UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT EASTERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK

SAMUEL & STEIN

David Stein (DS 2119) 38 West 32nd Street Suite 1110 New York, New York 10001 (212) 563-9884 dstein@samuelandstein.com

Attorneys for Plaintiffs, Individually and on behalf of all others similarly situated

Julio Antonio Valle and Hugo Lopez, on behalf of themselves and all other persons similarly situated,

Plaintiffs,

- vs. -

Dolphin Diner Corp. d/b/a Golden Dolphin Diner, Spiros Dimas, Baftjie Dimas, and Peter Tsadilis,

Defendants.

DOCKET NO. 18-cv-2735

COMPLAINT

Plaintiffs Julio Antonio Valle and Hugo Lopez, by and through their undersigned attorneys, for their complaint against defendants Dolphin Diner Corp. d/b/a Golden Dolphin Diner, Spiros Dimas, Baftjie Dimas, and Peter Tsadilis, allege as follows, on behalf of themselves and on behalf of all other persons similarly situated:

NATURE OF THE ACTION

- 1. Plaintiffs Julio Antonio Valle and Hugo Lopez allege, on behalf of themselves and on behalf of other similarly situated current and former employees of defendants Dolphin Diner Corp. d/b/a Golden Dolphin Diner, Spiros Dimas, Baftjie Dimas, and Peter Tsadilis, who elect to opt into this action pursuant to the Fair Labor Standards Act ("FLSA"), 29 U.S.C. § 216(b), that they are entitled to: (i) unpaid wages from defendants for overtime work for which they did not receive overtime premium pay as required by law, and (ii) liquidated damages pursuant to the FLSA, 29 U.S.C. §§ 201 et seq., because defendants' violations lacked a good faith basis.
- 2. Plaintiffs further complain that they are entitled to (i) compensation for wages paid at less than the statutory minimum wage; (ii) back wages for overtime work for which defendants willfully failed to pay overtime premium pay as required by the New York Labor Law §§ 650 et seq. and the supporting New York State Department of Labor regulations; (iii) compensation for defendants' failure to pay wages, (iv) liquidated damages pursuant to New York Labor Law for these violations; and (iv) statutory damages for defendants' violation of the Wage Theft Prevention Act.

THE PARTIES

- 3. Plaintiffs are adult individuals residing in Huntington Station, New York.
- 4. Plaintiffs consent in writing to be parties to this action pursuant to 29 U.S.C. § 216(b); their written consents are attached hereto and incorporated by reference.
- 5. Upon information and belief, defendant Dolphin Diner Corp. d/b/a Golden Dolphin Diner ("Golden Dolphin Diner") is a New York corporation with a principal place of business at 365 Main Street, Huntington, New York.
- 6. At all relevant times, defendant Golden Dolphin Diner has been, and continues to be, an employer engaged in interstate commerce and/or the production of goods for commerce within the meaning of the FLSA, 29 U.S.C. § 207(a).
- 7. Upon information and belief, at all relevant times, defendant Golden Dolphin Diner has had gross revenues in excess of \$500,000.00.
- 8. Upon information and belief, at all relevant times herein, defendant Golden Dolphin Diner has used goods and materials produced in interstate commerce, and has employed at least two individuals who handled such goods and materials.
- 9. Upon information and belief, at all relevant times, defendant Golden Dolphin Diner has constituted an "enterprise" as defined in the FLSA.

- 10. Upon information and belief, defendant Spiros Dimas is an owner or part owner and principal of Golden Dolphin Diner, who has the power to hire and fire employees, set wages and schedules, and maintain their records.
- 11. Defendant Spiros Dimas was involved in the day-to-day operations of Golden Dolphin Diner and played an active role in managing the business.
- 12. Upon information and belief, defendant Baftjie Dimas is an owner or part owner and principal of Golden Dolphin Diner, who has the power to hire and fire employees, set wages and schedules, and maintain their records.
- 13. Defendant Baftjie Dimas was involved in the dayto-day operations of Golden Dolphin Diner and played an active role in managing the business.
- 14. Upon information and belief, defendant Peter Tsadilis is an owner or part owner and principal of Golden Dolphin Diner, who has the power to hire and fire employees, set wages and schedules, and maintain their records.
- 15. Defendant Peter Tsadilis was involved in the dayto-day operations of Golden Dolphin Diner and played an active role in managing the business.
- 16. Defendants constituted "employers" of plaintiffs as that term is used in the Fair Labor Standards Act and New York Labor Law.

JURISDICTION AND VENUE

- 17. This Court has subject matter jurisdiction over this matter pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §§ 1331 and 1337 and supplemental jurisdiction over plaintiffs' state law claims pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1367. In addition, the Court has jurisdiction over plaintiffs' claims under the FLSA pursuant to 29 U.S.C. § 216(b).
- 18. Venue is proper in this district pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1391 because defendants' business is located in this district.

COLLECTIVE ACTION ALLEGATIONS

- 19. Pursuant to 29 U.S.C. § 207, plaintiffs seek to prosecute their FLSA claims as a collective action on behalf of a collective group of persons defined as follows:
 - All persons who are or were formerly employed by defendants in the United States at any time since May 4, 2015, to the entry of judgment in this case (the "Collective Action Period"), who were restaurant employees, and who were not paid overtime compensation at rates at least one-and-one-half times the regular rate of pay for hours worked in excess of forty hours per workweek (the "Collective Action Members").
- 20. The Collective Action Members are similarly situated to plaintiffs in that they were employed by defendants as non-exempt restaurant employees, and were denied premium overtime pay for hours worked beyond forty hours in a week.

- 21. They are further similarly situated in that defendants had a policy and practice of knowingly and willfully refusing to pay them overtime.
- 22. Plaintiffs and the Collective Action Members perform or performed the same or similar primary duties, and were subjected to the same policies and practices by defendants.
- 23. The exact number of such individuals is presently unknown, but is known by defendants and can be ascertained through appropriate discovery.

FACTS

- 24. At all relevant times herein, defendants owned and operated a diner in Huntington, New York.
- 25. Mr. Valle who was known as "Antonio" while working for defendants was employed at Golden Dolphin Diner from approximately September 2017 through March 2018.
- 26. Mr. Valle was employed as a dishwasher and food preparer.
- 27. Mr. Lopez was employed at Golden Dolphin Diner from approximately July 2017 through April 2018.
- 28. Mr. Lopez was employed as a dishwasher and line cook.
- 29. Plaintiffs' work was performed in the normal course of defendants' business and was integrated into the business

of defendants, and did not involve executive or administrative responsibilities.

- 30. At all relevant times herein, plaintiffs were employees engaged in commerce and/or in the production of goods for commerce, as defined in the FLSA and its implementing regulations.
- 31. Mr. Valle worked a regular schedule for defendants; he worked six days per week, ten hours per day, for a total of approximately 60 hours per week each week of his employment.
- 32. Mr. Lopez regularly worked six days per week, nine hours per day, for a total of approximately 54 hours per week each week of his employment.
- 33. Plaintiffs were paid on a weekly salary basis throughout their employment.
 - 34. Mr. Valle was paid at a rate of \$550 per week.
 - 35. Mr. Lopez was paid at a rate of \$580 per week.
- 36. However, defendants routinely failed to pay plaintiffs the full amount of their salaries, telling them that they did not have the money to pay them.
- 37. After about two months of work, Mr. Lopez's manager told him that he would be getting a raise to \$680 per week. However, after getting \$670 the first week, defendants began paying him \$580 per week again. When Mr. Lopez protested, he

was told that his manager did not have the authority to promise him more money, and that he would only get \$580 per week.

- 38. Plaintiffs' pay did not vary based on the exact number of hours they worked in a given week.
- 39. As a result, Mr. Valle's effective rate of pay was always below the statutory New York minimum wage in effect at relevant times, and Mr. Lopez's effective rate of pay was sometimes below the statutory New York minimum wage in effect at relevant times.
- 40. Defendants' failure to pay plaintiffs an amount at least equal to the New York state minimum wages in effect during relevant time periods was willful, and lacked a good faith basis.
- 41. Plaintiffs were paid in cash throughout their employment, and they received no paystubs or wage statements of any sort with their pay.
- 42. In addition, defendants failed to pay plaintiffs any overtime "bonus" for hours worked beyond 40 hours in a workweek, in violation of the FLSA, the New York Labor Law, and the supporting New York State Department of Labor regulations.

- 43. Defendants' failure to pay plaintiffs the overtime bonus for overtime hours worked was willful, and lacked a good faith basis.
- 44. Indeed, when Mr. Valle once asked about being paid overtime, he was told, "You get what is in the envelope."
- 45. Defendants failed to provide either plaintiff with a written notice providing the information required by the Wage Theft Prevention Act including, inter alia, defendants' contact information, plaintiff's regular and overtime rates, and intended allowances claimed and failed to obtain either plaintiff's signature acknowledging the same, upon their hiring or at any time thereafter, in violation of the Wage Theft Prevention Act in effect at the time.
- 46. Defendants failed to provide plaintiffs with weekly records of their compensation and hours worked, in violation of the Wage Theft Prevention Act.
- 47. Upon information and belief, throughout the period of plaintiffs' employment, both before that time (throughout the Collective Action Period) and continuing until today, defendants have likewise employed other individuals like plaintiffs (the Collective Action Members) in positions at defendants' restaurant that required little skill, no capital investment, and with duties and responsibilities that did not

include any managerial responsibilities or the exercise of independent judgment.

- 48. Defendants applied the same employment policies, practices, and procedures to all Collective Action Members, including policies, practices, and procedures with respect to the non-payment of overtime.
- 49. Upon information and belief, defendants have failed to pay these other individuals at a rate at least equal to the minimum wage, in violation of the New York Labor Law.
- 50. Upon information and belief, defendants have failed to pay these other individuals all the wages that they were owed, in violation of the New York Labor Law.
- 51. Upon information and belief, these other individuals have worked in excess of forty hours per week, yet defendants have likewise failed to pay them overtime compensation of one-and-one-half times their regular hourly rate in violation of the FLSA and the New York Labor Law.
- 52. Upon information and belief, these other individuals were not provided with required wage notices or weekly wage statements as specified in New York Labor Law §§ 195.1, 195.3, and the Wage Theft Prevention Act.
- 53. Upon information and belief, while defendants employed plaintiffs and the Collective Action members, and through all relevant time periods, defendants failed to

maintain accurate and sufficient time records or provide accurate records to employees.

54. Upon information and belief, while defendants employed plaintiffs and the Collective Action members, and through all relevant time periods, defendants failed to post or keep posted a notice explaining the minimum wage and overtime pay rights provided by the FLSA or New York Labor Law.

COUNT I

(New York Labor Law - Minimum Wage)

- 55. Plaintiffs repeat, reallege, and incorporate by reference the foregoing allegations as if set forth fully and again herein.
- 56. At all relevant times, plaintiffs were employed by defendants within the meaning of the New York Labor Law, §§ 2 and 651.
- 57. Defendants willfully violated plaintiffs' rights by failing to pay them compensation in excess of the statutory minimum wage in violation of the New York Labor Law §§ 190-199, 652 and their regulations.
- 58. Defendants' failure to pay compensation in excess of the statutory minimum wage was willful, and lacked a good faith basis, within the meaning of New York Labor Law § 198, § 663 and supporting regulations.

59. Due to defendants' New York Labor Law violations, plaintiffs are entitled to recover from defendants their unpaid compensation, liquidated damages, interest, reasonable attorneys' fees, and costs and disbursements of the action, pursuant to New York Labor Law § 198, and § 663(1).

COUNT II

(Fair Labor Standards Act - Overtime)

- 60. Plaintiffs, on behalf of themselves and all Collective Action Members, repeat, reallege, and incorporate by reference the foregoing allegations as if set forth fully and again herein.
- 61. At all relevant times, defendants employed plaintiffs and each of the Collective Action Members within the meaning of the FLSA.
- 62. At all relevant times, defendants had a policy and practice of refusing to pay overtime compensation to their employees for hours they worked in excess of forty hours per workweek.
- 63. As a result of defendants' willful failure to compensate their employees, including plaintiffs and the Collective Action Members, at a rate at least one-and-one-half times the regular rate of pay for work performed in excess of forty hours per workweek, defendants have violated,

and continue to violate, the FLSA, 29 U.S.C. §§ 201 et seq., including 29 U.S.C. §§ 207(a)(1) and 215(a).

- 64. The foregoing conduct, as alleged, constituted a willful violation of the FLSA within the meaning of 29 U.S.C. \$ 255(a), and lacked a good faith basis within the meaning of 29 U.S.C. \$ 260.
- 65. Due to defendants' FLSA violations, plaintiffs and the Collective Action Members are entitled to recover from defendants their unpaid overtime compensation, liquidated damages, interest, reasonable attorneys' fees, and costs and disbursements of this action, pursuant to 29 U.S.C. § 216(b).

COUNT III

(New York Labor Law - Overtime)

- 66. Plaintiffs repeat, reallege, and incorporate by reference the foregoing allegations as if set forth fully and again herein.
- 67. At all relevant times, plaintiffs were employed by defendants within the meaning of the New York Labor Law, §§ 2 and 651.
- 68. Defendants willfully violated plaintiffs' rights by failing to pay them overtime compensation at rates at least one-and-one-half times the regular rate of pay for each hour worked in excess of forty hours per workweek in violation of

the New York Labor Law §§ 650 et seq. and its supporting regulations in 12 N.Y.C.R.R. § 146.

- 69. Defendants' failure to pay overtime was willful, and lacked a good faith basis, within the meaning of New York Labor Law § 198, § 663 and supporting regulations.
- 70. Due to defendants' New York Labor Law violations, plaintiffs are entitled to recover from defendants their unpaid overtime compensation, liquidated damages, interest, reasonable attorneys' fees, and costs and disbursements of the action, pursuant to New York Labor Law § 198, and § 663(1).

COUNT IV

(New York Labor Law - Wage Theft Prevention Act)

- 71. Plaintiffs repeat, reallege, and incorporate by reference the foregoing allegations as if set forth fully and again herein.
- 72. At all relevant times, plaintiffs were employed by defendants within the meaning of the New York Labor Law, §§ 2 and 651.
- 73. Defendants willfully violated plaintiffs' rights by failing to provide them with the wage notice required by the Wage Theft Prevention Act when they were hired, or at any time thereafter.

- 74. Defendants willfully violated plaintiffs' rights by failing to provide them with weekly wage statements required by the Wage Theft Prevention Act at any time during their employment.
- 75. Due to defendants' New York Labor Law violations relating to the failure to provide paystubs, plaintiffs are entitled to recover from the defendants statutory damages of \$250 per day throughout their employment, up to the maximum statutory damages.
- 76. Due to defendants' New York Labor Law violations relating to the failure to provide wage notices, plaintiffs are entitled to recover from the defendants statutory damages of \$50 per day throughout their employment, up to the maximum statutory damages.

COUNT V

(New York Labor Law - Failure to Pay Wages)

- 77. Plaintiffs repeat, reallege, and incorporate by reference the foregoing allegations as if set forth fully and again herein.
- 78. At all relevant times, plaintiffs were employed by defendants within the meaning of the New York Labor Law, §§ 2 and 651.

- 79. Defendants violated plaintiffs' rights by failing to pay them their full wages earned, in violation of, inter alia, New York Labor Law § 191.
- 80. Defendants' failure to pay all wages owed was willful, and lacked a good faith basis, within the meaning of New York Labor Law § 198, § 663 and supporting regulations.
- 81. Due to defendants' New York Labor Law violations, plaintiffs are entitled to recover from defendants liquidated damages, interest, reasonable attorneys' fees, and costs and disbursements of the action, pursuant to New York Labor Law § 198, and § 663(1).

PRAYER FOR RELIEF

WHEREFORE, plaintiffs respectfully request that this Court grant the following relief:

a. Designation of this action as a collective action on behalf of the Collective Action Members and prompt issuance of notice pursuant to 29 U.S.C. § 216(b) to all similarly situated members of an FLSA Opt-In Class, apprising them of the pendency of this action, permitting them to assert timely FLSA claims in this action by filing individual Consents to Sue pursuant to 29 U.S.C. § 216(b),

- and appointing plaintiffs and their counsel to represent the Collective Action members;
- b. A declaratory judgment that the practices complained of herein are unlawful under the FLSA and the New York Labor Law;
- c. An injunction against defendants and their officers, agents, successors, employees, representatives, and any and all persons acting in concert with them, as provided by law, from engaging in each of the unlawful practices, policies, and patterns set forth herein;
- d. A compensatory award of unpaid compensation, at the statutory overtime rate, due under the FLSA and the New York Labor Law;
- e. An award of liquidated damages as a result of defendants' willful failure to pay overtime compensation pursuant to 29 U.S.C. § 216;
- f. Compensatory damages for failure to pay the minimum wage pursuant to the New York Labor Law;
- g. Compensatory damages for failure to pay all wages due pursuant to the New York Labor Law.

- h. Liquidated damages for defendants' New York Labor
 Law violations;
- i. Statutory damages for defendants' violation of the New York Wage Theft Prevention Act;
- j. Back pay;
- k. Punitive damages;
- 1. An award of prejudgment and postjudgment interest;
- m. An award of costs and expenses of this action together with reasonable attorneys' and expert fees; and
- n. Such other, further, and different relief as this

 Court deems just and proper.

Dated: May 4, 2018

Don'd Choin

David Stein
SAMUEL & STEIN
38 West 32nd Street
Suite 1110
New York, New York 10001
(212) 563-9884
Attorneys for Plaintiffs,
Individually and on behalf of an
FLSA collective action

EXHIBIT A

CONSENT TO SUE

By my signature below, I hereby authorize the filing and prosecution of claims in my name and on my behalf to contest the failure of Golden Dolphin Diner and its owners and affiliates to pay me, *inter alia*, minimum wage and overtime wages as required under state and/or federal law and also authorize the filing of this consent in the lawsuit challenging such conduct, and consent to being named as a representative plaintiff in this action to make decisions on behalf of all other plaintiffs concerning all aspects of this lawsuit. I have been provided with a copy of a retainer agreement with the law firm of Samuel & Stein, and I agree to be bound by its terms.

Con mi firma abajo, autorizo la presentación y tramitación de reclamaciones en mi nombre y de mi parte para impugnar el fallo de Golden Dolphin Diner y sus propietarios y afiliados a me pagan, entre otras cosas, el salario mínimo y pago de horas extras, requerida en el estado y / o la ley federal y también autorizan la presentación de este consentimiento en la demanda contra ese tipo de conducta, y el consentimiento para ser nombrado como demandante representante en esta acción para tomar decisiones en nombre de todos los demás demandantes en relación con todos aspectos de esta demanda. Se me ha proporcionado una copia de un acuerdo de retención con la firma de abogados de Samuel y Stein, y estoy de acuerdo en estar obligado por sus términos..

Julio Antonio Valle

Date: April 26, 2018

CONSENT TO SUE

By my signature below, I hereby authorize the filing and prosecution of claims in my name and on my behalf to contest the failure of Golden Dolphin Diner and its owners and affiliates to pay me, *inter alia*, minimum wage and overtime wages as required under state and/or federal law and also authorize the filing of this consent in the lawsuit challenging such conduct, and consent to being named as a representative plaintiff in this action to make decisions on behalf of all other plaintiffs concerning all aspects of this lawsuit. I have been provided with a copy of a retainer agreement with the law firm of Samuel & Stein, and I agree to be bound by its terms.

Con mi firma abajo, autorizo la presentación y tramitación de reclamaciones en mi nombre y de mi parte para impugnar el fallo de Golden Dolphin Diner y sus propietarios y afiliados a me pagan, entre otras cosas, el salario mínimo y pago de horas extras, requerida en el estado y / o la ley federal y también autorizan la presentación de este consentimiento en la demanda contra ese tipo de conducta, y el consentimiento para ser nombrado como demandante representante en esta acción para tomar decisiones en nombre de todos los demás demandantes en relación con todos aspectos de esta demanda. Se me ha proporcionado una copia de un acuerdo de retención con la firma de abogados de Samuel y Stein, y estoy de acuerdo en estar obligado por sus términos..

Hugo Lopez

Date: May 3, 2018

JS 44 (Rev. 01/29/2018)

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				DEFENDANTS					
Julio Antonio Valle and Hugo Lopez, on behalf of themselves and a other persons similarly situated (b) County of Residence of First Listed Plaintiff (EXCEPT IN U.S. PLAINTIFF CASES)				Dolphin Diner Corp. d/b/a Golden Dolphin Diner, Spiros Dimas, Baftji Dimas, and Peter Tsadilis County of Residence of First Listed Defendant Suffolk County, NY (IN U.S. PLAINTIFF CASES ONLY) NOTE: IN LAND CONDEMNATION CASES, USE THE LOCATION OF THE TRACT OF LAND INVOLVED.					
(c) Attorneys (Firm Name,	Address, and Telephone Numbe	er)		Attorneys (If Known)					
Samuel & Stein / 38 We NY 10001 / (212) 563-	est 32nd Street, Suite								
II. BASIS OF JURISD	ICTION (Place an "X" in C	One Box Only)		TIZENSHIP OF P	RINCIPA	L PARTIES			
☐ 1 U.S. Government Plaintiff	■ 3 Federal Question (U.S. Government)	Not a Party)			TF DEF	Incorporated or Pri		for Defende PTF 4	ant) DEF 4
2 U.S. Government Defendant	☐ 4 Diversity (Indicate Citizensh	ip of Parties in Item III)				Incorporated and P of Business In A		5	5
				en or Subject of a reign Country	3 🗆 3	Foreign Nation		1 6	6
IV. NATURE OF SUIT			l no			here for: Nature of			
CONTRACT 110 Insurance 120 Marine 130 Miller Act 140 Negotiable Instrument 150 Recovery of Overpayment & Enforcement of Judgment 151 Medicare Act 152 Recovery of Defaulted Student Loans (Excludes Veterans) 153 Recovery of Overpayment of Veteran's Benefits 160 Stockholders' Suits 190 Other Contract 195 Contract Product Liability 196 Franchise REAL PROPERTY 210 Land Condemnation 220 Forcelosure 230 Rent Lease & Ejectment 240 Torts to Land 245 Tort Product Liability 290 All Other Real Property	PERSONAL INJURY 310 Airplane 315 Airplane Product Liability 320 Assault, Libel & Slander 330 Federal Employers' Liability 340 Marine 345 Marine Product Liability 350 Motor Vehicle 355 Motor Vehicle 70 Story Vehicle 10 Story Vehicle 11 Jury 12 Medical Malpractice CIVIL RIGHTS 1440 Other Civil Rights 1441 Voting 1442 Employment 1443 Housing/ Accommodations 1445 Amer. w/Disabilities - Employment 1446 Amer. w/Disabilities - Other 1448 Education	Other:	X	DRFEITURE/PENALTY 5 Drug Related Seizure of Property 21 USC 881 0 Other LABOR 0 Fair Labor Standards Act 0 Labor/Management Relations 0 Railway Labor Act 1 Family and Medical Leave Act 0 Other Labor Litigation 1 Employee Retirement Income Security Act IMMIGRATION 2 Naturalization Application 5 Other Immigration Actions	422 Appe	SC 157 RTY RIGHTS rights t - Abbreviated Drug Application mark SECURITY (1395ff) Lung (923) C/DIWW (405(g)) Title XVI 405(g)) LTAX SUITS (U.S. Plaintiff efendant)	□ 375 False Cl □ 376 Qui Tar 3729(a) □ 400 State Re □ 410 Antitrus □ 430 Banks a □ 450 Comme □ 460 Deporta □ 470 Rackete Corrupt □ 480 Consum □ 490 Cable/S □ 850 Securiti Exchan □ 890 Other St □ 891 Agricult □ 893 Environ □ 895 Freedon Act □ 896 Arbitrat □ 899 Adminis Act/Rev	m (31 USC) (31 USC) (32 capportionration of the capportion of th	ment g ced and cons dities/ cetions ters nation
	noved from 3	Appellate Court	J 4 Reins Reop	ened Anothe (specify)	r District	☐ 6 Multidistri Litigation Transfer	-	Multidis Litigation Direct Fil	n -
VI. CAUSE OF ACTIO	29 11 5 C 8 201	et seq.	e filing (D	o not cite jurisdictional stat.	utes unless div	ersity):			
VII. REQUESTED IN COMPLAINT:	☐ CHECK IF THIS UNDER RULE 2:	IS A CLASS ACTION 3, F.R.Cv.P.	DE	EMAND \$		HECK YES only i	f demanded in Yes	complair No	ıt:
VIII. RELATED CASE IF ANY		JUDGE /	1			ΓNUMBER			
DATE 05/04/2018 FOR OFFICE USE ONLY		SIGNATURE OF A T	ORNEY	erecord Zen					
RECEIPT # AM	OUNT	APPLYING IFP		JUDGE		MAG. JUDO	GE		

CERTIFICATION OF ARBITRATION ELIGIBILITY

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

, David S			do hereby certify that the above captioned civil action
is ineligi	ble for compulsory arbitration for the following reason(s):		
ŀ	monetary damages sought are in excess of \$150,000,	exclusive of interest an	d costs,
Ľ	the complaint seeks injunctive relief,		
L	the matter is otherwise ineligible for the following reason	n	
	DISCLOSURE STATEMENT - FE	DERAL RULES	CIVIL PROCEDURE 7.1
	Identify any parent corporation and any public	ly held corporation that	owns 10% or more or its stocks:
None			
	RELATED CASE STATEMENT (Section VIII on t	he Front of this Form)
	RELATED CASE STATEMENT	Section vin on t	ne Front of this Form
o another substantial leemed "re Presumpti	all cases that are arguably related pursuant to Division of Business Rule 50 civil case for purposes of this guideline when, because of the similarity of fa saving of judicial resources is likely to result from assigning both cases to telated to another civil case merely because the civil case: (A) involves iden vely, and subject to the power of a judge to determine otherwise pursuant to fore the court."	cts and legal issues or bed he same judge and magist tical legal issues, or (B) inv	rause the cases arise from the same transactions or events, a rate judge." Rule 50.3.1 (b) provides that " A civil case shall not be rolves the same parties." Rule 50.3.1 (c) further provides that
	NY-E DIVISION OF I	BUSINESS RULE	50.1(d)(2)
l.)	Is the civil action being filed in the Eastern District re County? Yes No	moved from a New	V York State Court located in Nassau or Suffolk
2.)	If you answered "no" above: a) Did the events or omissions giving rise to the clair County? Yes No	n or claims, or a su	ıbstantial part thereof, occur in Nassau or Suffolk
	b) Did the events or omissions giving rise to the clair District? Yes No	n or claims, or a su	obstantial part thereof, occur in the Eastern
	c) If this is a Fair Debt Collection Practice Act case, specireceived:	fy the County in wh	ich the offending communication was
f your ar Suffolk C Suffolk C	nswer to question 2 (b) is "No," does the defendant (or a ma county, or, in an interpleader action, does the claimant (or a county?	ajority of the defenda majority of the claim	nts, if there is more than one) reside in Nassau or nants, if there is more than one) reside in Nassau or
outlone C	(Note: A corporation shall be considered a resident of the	County in which it ha	s the most significant contacts).
	<u>B</u>	AR ADMISSION	
	I am currently admitted in the Eastern District of New York	and currently a mem	ber in good standing of the bar of this court.
	✓ Yes		No
	Are you currently the subject of any disciplinary actio	n (s) in this or any	other state or federal court?
	Yes (If yes, pleas	e explain 🔽	No
	I certify the accuracy of all information provided abov	e.	
	Simplime 1 / 1/1/		

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

for the

Eastern Distric	et of New York
Julio Antonio Valle and Hugo Lopez, on behalf of themselves and all other persons similarly situated Plaintiff(s) V. Dolphin Diner Corp. d/b/a Golden Dolphin Diner, Spiros Dimas, Baftjie Dimas, and Peter Tsadilis Defendant(s)))))) Civil Action No. 18-cv-2735)))
SUMMONS IN	A CIVIL ACTION
To: (Defendant's name and address) Dolphin Diner Corp. d/b/a 365 Main Street Huntington, New York 117	·
are the United States or a United States agency, or an office	
If you fail to respond, judgment by default will be You also must file your answer or motion with the court.	entered against you for the relief demanded in the complaint.
	DOUGLAS C. PALMER CLERK OF COURT
Date:	Signature of Clerk or Deputy Clerk

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

Civil Action No. 18-cv-2735

PROOF OF SERVICE

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

		ne of individual and title, if any)			
was re	ceived by me on (date)	·			
	☐ I personally served	the summons on the individual	at (place)		
			on (date)		
	☐ I left the summons	at the individual's residence or	usual place of abode with (name)		
		, a perso	on of suitable age and discretion who res	sides the	ere,
	on (date)	, and mailed a copy to	the individual's last known address; or		
	☐ I served the summo	ons on (name of individual)			, who is
	designated by law to a	accept service of process on beh			
			on (date)	; or	
	☐ I returned the sumn	nons unexecuted because			; or
	☐ Other (specify):				
	My fees are \$	for travel and \$	for services, for a total of \$		0
	I declare under penalty	y of perjury that this information	is true.		
Date:					
2			Server's signature		
			Printed name and title		
			Server's address		

Additional information regarding attempted service, etc:

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

for the

Eastern Distri	ict of New York
Julio Antonio Valle and Hugo Lopez, on behalf of themselves and all other persons similarly situated Plaintiff(s) V. Dolphin Diner Corp. d/b/a Golden Dolphin Diner, Spiros Dimas, Baftjie Dimas, and Peter Tsadilis Defendant(s))))) Civil Action No. 18-cv-2735)))
SUMMONS IN	N A CIVIL ACTION
To: (Defendant's name and address) Spiros Dimas One Dorset Lane Bethpage, New York 117	714
are the United States or a United States agency, or an offi	you (not counting the day you received it) — or 60 days if you feer or employee of the United States described in Fed. R. Civ. asswer to the attached complaint or a motion under Rule 12 of ion must be served on the plaintiff or plaintiff's attorney,
David Stein, Esq. Samuel & Stein 38 West 32nd Street, Suite New York, NY 10001	e 1110
If you fail to respond, judgment by default will be You also must file your answer or motion with the court.	e entered against you for the relief demanded in the complaint.
	DOUGLAS C. PALMER CLERK OF COURT
Date:	Signature of Clerk or Deputy Clerk

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

Civil Action No. 18-cv-2735

PROOF OF SERVICE

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

***********		ame of individual and title, if an	ny)		
was re	ceived by me on (date)	-	·		
	☐ I personally serve	ed the summons on the ind	ividual at (place)		
			on (date)	; or	
	☐ I left the summon	s at the individual's reside	ence or usual place of abode with (name)		
		,	a person of suitable age and discretion who res	ides ther	·e,
	on (date)	, and mailed a	copy to the individual's last known address; or		
	☐ I served the sumn	nons on (name of individual)			, who is
	designated by law to	accept service of process	s on behalf of (name of organization)		
			on (date)	; or	
	☐ I returned the sum	nmons unexecuted because	e		; or
	☐ Other (specify):				
	My fees are \$	for travel and \$	for services, for a total of \$	() .
	I declare under penal	lty of perjury that this info	ormation is true.		
Date:					
		-	Server's signature		
		_	Printed name and title		
		_	Server's address		

Additional information regarding attempted service, etc:

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

for the

Eastern Distri	ict of New York
Julio Antonio Valle and Hugo Lopez, on behalf of themselves and all other persons similarly situated Plaintiff(s) V. Dolphin Diner Corp. d/b/a Golden Dolphin Diner, Spiros Dimas, Baftjie Dimas, and Peter Tsadilis Defendant(s))))) Civil Action No. 18-cv-2735)))
SUMMONS IN	N A CIVIL ACTION
To: (Defendant's name and address) Baftjie Dimas One Dorset Lane Bethpage, New York 117	714
are the United States or a United States agency, or an offi P. 12 (a)(2) or (3) — you must serve on the plaintiff an ar the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure. The answer or mot	you (not counting the day you received it) — or 60 days if you cer or employee of the United States described in Fed. R. Civ. nswer to the attached complaint or a motion under Rule 12 of ion must be served on the plaintiff or plaintiff's attorney,
whose name and address are:	
David Stein, Esq. Samuel & Stein 38 West 32nd Street, Suite New York, NY 10001	e 1110
If you fail to respond, judgment by default will be You also must file your answer or motion with the court.	e entered against you for the relief demanded in the complaint.
	DOUGLAS C. PALMER CLERK OF COURT
Date:	Signature of Clerk or Deputy Clerk

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

Civil Action No. 18-cv-2735

PROOF OF SERVICE

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

	This summons for (name	e of individual and title, if any)				
was red	ceived by me on (date)					
	☐ I personally served t	he summons on the individua	al at (place)			
			on (date)	; or		
	☐ I left the summons at the individual's residence or usual place of abode with (name)					
			son of suitable age and discretion who res	sides there,		
	on (date)	, and mailed a copy	to the individual's last known address; or			
	☐ I served the summon			,	who is	
	designated by law to a	ccept service of process on b	ehalf of (name of organization)			
			on (date)	; or		
	☐ I returned the summ	ons unexecuted because			; or	
	☐ Other (specify):					
	My fees are \$	for travel and \$	for services, for a total of \$	0		
	I declare under penalty	of perjury that this informati	on is true.			
Date:						
			Server's signature			
			Printed name and title			
			Server's address			

Additional information regarding attempted service, etc:

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

for the

Eastern Distri	ct of New York
Julio Antonio Valle and Hugo Lopez, on behalf of themselves and all other persons similarly situated Plaintiff(s) V. Dolphin Diner Corp. d/b/a Golden Dolphin Diner, Spiros Dimas, Baftjie Dimas, and Peter Tsadilis Defendant(s)))))) Civil Action No. 18-cv-2735)))
SUMMONS IN	N A CIVIL ACTION
To: (Defendant's name and address) Peter Tsadilis 20 Southwoods Rd Syosset, New York 1179	1
are the United States or a United States agency, or an office	you (not counting the day you received it) — or 60 days if you cer or employee of the United States described in Fed. R. Civ. aswer to the attached complaint or a motion under Rule 12 of ion must be served on the plaintiff or plaintiff's attorney,
Samuel & Stein 38 West 32nd Street, Suite New York, NY 10001	e 1110
If you fail to respond, judgment by default will be You also must file your answer or motion with the court.	e entered against you for the relief demanded in the complaint.
	DOUGLAS C. PALMER CLERK OF COURT
Date:	Signature of Clerk or Deputy Clerk

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

Civil Action No. 18-cv-2735

PROOF OF SERVICE

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

		ne of individual and title, if any)			
was re	ceived by me on (date)	·			
	☐ I personally served	the summons on the individual	at (place)		
			on (date)		
	☐ I left the summons	at the individual's residence or	usual place of abode with (name)		
		, a perso	on of suitable age and discretion who res	sides the	ere,
	on (date)	, and mailed a copy to	the individual's last known address; or		
	☐ I served the summo	ons on (name of individual)			, who is
	designated by law to a	accept service of process on beh			
			on (date)	; or	
	☐ I returned the sumn	nons unexecuted because			; or
	☐ Other (specify):				
	My fees are \$	for travel and \$	for services, for a total of \$		0
	I declare under penalty	y of perjury that this information	is true.		
Date:					
2			Server's signature		
			Printed name and title		
			Server's address		

Additional information regarding attempted service, etc:

ClassAction.org

This complaint is part of ClassAction.org's searchable class action lawsuit database and can be found in this post: Golden Dolphin Diner Accused of Failing to Pay Wages