	Case 2:17-cv-04924 Document 1 F	iled 08/21/17 Page 1 of 18 PageID #: 1								
1 2	Ariadne Panagopoulou (AP-2202) Pardalis & Nohavicka, LLP 3510 Broadway, Suite 201									
3	Astoria, NY 11106 Telephone: (718) 777-0400									
4	Facsimile: (718) 777-0599 Attorneys for the Plaintiff									
5										
6	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT EASTERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK									
7	Ismael Antonio Hernandez Garcia, on behalf	)								
8	of himself and others similarly situated,	) Civil Case No.:								
9	Plaintiff,	)								
10	-V-	) <b>FLSA COLLECTIVE ACTION</b>								
11		) <u>COMPLAINT</u>								
12	Wantagh Bagels Inc., Wantagh Bagels, Ralph Facchini, and Peter Casella, <i>jointly</i>	) )								
13	and severally,	) )								
14	Defendants.	)								
15		)								
16	NATURE OF									
17		<u>THE ACTION</u>								
18	1. Plaintiff Ismael Antonio Herna	ndez Garcia ("Plaintiff"), on behalf of himself								
19	and others similarly situated, brings this action under the Fair Labor Standards Act ("FLSA"),									
20	29 U.S.C. §§ 201 et. seq. in order to remedy Defendants' wrongful withholding of Plaintiff's									
21	lawfully earned overtime compensation. Plaintiff also brings these claims under New York									
22										
23	Labor Law ("NYLL"), Article 6, §§ 190 et seq., as well as the supporting New York State									
24	Department of Labor Regulations for violations of overtime wages, spread-of hours pay, and									
25	the failure of the Defendants to provide wage st	tatements and wage notices.								
26										
27										

Case 2:17-cv-04924 Document 1 Filed 08/21/17 Page 2 of 18 PageID #: 2

 Plaintiff was employed by Defendants, Wantagh Bagels Inc., Wantagh Bagels, Ralph Facchini, and Peter Casella (collectively "Defendants"), from May 2010 to July 15, 2017 as a baker.

SUMMARY

3. During his period of employment from May 2010 to December 2016, Plaintiff was working six (6) days per week and approximately fifty-six (56) hours per week. During that time period, Plaintiff was compensated at the same hourly rate for all hours he worked and did not receive overtime wages for hours exceeding 40 hours per week.

4. Defendants engaged in their unlawful conduct pursuant to a corporate policy of minimizing labor costs and denying employees lawful compensation by knowingly violating the FLSA and NYLL.

5. As a result of Defendants' actions, Plaintiff has suffered great hardship and damages.

6. Defendants' conduct extended beyond the Plaintiff to all other similarly situated employees. Plaintiff seeks certification of this action as a collective action on behalf of herself individually and those other similarly situated employees and former employees of Defendants pursuant to 29 U.S.C. § 216(b).

### JURISDICTION AND VENUE

## Federal Question Jurisdiction and Supplemental Jurisdiction

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

#### **Personal Jurisdiction**

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

#### Venue

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

#### THE PARTIES Plaintiff

#### Ismael Antonio Hernandez Garcia

10. Plaintiff Ismael Antonio Hernandez Garcia ("Plaintiff") is an adult individual residing in the state of New York, County of Nassau.

Plaintiff is a covered employee within the meaning of the FLSA, 29 U.S.C. §
 203(e) and the NYLL § 190.

12. Plaintiff worked at Wantagh Bagels located at 3056 Merrick Road, Wantagh, New York, 11793.

13. Plaintiff was employed by Defendants, Wantagh Bagels Inc., Wantagh Bagels, Ralph Facchini, and Peter Casella for the majority of his employment period of May 2010 to July 15, 2017, and worked as a baker. His duties included but were not limited to, measuring the dough and other ingredients, mixing and kneading the dough, and baking the bagels.

14. Plaintiff regularly handled goods in interstate commerce during his employment

#### Case 2:17-cv-04924 Document 1 Filed 08/21/17 Page 4 of 18 PageID #: 4

with the Defendants, such as food, ingredients, tools, and machines imported from outside the State of New York.

15. During his employment, Plaintiff was also performing side tasks apart from his duties as a baker and was required to regularly carry in food supplies and purchased merchandise into the shop such as flour, water jugs, etc.

16. From May 2010 to December 2016, Plaintiff worked six (6) days per week, from Monday through Saturday. His hours from Monday to Friday were 8 a.m. to 5 p.m. and on Saturday from 8 a.m. to 6 or 7 p.m. On average, from May 2010 to December 2016, Plaintiff worked approximately fifty-six (56) hours per week. Plaintiff was allowed a meal break lasting 10 to 15 minutes each day.

17. In or around January 2017, the business changed owners, and limited the Plaintiff's schedule to less than 40 hours per week.

18. Defendants utilized a time clock system to keep track of Plaintiff's hours of work. For this time clock system, each employee was provided a PIN number and the employees would enter their PIN when they would clock in and clock out.

19. Plaintiff was compensated at the rate of Fifteen Dollars (\$15.00) per hour, regardless of the number of hours he worked.

20. During his employment from May 2010 to December 2016, Defendants repeatedly suffered or permitted Plaintiff to work over forty (40) hours per week without paying him the appropriate premium overtime pay of one and one-half times his regular rate of pay.

21. During his period of employment from May 2010 to December 2016,Defendants failed to pay Plaintiff spread-of-hours pay of one hour's pay at the minimum

hourly wage rate for each day during which Plaintiff worked a shift which exceeded ten (10) hours.

22. Plaintiff was not provided with a notice containing the rate and basis of his pay; the designated pay date; and the employer's name, address and telephone number at the time of hiring or at any point thereafter.

23. Plaintiff was never provided with wage statements or other records detailing, *inter alia*, Plaintiff's regular hourly rate of pay; the overtime rate of pay; the number of regular hours worked; and the number of overtime hours worked at any point during the time of his employment with Defendants.

24. Upon information and belief, while Defendants employed Plaintiff, they failed to post notices explaining the minimum wage rights of employees under the FLSA and NYLL and failed to inform Plaintiff of such rights.

25. Throughout his period of employment, Plaintiff did not have any supervisory authority over any of Defendants' employees, nor did he exercise discretion or independent judgment with respect to matters of significance.

26. Plaintiff consented in writing to be a party to the FLSA claims in this action, pursuant to 29 U.S.C. § 216(b).

27. Plaintiff has personal knowledge of other employees of Defendants who are similarly situated and who also worked hours for which they were not paid overtime wages and spread-of-hour pay.

#### Defendants

28. At all relevant times, Individual and Corporate Defendants were joint employers of Plaintiff, acted in the interest of each other with respect to Plaintiff's and other employees'

#### Case 2:17-cv-04924 Document 1 Filed 08/21/17 Page 6 of 18 PageID #: 6

remuneration, and had common policies and practices as to wages and hours, pursuant to 29 1 C.F.R. § 791.2. Factors indicating joint employment include: 2 3 Defendants all suffered or permitted Plaintiff to work. a. 4 b. Each of the Defendants acted directly or indirectly in the interest of one another 5 in relation to Plaintiff and similarly situated employees. 6 c. Defendants each have an economic interest in the location in which Plaintiff and 7 similarly situated employees worked. 8 9 d. Defendants all simultaneously benefitted from Plaintiff's work. 10 e. Defendants each had either functional and/or formal control over the terms and 11 conditions of work of Plaintiff and similarly situated employees. 12 f. Plaintiff and similarly situated employees performed work integral to the 13 14 Corporate Defendant's operation. 15 29. In the alternative, all Defendants functioned together as a single integrated 16 employer of Plaintiff within the meaning of the FLSA and NYLL. 17 30. The Corporate Defendants own and operate the business Wantagh Bagels, a sit-18 down deli and bakery engaged in the retail sale of food and beverage items. Defendant 19 20 Wantagh Bagels Inc. and Wantagh Bagels share the exact same business address and operate 21 from the same location. 22 **Corporate Defendants** 23 Wantagh Bagels Inc. 24 31. Wantagh Bagels Inc. is a domestic corporation organized and existing under the 25 26 laws of the State of New York with initial DOS filing date of April 26, 2010 and a principle 27 place of business located at 3056 Merrick Road, Wantagh, New York, 11793.

6

Case 2:17-cv-04924 Document 1 Filed 08/21/17 Page 7 of 18 PageID #: 7

32. Wantagh Bagels Inc. owns and operates Wantagh Bagels, a sit-down deli and bakery engaged in the retail sale of food and beverage items where customers sit down and order and then pay after consuming items.

33. Wantagh Bagels Inc. is open seven (7) days per week for several hours per day. It employs a handful of full-time and part-time personnel including bakers, cashiers and cleaning personnel.

34. At all relevant times, Wantagh Bagels Inc. was a covered employer within the meaning of the FLSA, 29 U.S.C. § 203(d) and the NYLL § 190.

35. At all relevant times, Wantagh Bagels Inc. maintained control, oversight, and direction over the Plaintiff, including timekeeping, payroll, and other employment practices that applied to him.

36. At all relevant times, Wantagh Bagels Inc. was "an enterprise engaged in commerce" within the meaning of the FLSA, 29 U.S.C. § 203(s)(1)(A) because its employees were handling food made from ingredients imported from out of state and distributed in New York. In addition, Wantagh Bagels conducted business with vendors and other businesses outside the State of New York and engaged in credit card transactions involving banks and other institutions outside the State of New York.

37. Upon information and belief, at all relevant times, Wantagh Bagels Inc.'s annual gross volume of sales made, or business done, was not less than \$500,000.00, exclusive of separate retail excise taxes, within the meaning of the FLSA, 29 U.S.C. § 203(s)(1)(a)(ii).

#### Wantagh Bagels

38. Wantagh Bagels is the trade name of a domestic corporation organized and existing under the laws of the State of New York. Its principal place of business is located at

3056 Merrick Road, Wantagh, New York, 11793.

39. Wantagh Bagels is a sit-down deli and bakery engaged in the retail sale of food and beverage items where customers sit down and order and then pay after consuming items.

40. Wantagh Bagels is open seven (7) days per week for several hours per day. It employs a handful of full-time and part-time personnel including bakers, cashiers and cleaning personnel.

41. At all relevant times, Wantagh Bagels was a covered employer within the meaning of the FLSA, 29 U.S.C. § 203(d) and the NYLL § 190.

42. At all relevant times, Wantagh Bagels maintained control, oversight, and direction over the Plaintiff, including timekeeping, payroll, and other employment practices that applied to him.

43. At all relevant times, Wantagh Bagels was "an enterprise engaged in commerce" within the meaning of the FLSA, 29 U.S.C. § 203(s)(1)(A) because its employees were handling food made from ingredients imported from out of state and distributed in New York. In addition, Wantagh Bagels conducted business with vendors and other businesses outside the State of New York and engaged in credit card transactions involving banks and other institutions outside the State of New York.

44. Upon information and belief, at all relevant times, Wantagh Bagels' annual gross volume of sales made, or business done, was not less than \$500,000.00, exclusive of separate retail excise taxes, within the meaning of the FLSA, 29 U.S.C. § 203(s)(1)(a)(ii).

#### **Individual Defendants**

#### **Ralph Facchini**

45. Upon information and belief, at all relevant times, Ralph Facchini ("Facchini")

was, at the time of Plaintiff's employment owner, principal, authorized operator, manager shareholder, and/or agent of the Corporate Defendants.

46. At all relevant times throughout Plaintiff's employment, Facchini had the discretionary power to create and enforce personnel decisions on behalf of the Corporate Defendants, including but not limited to: hiring and terminating employees; setting and authorizing issuance of wages; maintaining employee records; setting Plaintiff's schedule; instructing and supervising Plaintiff; and otherwise controlling the terms and conditions for the Plaintiff while he was employed by Defendants.

47. At all relevant times throughout the Plaintiff's employment, Facchini was actively involved in the day-to-day operations of Corporate Defendants and was in charge of their finances.

48. At all relevant times throughout the Plaintiff's employment, Facchini was a covered employer within the meaning of the FLSA and NYLL, and employed or jointly employed Plaintiff, and is personally liable for the unpaid wages sought herein, pursuant to, 29 U.S.C. § 203(d).

#### Peter Casella

49. Upon information and belief, at all relevant times, Peter Casella ("Casella") was, at the time of Plaintiff's employment owner, principal, authorized operator, manager shareholder, and/or agent of the Corporate Defendants

50. At all relevant times throughout Plaintiff's employment, Casella had the discretionary power to create and enforce personnel decisions on behalf of the Corporate Defendants, including but not limited to: hiring and terminating employees; setting and authorizing issuance of wages; maintaining employee records; setting Plaintiff's schedule;

instructing and supervising Plaintiff; and otherwise controlling the terms and conditions for the Plaintiff while he was employed by Defendants.

51. At all relevant times throughout the Plaintiff's employment, Casella was actively involved in the day-to-day operations of Corporate Defendants and was in charge of their finances.

52. At all relevant times throughout the Plaintiff's employment, Casella was a covered employer within the meaning of the FLSA and NYLL, and employed or jointly employed Plaintiff, and is personally liable for the unpaid wages sought herein, pursuant to, 29 U.S.C. § 203(d).

#### **COLLECTIVE ACTION ALLEGATIONS**

53. Pursuant to 29 U.S.C. §§ 203, 207, and 216(b), Plaintiff brings his First cause of action as a collective action under the FLSA on behalf of himself and the following collective:

All persons employed by Defendants at any time from August 21, 2014 to December 31, 2016 (the "Collective Action Period") who worked as bakers, cashiers, and other non-exempt employees of the Defendants (the "Collective Action Members").

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

55. Plaintiff and the Collective Action Members have substantially similar job duties and are paid pursuant to a similar, if not the same, payment structure.

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

#### FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION

#### Fair Labor Standards Act – Unpaid Overtime Wages (August 21, 2011 - December 31, 2016)

57. Plaintiff and Collective Action Members, reallege and incorporate by reference the allegations made in all preceding paragraphs as if fully set forth herein.

58. At all relevant times, Plaintiff and the Collective Action Members were employees and employed by Defendants within the meaning of the FLSA, 29 U.S.C. § 203(d), (e)(1), and (g).

59. At all times relevant, Defendants have been employers of Plaintiff and the Collective Action Members, and were engaged in commerce and/or the production of goods for commerce within the meaning of 29 U.S.C. §§ 203 (s)(1) and 206 (a).

60. The overtime wage provisions set forth in the FLSA, 29 U.S.C. § 207 (a)(1) and the supporting federal regulations, apply to Defendants and protect the Plaintiff and the Collective Action Members.

61. Defendants have failed to pay Plaintiff and the Collective Action Members, overtime wages at a rate of one and one-half times the regular rate at which they were employed for but under no instance less than one and one-half times the statutory minimum wage for all of the hours that they worked in excess of forty (40) hours per workweek.

62. As a result of Defendants' violations of the FLSA, Plaintiff and the Collective Action Members have been deprived of overtime compensation and other wages in amounts to be determined at trial, and are entitled to recovery of such amounts, liquidated damages, attorneys' fees, costs, and other compensation pursuant to 29 U.S.C. § 216 (b). Case 2:17-cv-04924 Document 1 Filed 08/21/17 Page 12 of 18 PageID #: 12

63. Defendants' unlawful conduct, as described in this Complaint, has been willful and intentional. Defendants were aware, or should have been aware, that the practices described in this Complaint were unlawful.

64. Defendants have not made a good faith effort to comply with the FLSA with respect to the compensation of the Plaintiff and the Collective Action Members.

65. Defendants failed to post or keep posted conspicuous notices of Plaintiff's rights as required by the U.S. Department of Labor pursuant to 29 C.F.R. § 516.4, further evincing Defendants' lack of good faith.

66. Because Defendants' violations of the FLSA have been willful, a three-year statute of limitations applies pursuant to 29 U.S.C. § 255(a).

#### SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION

#### New York Labor Law – Unpaid Overtime Wages (August 21, 2011 - December 31, 2016)

67. Plaintiff realleges and incorporates by reference all allegations in all preceding paragraphs.

68. Defendants have engaged in a widespread pattern, policy, and practice of violating the NYLL, as detailed in this Complaint.

69. At all relevant times referenced herein, Plaintiff had been an employee of Defendants, and Defendants have been employers of Plaintiff within the meaning of the NYLL §§ 190, 651 (5), 652, and the supporting New York State Department of Labor Regulations.

70. The overtime wage provisions as set forth in NYLL §§ 190 *et seq.* and the supporting New York State Department of Labor Regulations apply to Defendants and protect Plaintiff

Case 2:17-cv-04924 Document 1 Filed 08/21/17 Page 13 of 18 PageID #: 13

71. Defendants have failed to pay Plaintiff proper overtime which he was entitled to at a wage rate of one and one-half times his regular rate but under no instance less than one and one-half times the statutory minimum wage as defined by the New York State Department of Labor regulations, 12 N.Y.C.R.R. Part 146-1.4.

72. Through their knowing or intentional failure to pay Plaintiff proper overtime wages for hours worked in excess of forty (40) hours per workweek, Defendants have violated the NYLL §§ 190 *et seq.*, and the supporting New York State Department of Labor Regulations.

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

74. Defendants also failed to post conspicuous notices of the Plaintiff's rights under the law, as required by the NYLL § 661 and the New York State Department of Labor Regulations, 12 N.Y.C.R.R. Part 146-2.4, further evincing Defendants' lack of good faith.

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

#### THIRD CAUSE OF ACTION

#### New York Labor Law – Spread-of-hours pay (August 21, 2011 - December 31, 2016)

76. Plaintiff realleges and incorporates by reference all allegations in all preceding paragraphs.

Case 2:17-cv-04924 Document 1 Filed 08/21/17 Page 14 of 18 PageID #: 14

77. The spread-of-hours provisions as set forth in NYLL §§ 190 *et seq.* and the supporting New York State Department of Labor Regulations apply to Defendants and protect Plaintiff.

78. Defendants have failed to pay Plaintiff spread-of-hours compensation of one hour's pay at the basic minimum hourly wage rate for each day during which Plaintiff's shift exceeded ten (10) hours, as defined by the New York State Department of Labor regulations, 12 N.Y.C.R.R. Part 146-1.6.

79. Through their knowing or intentional failure to pay Plaintiff spread-of-hours compensation, Defendants have willfully violated the NYLL §§ 190 *et seq.*, and the supporting New York State Department of Labor Regulations.

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

#### **FOURTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

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

81. Plaintiff realleges and incorporates by reference all allegations in all preceding paragraphs.

82. Defendants have failed to provide Plaintiff, at the time of hiring or at any point thereafter, a notice containing the rate of pay and basis thereof, whether paid by the hour, shift, day, week, salary, piece, commission, or other; the regular pay day designated by the employer; the physical address of the employer's main office or principal place of business; the telephone

number of the employer, and anything otherwise required by law, in violation of NYLL § 195(1).

83. Due to Defendants' violations of the NYLL § 195(1), Plaintiff is entitled to recover from Defendants statutory damages of Fifty dollars (\$50) per workweek that the violation occurred, up to a maximum of Two Thousand Five Hundred Dollars (\$2,500), until February 26, 2015, and statutory damages of Fifty Dollars (\$50) per workday that the violation occurred, up to a maximum of Five Thousand Dollars (\$5,000), thereafter, pursuant to NYLL § 198 (1-b).

#### **FIFTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

#### New York Labor Law – Failure to Provide Wage Statements

84. Plaintiff realleges and incorporates by reference all allegations in all preceding paragraphs.

85. Defendants have failed to provide Plaintiff with wage statements listing, *inter alia*, all his hours of work; rate of pay; basis of pay; the period covered; and overtime pay, in violation of NYLL § 195(3).

86. Due to Defendants' violations of the NYLL, Plaintiff is entitled to recover from Defendants One Hundred Dollars (\$100) for each work week that the violations occurred, up to a maximum of Two Thousand Five Hundred Dollars (\$2,500), until February 26, 2015, and statutory damages of Two Hundred and Fifty Dollars (\$250) per workday that the violation occurred, up to a maximum of Five Thousand Dollars (\$5,000), thereafter, pursuant to NYLL § 198 (1-d).

#### **PRAYER FOR RELIEF**

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff seeks the following relief:

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

B. An order tolling the statute of limitations;

C. Issuance of a declaratory judgment that the practices complained of in this complaint are unlawful under the Fair Labor Standards Act, 29 U.S.C. §§ 201 *et seq.*, New York Labor Law, Article 6, §§ 190 *et seq.*, and Article 19, §§ 650 *et seq.*, and the supporting New York State Department of Labor Regulations;

D. Unpaid overtime pay under the FLSA and an additional and equal amount as liquidated damages pursuant to 29 U.S.C. § 216(b) and the supporting United States Department of Labor regulations;

E. Unpaid overtime wages and spread-of-hour pay under NYLL, and an additional and equal amount as liquidated damages pursuant to NYLL §198(1-a) and § 663(1);

F. Civil penalties of One Thousand One Hundred Dollars (\$1,100) for each of Defendants' willful and repeated violations of the FLSA pursuant to 29 U.S.C. § 216(b);

G. An award of statutory damages for Defendants' failure to provide Plaintiff with a wage notice at the time of hiring or any time thereafter pursuant to NYLL § 198 (1-b);

H. An award of statutory damages for Defendants' failure to provide Plaintiff with wage statements pursuant to NYLL § 198 (1-d);

Case 2:17-cv-04924 Document 1 Filed 08/21/17 Page 17 of 18 PageID #: 17

1	I. A permanent injunction requiring Defendants to pay all statutorily required										
2	wages pursua	ages pursuant to the FLSA and NYLL;									
3	J.	If liquidated damages pursuant to FLSA, 29 U.S.C. § 216(b), are not awarded,									
4	an award of p	a award of prejudgment interest pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1961;									
5	K.	An award of pre-judgment interest of nine per centum per annum (9%)									
6 7	pursuant to the	the New York Civil Practice Law and Rules §§ 5001-5004;									
8	L.										
9	New York Civil Practice Law and Rules § 5003;										
10											
11	M. An award of attorney's fees, costs, and further expenses up to fifty dollars,										
12	pursuant to 29 U.S.C. § 216(b), and NYLL §§ 198 and 663(1);										
13	N.	Such other relief as this Court shall deem just and proper.									
14	Dated	d: August 21, 2017									
15		Respectfully submitted,									
16		PARDALIS & NOHAVICKA, LLP									
17 18		By:/s/Ariadne Panagopoulou									
19		Ariadne Panagopoulou (AP-2202) Attorneys for the Plaintiff									
20		35-10 Broadway, Suite 201 Astoria, New York 11106									
21		Tel: 718.777.0400   Fax: 718.777.0599 Email: ari@pnlawyers.com									
22											
23											
24											
25											
26											
27											
28		17									
		17									

Case 2:17-cv-04924 Document 1 Filed 08/21/17 Page 18 of 18 PageID #: 18

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

#### FAIR LABOR STANDARDS ACT CONSENT FORM

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

Dated: 7/18/2017 Astoria, New York

ESMAELHERNA NOES

Signature

Ismael Antonio Hernandez Garcia

Print Name

Address

516.547.5590

Telephone

JS 44 (Rev. 06/17)

#### **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.)* 

Ismael Antonio Hemande similarly situated	6	Wantagn Bagels inc., Wantagh Bagels, Ralph Facchini, and Peter Casella, jointly and severally						
(b) County of Residence of First Listed Plaintiff (EXCEPT IN U.S. PLAINTIFF CASES)				County of Residence of First Listed Defendant <u>Nassau</u> (IN U.S. PLAINTIFF CASES ONLY) NOTE: IN LAND CONDEMNATION CASES, USE THE LOCATION OF THE TRACT OF LAND INVOLVED.				
(c) Attorneys (Firm Name, J Pardalis & Nohavicka, LL 35-10 Broadway, Suite 2 Tel: (718) 777-0400; Fax	01, Astoria, NY 11106			Attorneys (If Known	n)			
II. BASIS OF JURISDI	CTION (Place an "X" in C	Dne Box Only)	III. CI	<b>TIZENSHIP OF</b>	PRINCIPA	L PARTIES	(Place an "X" in One Box for Plainti	
□ 1 U.S. Government Plaintiff	3 Federal Question (U.S. Government	Not a Party)			) PTF DEF O 1 O 1	Incorporated <i>or</i> Pri of Business In T		
2 U.S. Government Defendant	☐ 4 Diversity (Indicate Citizensh	ip of Parties in Item [11)				Incorporated and P of Business In A Foreign Nation		
••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••				eign Country				
IV. NATURE OF SUIT			- 100	NIED FOLDIO DIONIAT TAX		Distant and the second s	of Suit Code Descriptions.	
CONTRACT      110 Insurance     120 Marine     130 Miller Act     140 Negotiable Instrument     150 Recovery of Overpayment     & Enforcement of Judgment     151 Medicare Act     152 Recovery of Overpayment     of Veteran's Benefits     160 Stockholders' Suits     190 Other Contract     195 Contract Product Liability     196 Franchise <u>REAL PROPERTY     210 Land Condemnation     220 Foreclosure     230 Rent Lease &amp; Ejectment     240 Torts to Land     245 Tort Product Liability     290 All Other Real Property </u>	PERSONAL INJURY  310 Airplane 315 Airplane Product Liability 320 Assault, Libel & Slander 330 Federal Employers' Liability 340 Marine 345 Marine Product Liability 340 Marine 345 Morr Vehicle 355 Motor Vehicle 355 Motor Vehicle 355 Motor Vehicle 360 Other Personal Injury 360 Other Personal Injury 362 Personal Injury - Medical Malpractice CIVIL RIGHTS 441 Voting 442 Employment 443 Housing/ Accommodations 445 Amer. w/Disabilities - Other 448 Education	Other:	Y     □     62:       □     69:       ■     69:       ■     710       ■     720       □     720       □     720       □     720       □     720       □     720       □     720       □     720       □     720       □     790       □     790	BEFEITURE/PENALTY     S Drug Related Seizure     of Property 21 USC 881     Other     Definition of Property 21 USC 881     Other     Definition of Property 21 USC 881     Definit	□ 422 Appe □ 423 With 28 U ■ 820 Copp □ 830 Pater □ 835 Pater ■ 840 Trad. ■ 861 HIA ■ 861 HIA ■ 863 BIAU ■ 864 SSID ■ 864 SSID ■ 865 RSI ( ■ 870 Taxe or D ■ 871 IRS- 26 U	ISC 157 RTY:RIGHTS rights it Abbreviated Drug Application emark SECURITY (1395ff) k Lung (923) C/DIWW (405(g)) D Title XVI	OTHER STATUTES         375 False Claims Act         376 Qui Tam (31 USC 3729(a))         400 State Reapportionment         410 Antitrust         430 Banks and Banking         450 Commerce         460 Deportation         470 Racketeer Influenced and Corrupt Organizations         480 Consumer Credit         490 Cable/Sat TV         850 Securities/Commodities/ Exchange         890 Other Statutory Actions         891 Agricultural Acts         895 Freedom of Information Act         896 Arbitration         899 Administrative Procedure Act/Review or Appeal of Agency Decision         950 Constitutionality of State Statutes	
V. ORIGIN (Place an "X" in	n One Box Only)						J	
X 1 Original □ 2 Rei	moved from 3 te Court	Appellate Court	⊐ 4 Reins Reop	ened Anot (speci	her District	□ 6 Multidistr Litigation Transfer		
VI. CAUSE OF ACTIO	DN 29 U.S.C. §§201 Brief description of ca Unpaid overtime	ause: Wages						
VII. REQUESTED IN COMPLAINT:	CHECK IF THIS UNDER RULE 2	IS A CLASS ACTION 3, F.R.Cv.P.	,	EMAND \$ 200,000.00		CHECK YES only URY DEMAND:	if demanded in complaint:	
VIII. RELATED CASE IF ANY	E(S) (See instructions):	JUDGE			DOCKE	ET NUMBER		
DATE 08/21/2017 FOR OFFICE USE ONLY		SIGNATURE OF AT	TORNEY O	OF RECORD				
	/OUNT	APPLYING IFP		JUDGE		MAG. JUD	OGE	

#### 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, <u>Ariadne Panagopoulou, Esq.</u>, counsel for <u>Plaintiff</u>, 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 or its stocks:

#### **RELATED CASE STATEMENT (Section VIII on the Front of this Form)**

Please list all cases that are arguably related pursuant to Division of Business Rule 50.3.1 in Section VIII on the front of this form. Rule 50.3.1 (a) provides that "A civil case is "related" to another civil case for purposes of this guideline when, because of the similarity of facts and legal issues or because the cases arise from the same transactions or events, a substantial saving of judicial resources is likely to result from assigning both cases to the same judge and magistrate judge." Rule 50.3.1 (b) provides that "A civil case shall not be deemed "related" to another civil case merely because the civil case: (A) involves identical legal issues, or (B) involves the same parties." Rule 50.3.1 (c) further provides that "Presumptively, and subject to the power of a judge to determine otherwise pursuant to paragraph (d), civil cases shall not be deemed to be "related" unless both cases are still pending before the court."

#### NY-E DIVISION OF BUSINESS RULE 50.1(d)(2)

- 1.) Is the civil action being filed in the Eastern District removed from a New York State Court located in Nassau or Suffolk County: №
- 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? Yes

b) Did the events or omissions giving rise to the claim or claims, or a substantial part thereof, occur in the Eastern District? Yes

If your answer to question 2 (b) is "No," does the defendant (or a majority of the defendants, if there is more than one) reside in Nassau or Suffolk County, or, in an interpleader action, does the claimant (or a majority of the claimants, if there is more than one) reside in Nassau or Suffolk County?

(Note: A corporation shall be considered a resident of the County in which it has the most significant contacts).

#### BAR ADMISSION

I am currently admitted in the Eastern District of New York and currently a member in good standing of the bar of this court. X Yes N 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.

Madre Signature:

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

# UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

for the

Eastern District of New York

)

)

)

)

Civil Action No.

Ismael Antonio Hernandez Garcia, on behalf of himself and others similarly situated,

Plaintiff(s)

v.

Wantagh Bagels Inc., Wantagh Bagels, Ralph Facchini, and Peter Casella, jointly and severally,

Defendant(s)

#### SUMMONS IN A CIVIL ACTION

)

To: (Defendant's name and address)
1. Wantagh Bagels Inc. - 3056 Merrick Road, Wantagh, New York 11793
2. Wantagh Bagels - 3056 Merrick Road, Wantagh, New York 11793
3. Ralph Facchini - 3056 Merrick Road, Wantagh, New York 11793 and 2365
Riverside Avenue, Seaford, NY 11783
4. Peter Casella - 3056 Merrick Road, Wantagh, New York 11793 and 2056 Merrick Road, Wantagh, New York 11793 and 2056 Merrick Road, Wantagh, New York 11793 and 2056 Merrick Road, Wantagh, New York 11793

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:

Pardalis & Nohavicka, LLP 35-10 Broadway, Suite 201, Astoria, NY 11106 Tel: (718) 777-0400 Fax: (718) 777-0599

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.

> DOUGLAS C. PALMER CLERK OF COURT

Date:

Signature of Clerk or Deputy Clerk

# **ClassAction.org**

This complaint is part of ClassAction.org's searchable class action lawsuit database and can be found in this post: Long Island's Wantagh Bagels Hit with Unpaid Overtime Lawsuit