

MICHAEL FAILLACE & ASSOCIATES, P.C.  
Michael Faillace [MF-8436]  
60 East 42nd Street, Suite 2540  
New York, New York 10165  
(212) 317-1200  
*Attorneys for Plaintiff*

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

-----X  
ANGEL BASURTO, *individually and on behalf  
of others similarly situated,*

*Plaintiff,*

-against-

RUCHI INDIAN CUISINE INC. (d/b/a RUCHI),  
ASSIS GOES, SHAMIR DEB, SUMI DOE and  
BACHU DOE

*Defendants.*

-----X

Plaintiff Angel Basurto (“Plaintiff Basurto” or “Mr. Basurto”), individually and on behalf of others similarly situated, by and through his attorneys, Michael Faillace & Associates, P.C., upon information and belief, and as against each of Defendants Ruchi Indian Cuisine Inc. (d/b/a Ruchi ) (“Defendant Corporation”) Assis Goes, Shamir Deb, Sumi Doe and Bachu Doe (collectively, “Defendants”), alleges as follows:

**NATURE OF ACTION**

1. Plaintiff Basurto is a former employee of Defendants Ruchi Indian Cuisine Inc. (d/b/a Ruchi) Assis Goes, Shamir Deb, Sumi Doe and Bachu Doe.
2. Ruchi is an Indian restaurant owned by Assis Goes, Shamir Deb, Sumi Doe and Bachu Doe located at 120 Cedar Street #2, New York, New York 10006.

3. Upon information and belief, Defendants Assis Goes, Shamir Deb, Sumi Doe and Bachu Doe serve or served as owners, managers, principals and/or agents of Defendant Corporation, and through this corporate entity operate the Indian restaurant.

4. Plaintiff Basurto is a former employee of Defendants.

5. Plaintiff Basurto was ostensibly employed as a delivery worker, but he was required to spend several hours each day performing non-tipped duties unrelated to deliveries, including but not limited to dishwashing, sweeping, mopping, stocking deliveries, twisting and tying up cardboard boxes, taking out the garbage, buying items at the supermarket, cleaning windows, walls, the door and the bathrooms, bringing up items from the basement for the cooks in the kitchen, refilling bottles with sauce, and bringing in the restaurant sign at night (hereinafter, “non-delivery, non-tip duties”).

6. Plaintiff Basurto regularly worked for Defendants in excess of 40 hours per week without appropriate minimum wage or overtime compensation for any of the hours that he worked.

7. Rather, Defendants failed to maintain accurate recordkeeping of his hours worked and failed to pay Plaintiff Basurto appropriately for any hours worked, either at the straight rate of pay or for any additional overtime premium.

8. Further, Defendants failed to pay Plaintiff Basurto the required “spread of hours” pay for any day in which he had to work over 10 hours a day.

9. Defendants employed and accounted for Plaintiff Basurto as a delivery worker in their payroll, but in actuality his duties included greater or equal time spent performing the non-delivery, non-tipped duties alleged above.

10. At all times, regardless of duties, Defendants paid Plaintiff Basurto and all other delivery workers at a rate that was lower than the required tip-credit rate.

11. In addition, under both the FLSA and NYLL, Defendants were not entitled to take a tip credit because Plaintiff Basurto's non-tipped duties exceeded 20% of each workday, or 2 hours per day (whichever was less in each day) (12 N.Y.C.R.R. § 146).

12. Upon information and belief, Defendants employed the policy and practice of disguising Plaintiff Basurto's actual duties in payroll records to avoid paying Plaintiff Basurto at the minimum wage rate, and to enable them to pay Plaintiff Basurto at the lower tip-credited rate (which they still failed to do), by designating him as a delivery worker instead of a non-tipped employee.

13. In addition, Defendants maintained a policy and practice of unlawfully appropriating a percentage of Plaintiff Basurto's tips.

14. Defendants' conduct extended beyond Plaintiff Basurto to all other similarly situated employees.

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

16. Plaintiff Basurto now brings this action on behalf of himself, and other similarly situated individuals, for unpaid overtime wages pursuant to the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, 29 U.S.C. § 201 *et seq.* ("FLSA"), the New York Labor Law ("NYLL") §§190 and 650 *et seq.*, and "overtime wage order" respectively codified at N.Y.C.R.R. Tit. 12 §§ 142-2.2, 2.4), and

the “spread of hours” and overtime wage orders of the New York Commissioner of Labor codified at N.Y. COMP. CODES R. & REGS. tit. 12, § 146-1.6 (herein the “Spread of Hours Wage Order”), including applicable liquidated damages, interest, attorneys’ fees, and costs.

17. Plaintiff Basurto 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**

18. This Court has subject matter jurisdiction pursuant to 29 U.S.C. § 216(b) (FLSA), 28 U.S.C. § 1531 (interstate commerce) and 28 U.S.C. § 1331 (federal question). Supplemental jurisdiction over Plaintiff Basurto’s state law claims is conferred by 28 U.S.C. § 1367(a).

19. Venue is proper in this district under 28 U.S.C. § 391(b) and (c) because all or a substantial part of the events or omissions giving rise to the claims occurred in this district, Defendants operate their businesses in this district, and Plaintiff Basurto was employed by Defendants in this district.

### **PARTIES**

#### *Plaintiff*

20. Plaintiff Angel Basurto (“Plaintiff Basurto” or “Mr. Basurto”) is an adult individual residing in New York County, New York.

21. Plaintiff Basurto was employed by Defendants from approximately February 2014 until on or about October 21, 2016.

22. Pursuant to 29 U.S.C. § 216(b), Plaintiff Basurto consents to being a party 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*

23. At all times relevant to this Complaint, Defendants own, operate, and/or control an Indian restaurant located at 120 Cedar Street #2, New York, New York 10006 under the name “Ruchi”.

24. Upon information and belief, Ruchi Indian Cuisine Inc. (“Defendant Corporation”) is a 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 120 Cedar Street #2, New York, New York 10006.

25. Defendant Assis Goes is an individual engaging (or who was engaged) in business within this judicial district during the relevant time period. Defendant Assis Goes is sued individually and in his capacity as an owner, officer and/or agent of Defendant Corporation.

26. Defendant Assis Goes possesses or possessed operational control over Defendant Corporation, an ownership interest in Defendant Corporation and/or controlled significant functions of Defendant Corporation.

27. Defendant Assis Goes determined the wages and compensation of the employees of Defendants, including Plaintiff Basurto, established the schedules of the employees, maintained employee records and had the authority to hire and fire employees.

28. Defendant Shamir Deb is an individual engaging (or who was engaged) in business within this judicial district during the relevant time period. Defendant Shamir Deb is sued individually and in his capacity as an owner, officer and/or agent of Defendant Corporation.

29. Defendant Shamir Deb possesses or possessed operational control over Defendant Corporation, an ownership interest in Defendant Corporation and/or controlled significant functions of Defendant Corporation.

30. Defendant Shamir Deb determined the wages and compensation of the employees of Defendants, including Plaintiff Basurto, established the schedules of the employees, maintained employee records and had the authority to hire and fire employees.

31. Defendant Sumi Doe is an individual engaging (or who was engaged) in business within this judicial district during the relevant time period. Defendant Sumi Doe is sued individually and in his capacity as an owner, officer and/or agent of Defendant Corporation.

32. Defendant Sumi Doe possesses or possessed operational control over Defendant Corporation, an ownership interest in Defendant Corporation and/or controlled significant functions of Defendant Corporation.

33. Defendant Sumi Doe determined the wages and compensation of the employees of Defendants, including Plaintiff Basurto, established the schedules of the employees, maintained employee records and had the authority to hire and fire employees.

34. Defendant Bachu Doe is an individual engaging (or who was engaged) in business within this judicial district during the relevant time period. Defendant Bachu Doe is sued individually and in his capacity as an owner, officer and/or agent of Defendant Corporation.

35. Defendant Bachu Doe possesses or possessed operational control over Defendant Corporation, an ownership interest in Defendant Corporation and/or controlled significant functions of Defendant Corporation.

36. Defendant Bachu Doe determined the wages and compensation of the employees of Defendants, including Plaintiff Basurto, established the schedules of the employees, maintained employee records and had the authority to hire and fire employees.

**FACTUAL ALLEGATIONS**

*Defendants Constitute Joint Employers*

37. Defendants operate an Indian restaurant located at 120 Cedar Street #2, New York, New York 10006.

38. Individual Defendants Assis Goes, Shamir Deb, Sumi Doe and Bachu Doe possess operational control over Defendant Corporation, possess an ownership interest in Defendant Corporation, and control significant functions of Defendant Corporation.

39. 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.

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

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

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

43. Upon information and belief, individual Defendants Assis Goes, Shamir Deb, Sumi Doe and Bachu Doe operate Defendant Corporation as either an alter ego of themselves and/or fail to operate Defendant Corporation as a legal entity separate and apart from themselves by, among other things:

- (a) failing to adhere to the corporate formalities necessary to operate Defendant Corporation as a separate and legally distinct entity;
- (b) defectively forming or maintaining Defendant Corporation by, among 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 it as a closed corporation or closely controlled entity;
- (f) intermingling assets and debts of their own with Defendant Corporation;
- (g) diminishing and/or transferring assets of Defendant Corporation to protect their own interests; and



(h) other actions evincing a failure to adhere to the corporate form.

44. At all relevant times, Defendants were Plaintiff Basurto's employers within the meaning of the FLSA and NYLL.

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

46. In each year from 2014 to 2016, Defendants, both individually and jointly, had gross annual volume of sales of not less than \$500,000 (exclusive of excise taxes at the retail level that are separately stated).

47. In addition, upon information and belief, Defendants and/or their enterprises were directly engaged in interstate commerce. For example, numerous items that were sold in the Indian restaurant on a daily basis, such as steaks and plantains, were produced outside of the State of New York.

*Individual Plaintiff*

48. Plaintiff Basurto is a former employee of Defendants ostensibly employed as a delivery worker, but who spent more than 20% of the time he worked each day performing the non-delivery, non-tip duties outlined above.

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

*Plaintiff Angel Basurto*

50. Plaintiff Basurto was employed by Defendants from approximately February 2014 until on or about October 21, 2016.

51. At all relevant times, Plaintiff Basurto was ostensibly employed by Defendants as a delivery worker. However, Plaintiff Basurto spent more than 20% of each work day performing the non-delivery, non-tip duties outlined above.

52. Plaintiff Basurto regularly handled goods in interstate commerce, such as cleaning fluids and dishwashing detergents produced outside of the State of New York.

53. Plaintiff Basurto's work duties required neither discretion nor independent judgment.

54. From approximately February 2014 until on or about August 2015, Plaintiff Basurto worked from approximately 11:00 a.m. until on or about 11:00 p.m. Mondays through Saturdays and from approximately 5:00 p.m. until on or about 11:00 p.m. on Sundays (typically 78 hours per week).

55. From approximately August 2015 until on or about March 2016, Plaintiff Basurto worked from approximately 5:00 p.m. until on or about 11:00 p.m. Sundays through Fridays and from approximately 11:00 a.m. until on or about 11:00 p.m. on Saturdays (typically 48 hours per week).

56. From approximately March 2016 until on or about October 21, 2016, Plaintiff Basurto worked from approximately 5:00 p.m. until on or about 11:00 p.m. Sundays through Fridays (typically 36 hours per week).

57. Throughout his employment with Defendants, Plaintiff Basurto was paid his wages in cash.

58. From approximately February 2014 until on or about August 2015, defendants paid Plaintiff Basurto a fixed salary of \$400 per week.

59. From approximately August 2015 until on or about March 2016, defendants paid Plaintiff Basurto a fixed salary of \$35 per shift and \$70 for his Saturday Shift.

60. From approximately March 2016 until on or about October 21, 2016, defendants paid Plaintiff Basurto a fixed salary of \$35 per shift.

61. Defendants did not grant Plaintiff Basurto any break or meal periods of any length.

62. Plaintiff Basurto was never notified by Defendants that his tips would be included as an offset for wages.

63. Defendants did not account for these tips in any daily, weekly or other accounting of Plaintiff Basurto's wages.

64. Defendants withheld a portion of Plaintiff Basurto's tips.

65. Specifically, from approximately February 2014 until on or about August 2015, Defendants pocketed 10% of all tips customers wrote in for Plaintiff Basurto on all delivery orders he made.

66. Similarly, from approximately August 2015 until on or about October 21, 2016, Defendants pocketed 5% of all tips customers wrote in for Plaintiff Basurto on all delivery orders he made.

67. Defendants did not provide Plaintiff Basurto with an accurate statement of wages with each payment of wages, as required by NYLL 195(3).

68. Plaintiff Basurto was not required to keep track of his time, nor to his knowledge did the Defendants utilize any time tracking device, such as punch cards or sign in sheets, that accurately reflected his actual hours worked.

69. Instead, Defendants required Plaintiff Basurto to sign a document the contents of which he did not know, in order to get his weekly pay.

70. Defendants never provided Plaintiff Basurto with a written notice, in English and in Spanish (Plaintiff Basurto's primary language), of his rate of pay, employer's regular pay day, and such other information as required by NYLL §195(1).

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

72. Defendants required Plaintiff Basurto to purchase "tools of the trade" with his own funds—including two bicycles, two helmets, two sets of lights, a vest and a lock and chain set.

*Defendants' General Employment practices*

73. Defendants regularly required their employees, including Plaintiff Basurto, to work in excess of forty (40) hours per week without paying them the proper minimum wage, overtime, or Spread of Hours compensation.

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

75. As part of its regular business practice, Defendants intentionally, willfully, and repeatedly harmed Plaintiff Basurto by engaging in a pattern, practice, and/or policy of violating the FLSA and the NYLL. This policy and pattern or practice included depriving Plaintiff Basurto of a portion of the tips earned during the course of employment.

76. Defendants unlawfully misappropriated charges purported to be gratuities received by Plaintiff Basurto, and other tipped employees, in violation of New York Labor Law § 196-d (2007).

77. Under the FLSA and NYLL, in order to be eligible for a “tip credit,” employers of tipped employees must either allow employees to keep all the tips that they receive, or forgo the tip credit and pay them the full hourly minimum wage.

78. Defendants failed to inform Plaintiff Basurto that his tips would be credited towards the payment of the minimum wage.

79. At no time did Defendants inform their employees, including Plaintiff Basurto, that they had reduced their hourly wages by a tip allowance.

80. Defendants failed to maintain a record of tips earned by Plaintiff Basurto for the deliveries he made to customers.

81. Defendants required all delivery workers, including Plaintiff Basurto, to perform general non-delivery, non-tipped restaurant tasks in addition to their primary duties as delivery workers.

82. Plaintiff Basurto, and all similarly situated employees, were ostensibly employed as tipped employees by Defendants, although their actual duties included greater or equal time spent performing non-delivery, non-tipped duties.

83. Plaintiff Basurto and all other delivery workers were not even paid at the required lower tip-credit rate by Defendants. However, under state law, Defendants were not entitled to a tip credit because the delivery worker’s and Plaintiff Basurto’s non-tipped duties exceeded 20% of each workday (or 2 hours a day, whichever was less) (12 N.Y.C.R.R. § 146).

84. New York State regulations provide that an employee cannot be classified as a tipped employee on any day in which he has been assigned to work in an occupation in which tips are not customarily received. (12 N.Y.C.R.R. §§137-3.3 and 137-3.4). Similarly, under federal regulation 29 C.F.R. §531.56(e), an employer may not take a tip credit for any employee time if that time is devoted to a non-tipped occupation.

85. The delivery workers', including Plaintiff Basurto's , duties were not incidental to their occupation as delivery workers, but instead constituted entirely unrelated general restaurant work with duties, including the non-tipped duties described above.

86. In violation of federal and state law as codified above, Defendants classified Plaintiff Basurto and other delivery workers as tipped employees, but did not even pay them at the tip-credited rate when they should have classified them as non-tipped employees and paid them at the minimum wage rate.

87. Plaintiff Basurto was paid his wages entirely in cash.

88. Defendants willfully disregarded and purposefully evaded record keeping requirements of the Fair Labor Standards Act and New York Labor Law by failing to maintain accurate and complete timesheets and payroll records.

89. Instead, defendants required Plaintiff Basurto and all other similarly situated employees, to sign a document, the contents of which they were not allowed to read, in order to get their weekly check.

90. Upon information and belief, this was done to disguise the actual number of hours Plaintiff Basurto, and similarly situated employees, worked and to avoid paying them properly

for their (1) full hours worked, (2) minimum wage, (3) overtime wages, and (4) spread of hours pay.

91. Defendants failed to post required wage and hour posters in the restaurant, and did not provide their employees, including Plaintiff Basurto, with statutorily required wage and hour records or statements of their pay received, in part so as to hide Defendants' violations of the wage and hour laws, and to take advantage of their employees', including Plaintiff Basurto's, relative lack of sophistication in wage and hour laws.

92. Defendants failed to provide Plaintiff Basurto and other employees with wage statements at the time of each 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).

93. Defendants failed to provide Plaintiff Basurto 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**

94. Plaintiff Basurto 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 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 his case (the “FLSA Class Period”), as employees of Defendants (the “FLSA Class”).

95. At all relevant times, Plaintiff Basurto , and other members of the FLSA Class who are and/or have been similarly situated, had substantially similar job requirements and pay provisions, and were subject to Defendants’ common practices, policies, programs, procedures, protocols and plans of willfully failing and refusing to pay them the required minimum wage, overtime pay of one and one-half times his regular rates for work in excess of forty (40) hours per workweek under the FLSA, willfully taking improper wage deductions and other improper credits against the FLSA Class’ wages for which Defendants did not qualify under the FLSA, and willfully failing to keep records required by the FLSA.

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

**FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION**  
**VIOLATION OF THE FLSA MINIMUM WAGE PROVISIONS**

97. Plaintiff Basurto repeats and realleges all paragraphs above as though fully set forth herein.



98. At all times relevant to this action, Defendants were Plaintiff Basurto's employers (and employers of the putative FLSA Class members) within the meaning of the Fair Labor Standards Act. 29 U.S.C. § 203(d). Defendants had the power to hire and fire Plaintiff Basurto (and the FLSA class members), controlled the terms and conditions of employment, and determined the rate and method of any compensation in exchange for their employment.

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

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

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

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

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

**SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION**  
**VIOLATION OF THE FLSA OVERTIME PROVISIONS**

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

105. At all times relevant to this action, Defendants were Plaintiff Basurto's employers (and employers of the putative FLSA Class members) within the meaning of the Fair Labor Standards Act. 29 U.S.C. § 203(d). Defendants had the power to hire and fire Plaintiff Basurto

(and the FLSA class members), controlled the terms and conditions of employment, and determined the rate and method of any compensation in exchange for his employment.

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

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

108. Defendants, in violation of 29 U.S.C. § 207 (a)(1) of the FLSA, failed to pay Plaintiff Basurto (and the FLSA Class members) 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 workweek.

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

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

**THIRD CAUSE OF ACTION**  
**VIOLATION OF THE OVERTIME PROVISIONS OF THE**  
**NEW YORK STATE LABOR LAW**

111. Plaintiff Basurto repeats and realleges all paragraphs above as though fully set forth herein.

112. 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 Basurto 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 workweek.

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

114. Plaintiff Basurto was damaged in an amount to be determined at trial.

**FOURTH CAUSE OF ACTION**  
**VIOLATION OF THE NEW YORK MINIMUM WAGE RATE**

115. Plaintiff Basurto repeats and realleges all paragraphs above as though fully set forth herein.

116. At all times relevant to this action, Defendants were Plaintiff Basurto's employers within the meaning of the N.Y. Lab. Law §§ 2 and 651. Defendants had the power to hire and fire Plaintiff Basurto (and the FLSA Class members), controlled terms and conditions of employment, and determined the rates and methods of any compensation in exchange for employment.

117. Defendants, in violation of NYLL § 652(1) and the supporting regulations of the New York State Department of Labor, paid Plaintiff Basurto (and the FLSA Class members) less than the minimum wage.

118. Defendants' failure to pay Plaintiff Basurto (and the FLSA Class members) minimum wage was willful within the meaning of N.Y. Lab. Law § 663.

119. Plaintiff Basurto (and the FLSA Class Members) were damaged in an amount to be determined at trial.

**FIFTH CAUSE OF ACTION**  
**VIOLATION OF THE SPREAD OF HOURS WAGE ORDER**

**OF THE NEW YORK COMISSIONER OF LABOR**

120. Plaintiff Basurto repeats and realleges all paragraphs above as though fully set forth herein.

121. Defendants failed to pay Plaintiff Basurto one additional hour's pay at the basic minimum wage rate before allowances for each day Plaintiff Basurto's spread of hours exceeded ten hours in violation of NYLL §§ 190 *et seq.* and 650 *et seq.* and the wage order of the New York Commissioner of Labor codified at N.Y. COMP. CODES R. & REGS. Tit. 12, § 146-1.6.

122. Defendants' failure to pay Plaintiff Basurto an additional hour's pay for each day Plaintiff Basurto's spread of hours exceeded ten hours was willful within the meaning of NYLL § 663.

123. Plaintiff Basurto was damaged in an amount to be determined at trial.

**SIXTH CAUSE OF ACTION**  
**VIOLATION OF THE NOTICE AND RECORDKEEPING**  
**REQUIREMENTS OF THE NEW YORK LABOR LAW**

124. Plaintiff Basurto repeats and realleges all paragraphs above as though fully set forth herein.

125. Defendants failed to provide Plaintiff Basurto with a written notice, in English and in Spanish (Plaintiff Basurto's primary language), of his rate of pay, regular pay day, and such other information as required by NYLL §195(1).

126. Defendants are liable to Plaintiff Basurto in the amount of \$5,000, together with costs and attorney's fees.

**SEVENTH CAUSE OF ACTION**  
**VIOLATION OF THE WAGE STATEMENT PROVISIONS**  
**OF THE NEW YORK LABOR LAW**

127. Plaintiff Basurto repeats and realleges all paragraphs above as though set forth fully herein.

128. Defendants did not provide Plaintiff Basurto with a statement of wages with each payment of wages, as required by NYLL 195(3).

129. Defendants are liable to Plaintiff Basurto in the amount of \$5,000, together with costs and attorney's fees.

**EIGHTH CAUSE OF ACTION**  
**(RECOVERY OF EQUIPMENT COSTS)**

130. Plaintiff Basurto repeats and re-alleges all paragraphs above as though set forth fully herein.

131. Defendants required Plaintiff Basurto to pay, without reimbursement, the costs and expenses for purchasing and maintaining equipment and "tools of the trade" required to perform his job, such as bicycles, further reducing his wages in violation of the FLSA and NYLL. 29 U.S.C. § 206(a); 29 C.F.R. § 531.35; N.Y. Lab. Law §§ 193 and 198-b.

132. Plaintiff Basurto was damaged in an amount to be determined at trial.

**NINTH CAUSE OF ACTION**  
**(VIOLATION OF THE TIP WITHHOLDING PROVISIONS**  
**OF THE NEW YORK LABOR LAW)**

133. Plaintiff Basurto repeats and re-alleges all paragraphs above as though set forth fully herein.

134. Defendants unlawfully and without permission from Plaintiff Basurto misappropriated and withheld gratuities paid by customers which should have been retained by Plaintiff Basurto.

135. Defendants' action violated NYLL §196-d.

136. Defendants are liable to Plaintiff Basurto in an amount to be determined at trial.

**PRAYER FOR RELIEF**

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

(a) Designating this action as a collective action and authorizing prompt issuance of notice pursuant to 29 U.S.C. § 216(b) to all putative class members, apprising them of the pendency of this action, and permitting them promptly to 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 Basurto 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 Basurto and the FLSA class members;

(d) Declaring that Defendants violated the recordkeeping requirements of, and associated rules and regulations under, the FLSA with respect to Plaintiff Basurto's , and the FLSA class members', compensation, hours, wages, and any deductions or credits taken against wages;

(e) Declaring that Defendants' violation of the provisions of the FLSA were willful as to Plaintiff Basurto and the FLSA class members;

(f) Awarding Plaintiff Basurto and the FLSA class members damages for the amount of unpaid minimum and overtime wages, and damages for any improper deductions or credits

taken against wages under the FLSA, as applicable;

(g) Awarding Plaintiff Basurto and the FLSA class members liquidated damages in an amount equal to 100% of their damages for the amount of unpaid minimum and overtime wages, and damages for any improper deductions or credits taken against wages under the FLSA as applicable pursuant to 29 U.S.C. § 216(b);

(h) Declaring that Defendants violated the minimum wage provisions of, and rules and orders promulgated under, the NYLL as to Plaintiff Basurto and the members of the FLSA Class;

(i) Declaring that Defendants violated the overtime wage provisions of, and rules and orders promulgated under, the NYLL as to Plaintiff Basurto and the members of the FLSA Class;

(j) Declaring that Defendants violated the Spread of Hours Wage Order of the New York Commission of Labor as to Plaintiff Basurto and the members of the FLSA Class;

(k) Declaring that Defendants violated the recordkeeping requirements of the NYLL with respect to Plaintiff Basurto's , and the FLSA Class members', compensation, hours, wages; and any deductions or credits taken against wages;

(l) Declaring that Defendants' violations of the New York Labor Law were willful as to Plaintiff Basurto and the FLSA Class members;

(m) Awarding Plaintiff Basurto and the FLSA class members damages for the amount of unpaid minimum and overtime wages, spread of hours pay and damages for any improper deductions or credits taken against wages, under the NYLL as applicable;

(n) Awarding Plaintiff Basurto and the FLSA class members liquidated damages in





By: Michael A. Faillace [MF-8436]  
60 East 42nd Street, Suite 2540  
New York, New York 10165  
(212) 317-1200  
*Attorneys for Plaintiff*

# Michael Faillace & Associates, P.C.

Employment and Litigation Attorneys

60 E 42<sup>nd</sup> Street, Suite 2540  
New York, New York 10165

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

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

October 24, 2016

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: Angel Basurto

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

Signature / Firma: 

Date / Fecha: 24 de octubre de 2016

# ClassAction.org

This complaint is part of ClassAction.org's searchable class action lawsuit database and can be found in this post: [New York Indian Restaurant Hit with FLSA Case](#)

---