

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

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
EASTERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK**

-----X  
MARGARITO ROMERO, *individually and on  
behalf of others similarly situated,*

*Plaintiff,*

-against-

FOOD COLONY LLC (D/B/A C TOWN),  
NOOR HAMDAN, NAYEF HASAN  
HAMDAN, RADWAN HAMDAN, and ALEX  
DOE,

*Defendants.*

-----X

**COMPLAINT**

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

**ECF Case**

Plaintiff Margarito Romero (“Plaintiff Romero” or “Mr. Romero”), individually and on behalf of others similarly situated, by and through his attorneys, Michael Faillace & Associates, P.C., upon his knowledge and belief, and as against Food Colony LLC (d/b/a C Town), (“Defendant Corporation”), Noor Hamdan, Nayef Hasan Hamdan, Radwan Hamdan, and Alex Doe, (“Individual Defendants”), (collectively, “Defendants”), alleges as follows:

**NATURE OF ACTION**

1. Plaintiff Romero is a former employee of Defendants Food Colony LLC (d/b/a C Town), Noor Hamdan, Nayef Hasan Hamdan, Radwan Hamdan, and Alex Doe.
2. Defendants own, operate, or control a supermarket, located at 7510 7512 5th Avenue, Brooklyn, NY 11209 under the name “C Town”.

3. Upon information and belief, individual Defendants Noor Hamdan, Nayef Hasan Hamdan, Radwan Hamdan, and Alex Doe, serve or served as owners, managers, principals, or agents of Defendant Corporation and, through this corporate entity, operate or operated the supermarket as a joint or unified enterprise.

4. Plaintiff Romero was employed as a freezer and dairy packer at the supermarket located at 7510 7512 5th Avenue, Brooklyn, NY 11209.

5. At all times relevant to this Complaint, Plaintiff Romero worked for Defendants in excess of 40 hours per week, without appropriate minimum wage and overtime compensation for the hours that he worked.

6. Rather, Defendants failed to pay Plaintiff Romero appropriately for any hours worked and either at the straight rate of pay or for any additional overtime premium.

7. Defendants' conduct extended beyond Plaintiff Romero to all other similarly situated employees.

8. At all times relevant to this Complaint, Defendants maintained a policy and practice of requiring Plaintiff Romero and other employees to work in excess of forty (40) hours per week without providing the minimum wage and overtime compensation required by federal and state law and regulations.

9. Plaintiff Romero now brings this action on behalf of himself, and other similarly situated individuals, for unpaid minimum and 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"), including applicable liquidated damages, interest, attorneys' fees and costs.

10. Plaintiff Romero seeks certification of this action as a collective action on behalf of himself, individually, and all other similarly situated employees and former employees of Defendants pursuant to 29 U.S.C. § 216(b).

### **JURISDICTION AND VENUE**

11. This Court has subject matter jurisdiction under 28 U.S.C. § 1331 (federal question) and the FLSA, and supplemental jurisdiction over Plaintiff Romero's state law claims under 28 U.S.C. § 1367(a).

12. 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 supermarket located in this district. Further, Plaintiff Romero was employed by Defendants in this district.

### **PARTIES**

#### *Plaintiff*

13. Plaintiff Margarito Romero ("Plaintiff Romero" or "Mr. Romero") is an adult individual residing in Kings County, New York.

14. Plaintiff Romero was employed by Defendants at C Town from approximately July 2014 until on or about November 15, 2018.

15. Plaintiff Romero consents to being a party plaintiff pursuant to 29 U.S.C. § 216(b), and brings these claims based upon the allegations herein as a representative party of a prospective class of similarly situated individuals under 29 U.S.C. § 216(b).

#### *Defendants*

16. At all relevant times, Defendants owned, operated, or controlled a supermarket, located at 7510 7512 5th Avenue, Brooklyn, NY 11209 under the name “C Town”.

17. Upon information and belief, Food Colony LLC (d/b/a C Town) 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 7510 7512 5th Avenue, Brooklyn, NY 11209.

18. Defendant Noor Hamdan is an individual engaging (or who was engaged) in business in this judicial district during the relevant time period. Defendant Noor Hamdan is sued individually in his capacity as owner, officer and/or agent of Defendant Corporation. Defendant Noor Hamdan 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 Plaintiff Romero, establishes the schedules of the employees, maintains employee records, and has the authority to hire and fire employees.

19. Defendant Nayef Hasan Hamdan is an individual engaging (or who was engaged) in business in this judicial district during the relevant time period. Defendant Nayef Hasan Hamdan is sued individually in his capacity as owner, officer and/or agent of Defendant Corporation. Defendant Nayef Hasan Hamdan 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 Plaintiff Romero, establishes the schedules of the employees, maintains employee records, and has the authority to hire and fire employees.

20. Defendant Radwan Hamdan is an individual engaging (or who was engaged) in business in this judicial district during the relevant time period. Defendant Radwan Hamdan is sued individually in his capacity as owner, officer and/or agent of Defendant Corporation. Defendant Radwan Hamdan 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 Plaintiff Romero, establishes the schedules of the employees, maintains employee records, and has the authority to hire and fire employees.

21. Defendant Alex Doe is an individual engaging (or who was engaged) in business in this judicial district during the relevant time period. Defendant Alex Doe is sued individually in his capacity as a manager of Defendant Corporation. Defendant Alex Doe possesses operational control over Defendant Corporation and controls significant functions of Defendant Corporation. He determines the wages and compensation of the employees of Defendants, including Plaintiff Romero, establishes the schedules of the employees, maintains employee records, and has the authority to hire and fire employees.

### **FACTUAL ALLEGATIONS**

#### *Defendants Constitute Joint Employers*

22. Defendants operate a supermarket located in the Bay Ridge section of Brooklyn in New York City.

23. Individual Defendants, Noor Hamdan, Nayef Hasan Hamdan, Radwan Hamdan, and Alex Doe, possess operational control over Defendant Corporation, possess ownership interests in Defendant Corporation, or control significant functions of Defendant Corporation.

24. 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.

25. Each Defendant possessed substantial control over Plaintiff Romero's (and other similarly situated employees') working conditions, and over the policies and practices with respect to the employment and compensation of Plaintiff Romero, and all similarly situated individuals, referred to herein.

26. Defendants jointly employed Plaintiff Romero (and all similarly situated employees) and are Plaintiff Romero's (and all similarly situated employees') employers within the meaning of 29 U.S.C. 201 *et seq.* and the NYLL.

27. In the alternative, Defendants constitute a single employer of Plaintiff Romero and/or similarly situated individuals.

28. Upon information and belief, Individual Defendants Noor Hamdan, Nayef Hasan Hamdan, and Radwan Hamdan operate Defendant Corporation as either an alter ego of themselves and/or failed 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.

29. At all relevant times, Defendants were Plaintiff Romero's employers within the meaning of the FLSA and New York Labor Law.

30. Defendants had the power to hire and fire Plaintiff Romero, controlled the terms and conditions of employment, and determined the rate and method of any compensation in exchange for Plaintiff Romero's services.

31. 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).

32. 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 supermarket on a daily basis are goods produced outside of the State of New York.

*Individual Plaintiff*

33. Plaintiff Romero is a former employee of Defendants who was employed as a freezer and dairy packer.

34. Plaintiff Romero seeks to represent a class of similarly situated individuals under 29 U.S.C. 216(b).

*Plaintiff Margarito Romero*

35. Plaintiff Romero was employed by Defendants from approximately July 2014 until on or about November 15, 2018.

36. Defendants employed Plaintiff Romero as a freezer and dairy packer.

37. Plaintiff Romero regularly handled goods in interstate commerce, such as frozen food, dairy products and other supplies produced outside the State of New York.

38. Plaintiff Romero's work duties required neither discretion nor independent judgment.

39. Throughout his employment with Defendants, Plaintiff Romero regularly worked in excess of 40 hours per week.

40. From approximately July 2014 until on or about December 2016, Plaintiff Romero worked from approximately 8:00 a.m. until on or about 6:00 p.m., 6 days a week (typically 60 hours per week).

41. From approximately January 2017 until on or about December 2017, Plaintiff Romero worked from approximately 9:00 a.m. until on or about 6:00 p.m., 5 days a week and from approximately 12:00 p.m. until on or about 8:00 p.m., 1 day a week (typically 53 hours per week).

42. From approximately January 2018 until on or about November 15, 2018, Plaintiff Romero worked from approximately 10:00 a.m. until on or about 6:00 p.m., 3 days a week and from approximately 9:00 a.m. until on or about 6:00 p.m., 3 days a week (typically 51 hours per week).

43. Throughout his employment, Defendants paid Plaintiff Romero his wages in cash.

44. From approximately July 2014 until on or about December 2016, Defendants paid Plaintiff Romero \$9.00 per hour for an average of 34 hours per week.

45. From approximately January 2017 until on or about December 2017, Defendants paid Plaintiff Romero \$11.00 per hour for an average of 38 hours per week.



46. From approximately January 2018 until on or about November 15, 2018, Defendants paid Plaintiff Romero \$13.00 per hour for an average of 28 hours per week.

47. In addition to whatever the paychecks showed, Defendants paid Plaintiff Romero the equivalent of 8 hours of work per week, in cash too.

48. Plaintiff Romero's pay did not vary even when he was required to stay later or work a longer day than his usual schedule.

49. For example, Defendants required Plaintiff Romero to work an additional 30 minutes past his scheduled departure time twice a year, and did not pay him for the additional time he worked.

50. Defendants never granted Plaintiff Romero any breaks or meal periods of any kind.

51. Nevertheless, Defendants deducted one hour per day from Plaintiff Romero's weekly paycheck for meals he never ate.

52. Defendants required Plaintiff Romero to sign a check he was not allowed to keep or cash, in order to release his weekly pay.

53. On two occasions in the year 2018, Defendants required Plaintiff Romero to sign a document in English, the contents of which he was not allowed to review in detail.

54. Defendants took improper and illegal deductions from Plaintiff Romero's wages; specifically, Defendants deducted one hour every day from Plaintiff Romero's weekly wages for meal breaks they never allowed him to take.

55. No notification, either in the form of posted notices or other means, was ever given to Plaintiff Romero regarding overtime and wages under the FLSA and NYLL.

56. Defendants did not provide Plaintiff Romero an accurate statement of wages, as required by NYLL 195(3).

57. In fact, Defendants adjusted Plaintiff Romero's paystubs so that they reflected inaccurate wages and hours worked.

58. Defendants did not give any notice to Plaintiff Romero, in English and in Spanish (Plaintiff Romero's primary language), of his rate of pay, employer's regular pay day, and such other information as required by NYLL §195(1).

*Defendants' General Employment Practices*

59. At all times relevant to this Complaint, Defendants maintained a policy and practice of requiring Plaintiff Romero (and all similarly situated employees) to work in excess of 40 hours a week without paying him appropriate minimum wage and overtime compensation as required by federal and state laws.

60. Plaintiff Romero was a victim of Defendants' common policy and practices which violate his rights under the FLSA and New York Labor Law by, *inter alia*, not paying him the wages he was owed for the hours he worked.

61. Defendants' pay practices resulted in Plaintiff Romero not receiving payment for all his hours worked, and resulted in Plaintiff Romero's effective rate of pay falling below the required minimum wage rate.

62. Defendants habitually required Plaintiff Romero to work additional hours beyond his regular shifts but did not provide him with any additional compensation.

63. Defendants' time keeping system did not reflect the actual hours that Plaintiff Romero worked.

64. On two occasion in the year 2018, Defendants required Plaintiff Romero to sign a document in English the contents of which he was not allowed to review in detail.

65. Defendants required Plaintiff Romero to sign a check, in order to release his weekly pay.

66. Defendants paid Plaintiff Romero his wages in cash.

67. 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.

68. Upon information and belief, these practices by Defendants were done willfully to disguise the actual number of hours Plaintiff Romero (and similarly situated individuals) worked, and to avoid paying Plaintiff Romero properly for his full hours worked.

69. 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.

70. Defendants' unlawful conduct was intentional, willful, in bad faith, and caused significant damages to Plaintiff Romero and other similarly situated former workers.

71. Defendants failed to provide Plaintiff Romero 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).

72. Defendants failed to provide Plaintiff Romero 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**

73. Plaintiff Romero brings his FLSA minimum wage, 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").

74. At all relevant times, Plaintiff Romero 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 minimum wage and overtime pay at a one and one-half their regular rates for work in excess of forty (40) hours per workweek, as required under the FLSA.

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

**FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION**

**VIOLATION OF THE MINIMUM WAGE PROVISIONS OF THE FLSA**

76. Plaintiff Romero repeats and realleges all paragraphs above as though fully set forth herein.

77. At all times relevant to this action, Defendants were Plaintiff Romero's employers within the meaning of the Fair Labor Standards Act, 29 U.S.C. § 203(d).

78. Defendants had the power to hire and fire Plaintiff Romero (and the FLSA Class Members), controlled the terms and conditions of their employment, and determined the rate and method of any compensation in exchange for their employment.

79. At all times relevant to this action, Defendants were engaged in commerce or in an industry or activity affecting commerce.

80. Defendants constitute an enterprise within the meaning of the Fair Labor Standards Act, 29 U.S.C. § 203 (r-s).

81. Defendants failed to pay Plaintiff Romero (and the FLSA Class members) at the applicable minimum hourly rate, in violation of 29 U.S.C. § 206(a).

82. Defendants' failure to pay Plaintiff Romero (and the FLSA Class members) at the applicable minimum hourly rate was willful within the meaning of 29 U.S.C. § 255(a).

83. Plaintiff Romero (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 FLSA**

84. Plaintiff Romero repeats and realleges all paragraphs above as though fully set forth herein.

85. Defendants, in violation of 29 U.S.C. § 207(a)(1), failed to pay Plaintiff Romero (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.

86. Defendants' failure to pay Plaintiff Romero (and the FLSA Class members), overtime compensation was willful within the meaning of 29 U.S.C. § 255(a).

87. Plaintiff Romero (and the FLSA Class members) were damaged in an amount to be determined at trial.

### **THIRD CAUSE OF ACTION**

#### **VIOLATION OF THE NEW YORK MINIMUM WAGE ACT**

88. Plaintiff Romero repeats and realleges all paragraphs above as though fully set forth herein.

89. At all times relevant to this action, Defendants were Plaintiff Romero's employers within the meaning of the N.Y. Lab. Law §§ 2 and 651.

90. Defendants had the power to hire and fire Plaintiff Romero, controlled the terms and conditions of his employment, and determined the rates and methods of any compensation in exchange for his employment.

91. Defendants, in violation of NYLL § 652(1) and the supporting regulations of the New York State Department of Labor, paid Plaintiff Romero less than the minimum wage.

92. Defendants' failure to pay Plaintiff Romero the minimum wage was willful within the meaning of N.Y. Lab. Law § 663.

93. Plaintiff Romero was damaged in an amount to be determined at trial.

### **FOURTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

#### **VIOLATION OF THE OVERTIME PROVISIONS**

**OF THE NEW YORK STATE LABOR LAW**

94. Plaintiff Romero repeats and realleges all paragraphs above as though fully set forth herein.

95. 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 Plaintiff Romero 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.

96. Defendants' failure to pay Plaintiff Romero overtime compensation was willful within the meaning of N.Y. Lab. Law § 663.

97. Plaintiff Romero was damaged in an amount to be determined at trial.

**FIFTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

**VIOLATION OF THE NOTICE AND RECORDKEEPING**

**REQUIREMENTS OF THE NEW YORK LABOR LAW**

98. Plaintiff Romero repeats and realleges all paragraphs above as though fully set forth herein.

99. Defendants failed to provide Plaintiff Romero with a written notice, in English and in Spanish (Plaintiff Romero's 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).

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

**SIXTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

**VIOLATION OF THE WAGE STATEMENT PROVISIONS**

**OF THE NEW YORK LABOR LAW**

101. Plaintiff Romero repeats and realleges all paragraphs above as though fully set forth herein.

102. With each payment of wages, Defendants failed to provide Plaintiff Romero 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).

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

**SEVENTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

**UNLAWFUL DEDUCTIONS FROM WAGES IN VIOLATION**

**OF THE NEW YORK LABOR LAW**

104. Plaintiff Romero repeats and realleges all paragraphs above as though fully set forth herein.



105. At all relevant times, Defendants were Plaintiff Romero's employers within the meaning of the N.Y. Lab. Law §§ 2 and 651.

106. Defendants made unlawful deductions from Plaintiff Romero's wages including, but not limited to, deductions for meals he never ate.

107. The deductions made from Plaintiff Romero's wages was not authorized or required by law.

108. Through their knowing and intentional efforts to take unauthorized deductions from Plaintiff Romero's wages, Defendants willfully violated NYLL, Article 6, §§ 190 *et seq.*, and supporting New York State regulations.

109. Plaintiff Romero was damaged in an amount to be determined at trial.

#### **EIGHTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

#### **UNLAWFUL DEDUCTIONS FROM WAGES IN VIOLATION**

#### **OF THE NEW YORK LABOR LAW**

110. Plaintiff Romero repeats and realleges all paragraphs above as though set forth fully herein.

111. At all relevant times, Defendants were Plaintiff Romero's employers within the meaning of the N.Y. Lab. Law §§ 2 and 651.

112. Defendants made unlawful deductions from Plaintiff Romero's wages; specifically, Defendants deducted one hour every day from Plaintiff Romero's weekly wages for meal breaks they never allowed him to take.

113. The deductions made from Plaintiff Romero's wages were not authorized or required by law.

114. Through their knowing and intentional efforts to take unauthorized deductions from

Plaintiff Romero's wages, Defendants willfully violated NYLL, Article 6, §§ 190 *et seq.*, and supporting New York State regulations.

115. Plaintiff Romero was damaged in an amount to be determined at trial.

**PRAYER FOR RELIEF**

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff Romero respectfully requests 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 minimum wage provisions of, and associated rules and regulations under, the FLSA as to Plaintiff Romero and the FLSA Class members;

(c) Declaring that Defendants violated the overtime wage provisions of, and associated rules and regulations under, the FLSA as to Plaintiff Romero and the FLSA Class members;

(d) Declaring that Defendants' violations of the provisions of the FLSA were willful as to Plaintiff Romero and the FLSA Class members;

(e) Awarding Plaintiff Romero and the FLSA Class members damages for the amount of unpaid minimum wage, overtime compensation, and damages for any improper deductions or credits taken against wages under the FLSA as applicable;

(f) Awarding Plaintiff Romero and the FLSA Class members liquidated damages in an amount equal to 100% of his damages for the amount of unpaid minimum wage and 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 minimum wage provisions of, and rules and orders promulgated under, the NYLL as to Plaintiff Romero;

(h) Declaring that Defendants violated the overtime wage provisions of, and rules and orders promulgated under, the NYLL as to Plaintiff Romero;

(i) Declaring that Defendants' violations of the provisions of the NYLL were willful as to Plaintiff Romero;

(j) Awarding Plaintiff Romero damages for the amount of unpaid minimum wage and overtime compensation, and for any improper deductions or credits taken against wages as applicable

(k) Awarding Plaintiff Romero liquidated damages in an amount equal to one hundred percent (100%) of the total amount of minimum wage and overtime compensation shown to be owed pursuant to NYLL § 663 as applicable; and liquidated damages pursuant to NYLL § 198(3);

(l) Awarding Plaintiff Romero and the FLSA Class members pre-judgment and post-judgment interest as applicable;

(m) Awarding Plaintiff Romero and the FLSA Class members the expenses incurred in this action, including costs and attorneys' fees;

(n) 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

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

**JURY DEMAND**

Plaintiff Romero demands a trial by jury on all issues triable by a jury.

Dated: New York, New York  
December 28, 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 Plaintiff*

# Michael Faillace & Associates, P.C.

Employment and Litigation Attorneys

60 E 42<sup>nd</sup> Street, Suite 4510  
New York, New York 10165

Telephone: (212) 317-1200  
Facsimile: (212) 317-1620

\_\_\_\_\_  
Faillace@employmentcompliance.com

December 20, 2018

BY HAND

TO: Clerk of Court,

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.)**

Name / Nombre: Margarito Romero

Legal Representative / Abogado: Michael Faillace & Associates, P.C.

Signature / Firma:



Date / Fecha:

20 de diciembre 2018

CIVIL COVER SHEET

The JS 44 civil cover sheet and the information contained herein neither replace nor supplement the filing and service of pleadings or other papers as required by law, except as provided by local rules of court. This form, approved by the Judicial Conference of the United States in September 1974, is required for the use of the Clerk of Court for the purpose of initiating the civil docket sheet. (SEE INSTRUCTIONS ON NEXT PAGE OF THIS FORM.)

I. (a) PLAINTIFFS

MARGARITO ROMERO, individually and on behalf of others similarly situated,

(b) County of Residence of First Listed Plaintiff Kings (EXCEPT IN U.S. PLAINTIFF CASES)

(c) Attorneys (Firm Name, Address, and Telephone Number) Michael A. Faillace, Michael Faillace & Associates, P.C. 60 East 42nd Suite 4510 New York, NY 10165

DEFENDANTS

FOOD COLONY LLC (D/B/A C TOWN), NOOR HAMDAN, NAYEF HASAN HAMDAN, RADWAN HAMDAN, and ALEX DOE,

County of Residence of First Listed Defendant Kings (IN U.S. PLAINTIFF CASES ONLY)

NOTE: IN LAND CONDEMNATION CASES, USE THE LOCATION OF THE TRACT OF LAND INVOLVED.

Attorneys (If Known)

II. BASIS OF JURISDICTION (Place an "X" in One Box Only)

- 1 U.S. Government Plaintiff, 2 U.S. Government Defendant, 3 Federal Question (U.S. Government Not a Party), 4 Diversity (Indicate Citizenship of Parties in Item III)

III. CITIZENSHIP OF PRINCIPAL PARTIES (Place an "X" in One Box for Plaintiff and One Box for Defendant)

Table with columns for Plaintiff (PTF) and Defendant (DEF) citizenship: Citizen of This State, Citizen of Another State, Citizen or Subject of a Foreign Country, Incorporated or Principal Place of Business In This State, Incorporated and Principal Place of Business In Another State, Foreign Nation.

IV. NATURE OF SUIT (Place an "X" in One Box Only)

Large table with categories: CONTRACT, REAL PROPERTY, TORTS, CIVIL RIGHTS, PRISONER PETITIONS, FORFEITURE/PENALTY, LABOR, IMMIGRATION, BANKRUPTCY, SOCIAL SECURITY, FEDERAL TAX SUITS, OTHER STATUTES.

V. ORIGIN (Place an "X" in One Box Only)

- 1 Original Proceeding, 2 Removed from State Court, 3 Remanded from Appellate Court, 4 Reinstated or Reopened, 5 Transferred from Another District, 6 Multidistrict Litigation

VI. CAUSE OF ACTION

Cite the U.S. Civil Statute under which you are filing (Do not cite jurisdictional statutes unless diversity): Plaintiff seeks unpaid overtime wages pursuant to The Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, 29 U.S.C. § 201 et seq. Brief description of cause: unpaid overtime wages

VII. REQUESTED IN COMPLAINT:

CHECK IF THIS IS A CLASS ACTION UNDER RULE 23, F.R.Cv.P. DEMAND \$ CHECK YES only if demanded in complaint: JURY DEMAND: Yes No

VIII. RELATED CASE(S) IF ANY

(See instructions): JUDGE DOCKET NUMBER

DATE 12/28/2018 SIGNATURE OF ATTORNEY OF RECORD /s/ Michael Faillace

FOR OFFICE USE ONLY

RECEIPT # AMOUNT APPLYING IFP JUDGE MAG. JUDGE

**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 Faillace, counsel for Plaintiff, do hereby certify that the above captioned civil action is ineligible 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 of 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)**

- 1.) Is the civil action being filed in the Eastern District removed from a New York State Court located in Nassau or Suffolk County? No
- 2.) If you answered "no" above:
  - 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? 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 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?

- Yes (If yes, please explain)
- No

I certify the accuracy of all information provided above.

Signature: /s/ Michael Faillace

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

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

for the

Eastern District of New York

MARGARITO ROMERO, individually and on behalf of others similarly situated,

Plaintiff(s)

v.

FOOD COLONY LLC (D/B/A C TOWN), NOOR HAMDAN, NAYEF HASAN HAMDAN, RADWAN HAMDAN, and ALEX DOE,

Defendant(s)

Civil Action No.

SUMMONS IN A CIVIL ACTION

To: (Defendant's name and address) Food Colony LLC c/o C Town 7510 7512 5th Avenue Brooklyn, NY 11209

A lawsuit has been filed against you.

Within 21 days after service of this summons on you (not counting the day you received it) — or 60 days if you are the United States or a United States agency, or an officer or employee of the United States described in Fed. R. Civ. P. 12 (a)(2) or (3) — you must serve on the plaintiff an answer to the attached complaint or a motion under Rule 12 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure. The answer or motion must be served on the plaintiff or plaintiff's attorney, whose name and address are:

Michael A. Faillace MICHAEL FAILLACE & ASSOCIATES, P.C. 60 East 42nd Street, Suite 4510 New York, New York 10165

If you fail to respond, judgment by default will be entered against you for the relief demanded in the complaint. You also must file your answer or motion with the court.

CLERK OF COURT

Date: \_\_\_\_\_

Signature of Clerk or Deputy Clerk



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 *(name of individual and title, if any)* \_\_\_\_\_  
was received by me on *(date)* \_\_\_\_\_.

I personally served the summons on the individual at *(place)* \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_ on *(date)* \_\_\_\_\_; or

I left the summons at the individual's residence or usual place of abode with *(name)* \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_, a person of suitable age and discretion who resides there,  
on *(date)* \_\_\_\_\_, and mailed a copy to the individual's last known address; or

I served the summons on *(name of individual)* \_\_\_\_\_, who is  
designated by law to accept service of process on behalf of *(name of organization)* \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_ on *(date)* \_\_\_\_\_; or

I returned the summons unexecuted because \_\_\_\_\_; or

Other *(specify)*:

My fees are \$ \_\_\_\_\_ for travel and \$ \_\_\_\_\_ for services, for a total of \$ \_\_\_\_\_ 0.00 \_\_\_\_\_.

I declare under penalty of perjury that this information is true.

Date: \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_  
*Server's signature*

\_\_\_\_\_  
*Printed name and title*

\_\_\_\_\_  
*Server's address*

Additional information regarding attempted service, etc:

Print

Save As...

Reset

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

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

for the

Eastern District of New York

MARGARITO ROMERO, individually and on behalf of others similarly situated,

Plaintiff(s)

v.

FOOD COLONY LLC (D/B/A C TOWN), NOOR HAMDAN, NAYEF HASAN HAMDAN, RADWAN HAMDAN, and ALEX DOE,

Defendant(s)

Civil Action No.

SUMMONS IN A CIVIL ACTION

To: (Defendant's name and address) Noor Hamdan c/o C Town 7510 7512 5th Avenue Brooklyn, NY 11209

A lawsuit has been filed against you.

Within 21 days after service of this summons on you (not counting the day you received it) — or 60 days if you are the United States or a United States agency, or an officer or employee of the United States described in Fed. R. Civ. P. 12 (a)(2) or (3) — you must serve on the plaintiff an answer to the attached complaint or a motion under Rule 12 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure. The answer or motion must be served on the plaintiff or plaintiff's attorney, whose name and address are:

Michael A. Faillace MICHAEL FAILLACE & ASSOCIATES, P.C. 60 East 42nd Street, Suite 4510 New York, New York 10165

If you fail to respond, judgment by default will be entered against you for the relief demanded in the complaint. You also must file your answer or motion with the court.

CLERK OF COURT

Date: \_\_\_\_\_

Signature of Clerk or Deputy Clerk

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 *(name of individual and title, if any)* \_\_\_\_\_  
was received by me on *(date)* \_\_\_\_\_ .

I personally served the summons on the individual at *(place)* \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_ on *(date)* \_\_\_\_\_ ; or

I left the summons at the individual's residence or usual place of abode with *(name)* \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_, a person of suitable age and discretion who resides there,  
on *(date)* \_\_\_\_\_ , and mailed a copy to the individual's last known address; or

I served the summons on *(name of individual)* \_\_\_\_\_ , who is  
designated by law to accept service of process on behalf of *(name of organization)* \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_ on *(date)* \_\_\_\_\_ ; or

I returned the summons unexecuted because \_\_\_\_\_ ; or

Other *(specify)*:

My fees are \$ \_\_\_\_\_ for travel and \$ \_\_\_\_\_ for services, for a total of \$ \_\_\_\_\_ 0.00 .

I declare under penalty of perjury that this information is true.

Date: \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_  
*Server's signature*

\_\_\_\_\_  
*Printed name and title*

\_\_\_\_\_  
*Server's address*

Additional information regarding attempted service, etc:

Print

Save As...

Reset

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

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

for the

Eastern District of New York

MARGARITO ROMERO, individually and on behalf of others similarly situated,

Plaintiff(s)

v.

FOOD COLONY LLC (D/B/A C TOWN), NOOR HAMDAN, NAYEF HASAN HAMDAN, RADWAN HAMDAN, and ALEX DOE,

Defendant(s)

Civil Action No.

SUMMONS IN A CIVIL ACTION

To: (Defendant's name and address) Nayef Hasan Hamdan c/o C Town 7510 7512 5th Avenue Brooklyn, NY 11209

A lawsuit has been filed against you.

Within 21 days after service of this summons on you (not counting the day you received it) — or 60 days if you are the United States or a United States agency, or an officer or employee of the United States described in Fed. R. Civ. P. 12 (a)(2) or (3) — you must serve on the plaintiff an answer to the attached complaint or a motion under Rule 12 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure. The answer or motion must be served on the plaintiff or plaintiff's attorney, whose name and address are:

Michael A. Faillace MICHAEL FAILLACE & ASSOCIATES, P.C. 60 East 42nd Street, Suite 4510 New York, New York 10165

If you fail to respond, judgment by default will be entered against you for the relief demanded in the complaint. You also must file your answer or motion with the court.

CLERK OF COURT

Date: \_\_\_\_\_

Signature of Clerk or Deputy Clerk

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 *(name of individual and title, if any)* \_\_\_\_\_  
was received by me on *(date)* \_\_\_\_\_ .

I personally served the summons on the individual at *(place)* \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_ on *(date)* \_\_\_\_\_ ; or

I left the summons at the individual's residence or usual place of abode with *(name)* \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_, a person of suitable age and discretion who resides there,  
on *(date)* \_\_\_\_\_ , and mailed a copy to the individual's last known address; or

I served the summons on *(name of individual)* \_\_\_\_\_ , who is  
designated by law to accept service of process on behalf of *(name of organization)* \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_ on *(date)* \_\_\_\_\_ ; or

I returned the summons unexecuted because \_\_\_\_\_ ; or

Other *(specify)*:

My fees are \$ \_\_\_\_\_ for travel and \$ \_\_\_\_\_ for services, for a total of \$ \_\_\_\_\_ 0.00 .

I declare under penalty of perjury that this information is true.

Date: \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_  
*Server's signature*

\_\_\_\_\_  
*Printed name and title*

\_\_\_\_\_  
*Server's address*

Additional information regarding attempted service, etc:

**Print**

**Save As...**

**Reset**

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

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

for the

Eastern District of New York

MARGARITO ROMERO, individually and on behalf of others similarly situated,

Plaintiff(s)

v.

FOOD COLONY LLC (D/B/A C TOWN), NOOR HAMDAN, NAYEF HASAN HAMDAN, RADWAN HAMDAN, and ALEX DOE,

Defendant(s)

Civil Action No.

SUMMONS IN A CIVIL ACTION

To: (Defendant's name and address) Radwan Hamdan c/o C Town 7510 7512 5th Avenue Brooklyn, NY 11209

A lawsuit has been filed against you.

Within 21 days after service of this summons on you (not counting the day you received it) — or 60 days if you are the United States or a United States agency, or an officer or employee of the United States described in Fed. R. Civ. P. 12 (a)(2) or (3) — you must serve on the plaintiff an answer to the attached complaint or a motion under Rule 12 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure. The answer or motion must be served on the plaintiff or plaintiff's attorney, whose name and address are:

Michael A. Faillace MICHAEL FAILLACE & ASSOCIATES, P.C. 60 East 42nd Street, Suite 4510 New York, New York 10165

If you fail to respond, judgment by default will be entered against you for the relief demanded in the complaint. You also must file your answer or motion with the court.

CLERK OF COURT

Date: \_\_\_\_\_

Signature of Clerk or Deputy Clerk

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 *(name of individual and title, if any)* \_\_\_\_\_  
was received by me on *(date)* \_\_\_\_\_.

I personally served the summons on the individual at *(place)* \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_ on *(date)* \_\_\_\_\_ ; or

I left the summons at the individual's residence or usual place of abode with *(name)* \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_, a person of suitable age and discretion who resides there,  
on *(date)* \_\_\_\_\_, and mailed a copy to the individual's last known address; or

I served the summons on *(name of individual)* \_\_\_\_\_, who is  
designated by law to accept service of process on behalf of *(name of organization)* \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_ on *(date)* \_\_\_\_\_ ; or

I returned the summons unexecuted because \_\_\_\_\_ ; or

Other *(specify)*:

My fees are \$ \_\_\_\_\_ for travel and \$ \_\_\_\_\_ for services, for a total of \$ \_\_\_\_\_ 0.00 \_\_\_\_\_.

I declare under penalty of perjury that this information is true.

Date: \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_  
*Server's signature*

\_\_\_\_\_  
*Printed name and title*

\_\_\_\_\_  
*Server's address*

Additional information regarding attempted service, etc:

**Print**

**Save As...**

**Reset**

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

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

for the

Eastern District of New York

MARGARITO ROMERO, individually and on behalf of others similarly situated,

Plaintiff(s)

v.

FOOD COLONY LLC (D/B/A C TOWN), NOOR HAMDAN, NAYEF HASAN HAMDAN, RADWAN HAMDAN, and ALEX DOE,

Defendant(s)

Civil Action No.

SUMMONS IN A CIVIL ACTION

To: (Defendant's name and address) Alex Doe c/o C Town 7510 7512 5th Avenue Brooklyn, NY 11209

A lawsuit has been filed against you.

Within 21 days after service of this summons on you (not counting the day you received it) — or 60 days if you are the United States or a United States agency, or an officer or employee of the United States described in Fed. R. Civ. P. 12 (a)(2) or (3) — you must serve on the plaintiff an answer to the attached complaint or a motion under Rule 12 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure. The answer or motion must be served on the plaintiff or plaintiff's attorney, whose name and address are:

Michael A. Faillace MICHAEL FAILLACE & ASSOCIATES, P.C. 60 East 42nd Street, Suite 4510 New York, New York 10165

If you fail to respond, judgment by default will be entered against you for the relief demanded in the complaint. You also must file your answer or motion with the court.

CLERK OF COURT

Date: \_\_\_\_\_

Signature of Clerk or Deputy Clerk



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 *(name of individual and title, if any)* \_\_\_\_\_  
was received by me on *(date)* \_\_\_\_\_ .

I personally served the summons on the individual at *(place)* \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_ on *(date)* \_\_\_\_\_ ; or

I left the summons at the individual's residence or usual place of abode with *(name)* \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_, a person of suitable age and discretion who resides there,  
on *(date)* \_\_\_\_\_ , and mailed a copy to the individual's last known address; or

I served the summons on *(name of individual)* \_\_\_\_\_ , who is  
designated by law to accept service of process on behalf of *(name of organization)* \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_ on *(date)* \_\_\_\_\_ ; or

I returned the summons unexecuted because \_\_\_\_\_ ; or

Other *(specify)*:

My fees are \$ \_\_\_\_\_ for travel and \$ \_\_\_\_\_ for services, for a total of \$ \_\_\_\_\_ 0.00 .

I declare under penalty of perjury that this information is true.

Date: \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_  
*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: [Brooklyn Supermarket C Town Sued by Former Employee Over Allegedly Unpaid Wages](#)

---