
V. ORIGIN (Place an "X" i	in One Box Only)									
	emoved from	Remanded from Appellate Court			ferred from	Multidistrict Litigation - Transfer		Multidis Litigatio Direct F	n -	
	I 29 USC 201 et. s		are filing	Do not cite jurisdictional si	tatutes unless diversity): 			_	
VI. CAUSE OF ACTION	ON Brief description of ca		es							
VII. REQUESTED IN COMPLAINT:	CHECK IF THIS UNDER RULE 2	IS A CLASS ACTIO 3, F.R.Cv.P.	N I	DEMAND \$ 200,000.00		K YES only if one of the contract of the contr	demanded in Yes	complaii No	nt:	
VIII. RELATED CAS	E(S) (See instructions):	JUDGE			DOCKET N	JMBER				
DATE +0 /0 F	12016	SIGNATURA OF A	TTORNEY	OF RECORD						
10/25/	/2016	_ Oth	aan	10						
FOR OFFICE USE ONLY				~~~		MAC UDO	ıe			
RECEIPT # A	MOUNT	APPLYING IFP		JUDGE		MAG. JUDG	il.			

Case 1:16-cv-05935 Document 1-2 Filed 10/25/16 Page 2 of 2 PageID #: 25

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. _, do hereby certify that the above captioned civil action is I. Ariadne Panagopoulou , counsel for Plaintiff ineligible for compulsory arbitration for the following reason(s): \boxtimes monetary damages sought are in excess of \$150,000, exclusive of interest and costs, $|\mathbf{x}|$ 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) Please list 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) provides that "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 because the cases arise from the same transactions or events, a substantial saving of judicial resources is likely to result from assigning both cases to the same judge 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 case: (A) involves identical legal issues, or (B) involves the same parties." Rule 50.3.1 (c) further provides that "Presumptively, and subject to the power of a judge to determine otherwise pursuant to paragraph (d), civil cases shall not be deemed to be "related" unless both cases are still pending before the court." NY-E DIVISION OF BUSINESS RULE 50.1(d)(2) Is the civil action being filed in the Eastern District removed from a New York State Court located in Nassau or Suffolk 1.) County: No If you answered "no" above: 2.) a) Did the events or omissions giving rise to the claim or claims, or a substantial part thereof, occur in Nassau or Suffolk County? No b) Did the events or omissions giving rise to the claim or claims, or a substantial part thereof, occur in the Eastern District? Yes If your answer 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 Suffolk County, or, in an interpleader action, does the claimant (or a majority of the claimants, if there is more than one) reside in Nassau or Suffolk County? (Note: A corporation shall be considered a resident of the County in which it has the most significant contacts). **BAR ADMISSION** I am currently 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 currently the subject of any disciplinary action (s) in this or any other state or federal court? (If yes, please explain) No

I certify the accuracy of all information provided above.

Sijadul Signature:

ClassAction.org

This complaint is part of ClassAction.org's searchable class action lawsuit database and can be found in this post: Ripe Juice Bar & Grill Squeezed with FLSA Class Action