### UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF FLORIDA MIAMI DIVISION

CASE NO
BERKANT HAKLI, KARIM LAROUSSI, and others similarly-situated,
Plaintiff,
VS.
BAL HARBOUR TOWER CONDOMINIUM ASSOCIATION, a Florida Corporation
Defendant.

## **COMPLAINT**

COMES NOW Plaintiffs, BERKANT HAKLI, KARIM LAROUSSI, by and through his undersigned attorney, and hereby sues Defendant, BAL HARBOUR TOWER CONDOMINIUM ASSOCIATION, and as grounds alleges:

#### JURISDICTIONAL ALLEGATIONS

- 1. This is an action to recover monetary damages, liquidated damages, interests, costs and attorney's fees for willful violations of overtime pay under the laws of the United States, the Fair Labor Standards Act, 29 U.S.C. §§201-219) ("the FLSA").
- 2. The Plaintiff HAKLI is a resident of Miami-Dade County, Florida, within the jurisdiction of this Honorable Court. Plaintiff LAROUSSI is a resident of Broward County, Florida, within the jurisdiction of this Honorable Court.

- 3. The Defendant is a condominium association that operated a restaurant which regularly transacted business within Miami-Dade County, Florida, including the work performed by the Plaintiffs while they were employed by the Defendant.
- 4. This Court has subject matter jurisdiction pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §1331 because this action involves the Fair Labor Standards Act, 29 U.S.C. §§201, *et seq.*, a federal statute.
  - 5. Venue is proper in this district pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §1391(c) and (d).
- 6. BAL HARBOUR is and, at all times pertinent to this Complaint, was engaged in interstate commerce. At all times pertinent to this Complaint, BAL HARBOUR operated as an organization which sells and/or markets and/or handles its services and/or goods and/or materials to customers from throughout the United States and also provides its services for goods sold and transported from across state lines of numerous other states, and otherwise regularly engages in interstate commerce, particularly with respect to its employees. BAL HARBOUR purchased food ingredients, food preparation tools, utensils, plates, and other goods, materials and equipment which travelled in interstate commerce. Two or more kitchen employees of BAL HARBOUR used the aforementioned goods, materials and equipment.
- 7. Upon information and belief, the annual gross income for the Defendant BAL HARBOUR during the years 2014, 2015 and 2016 was in excess of \$500,000.00, annually.
- 8. By reason of the foregoing, BAL HARBOUR is and was, during all times hereafter mentioned, an enterprise engaged in commerce or in the production of goods for commerce as defined in §3(r) and 3(s) of the FLSA, 29 U.S.C. §203(r) and 203(s) and/or Plaintiffs are within interstate commerce.

#### **COUNT I: UNPAID OVERTIME WAGES**

9. Plaintiffs re-allege and re-aver paragraphs 1 through 8 as fully set forth herein.

- 10. The corporate Defendant is a condominium association which also operates a restaurant. Plaintiffs were employed by the Defendant as servers.
- through the present time (Plaintiff seeks overtime wages through the period of April 21, 2016). During the low season (estimated between February and September), Plaintiff worked approximately 50 hours per week. During the high season (estimated between October and January), Plaintiff worked approximately 62 hours per week; except during the last three weeks in December, when Plaintiff worked approximately 85 hours per week. Plaintiff was paid based on a shift rate. Plaintiff was paid approximately \$50 per breakfast shift, \$70 (later raised to \$80) per lunch shift, and \$120 (later raised to \$130) per dinner shift. The shift rate pay system devised by Defendants did not account for overtime wage payments when Plaintiff worked more than 40 hour per week. As a result, Plaintiff was not paid overtime wages, at a rate of time and one half the regular rate, when he worked more than 40 hours per week.
- 12. Plaintiff LAROUSSI was employed by the Defendant during the period of 2005 through the present time (Plaintiff seeks overtime wages through the period of April 21, 2016). During the low season (estimated between February and September), Plaintiff worked approximately 50 hours per week. During the high season (estimated between October and January), Plaintiff worked approximately 55 hours per week. Plaintiff was paid based on a shift rate. Plaintiff was paid \$90 per lunch shift, and \$120 per dinner shift. The shift rate pay system devised by Defendants did not account for overtime wage payments when Plaintiff worked more than 40 hour per week. As a result, Plaintiff was not paid overtime wages, at a rate of time and one half the regular rate, when he worked more than 40 hours per week.

3

- 13. The similarly situated individuals are those individuals whom were employed by the Defendant as servers and whom were not paid overtime wages, in whole or in part.
- 14. The FLSA requires that employees be paid overtime hours worked in excess of forty (40) hours weekly at a rate of time-and-one-half the regular rate. At all times material hereto, Defendant failed to comply with Title 29 U.S.C. § 201-219 and 29 C.F.R. §516.2 and §516.4 et seq. in that Plaintiffs performed services and worked in excess of the maximum hours provided by the FLSA but no provision was made by the Defendant to properly pay his at the rate of time and one-half for all hours worked in excess of forty (40) per workweek as provided in the FLSA.
- 15. Defendant knew and/or showed reckless disregard of the provisions of the FLSA concerning the payment of overtime wages as required by the Fair Labor Standards Act. Defendant was aware of Plaintiffs' work schedule and further aware that Plaintiffs were working more than 40 hours per week. Defendant was aware of Plaintiffs' pay records and the rate that he was being paid for his hours. Despite Defendant having knowledge of Plaintiffs' hours and their failure to pay overtime wages, Defendant did not alter their pay practices to pay overtime wages. Defendant continued their wage practices despite such knowledge. Defendant continued to pay Plaintiffs by a shift rate despite having knowledge that such pay violated the FLSA. Defendant had the opportunity and/or ability to pay their employees by means other than a shift rate; as since April 21, 2016, Defendant began paying their employees through an hourly rate.
- 16. Plaintiffs have retained the law offices of the undersigned attorneys to represent him in this action and is entitled to award of reasonable attorney's fees.

WHEREFORE, Plaintiffs requests compensatory and liquidated damages, and reasonable attorney's fees and costs from Defendant, pursuant to the Fair Labor Standards Act as cited

above, to be proven at the time of trial for overtime owing from Plaintiffs' entire employment period with Defendant, or as much as allowed by the Fair Labor Standards Act, whichever is greater, along with court costs. In the event that Plaintiffs do not recover liquidated damages, then Plaintiffs will seek an award of prejudgment interest for the unpaid overtime, and any and all other relief which this Court deems reasonable under the circumstances.

#### JURY DEMAND

Plaintiffs and those similarly-situated demands trial by jury of all issues triable as of right by jury.

Dated: February 1, 2017

Law Office of Daniel T. Feld, P.A. *Co-Counsel for Plaintiff* 2847 Hollywood Blvd. Hollywood, Florida 33020 Tel: (305) 308 - 5619

Email: DanielFeld.Esq@gmail.com

/s Daniel T. Feld Daniel T. Feld, Esq. Florida Bar No. 37013

Mamane Law LLC

Co-counsel for Plaintiff
1150 Kane Concourse, Second Floor
Bay Harbor Islands, FL 33154
Telephone 305-773-6661
E-mail: mamane@gmail.com

<u>s/ Isaac Mamane</u>Isaac Mamane, Esq.Florida Bar No. 44561

## United States District Court

for the Southern District of Florida

BERKANT HAKLI, KARIM LAROUSSI, and others similarly-situated,						
Plaintiff,						
VS.						
BAL HARB	BOUR	TOWE	ER			
CONDOMINIUM	ASSOCIAT	ION,	a			
Florida Corporation						
Defendant.						

#### SUMMONS IN A CIVIL ACTION

To:

BAY HARBOUR TOWER CONDOMINIUM ASSOCIATION c/o Becker & Poliakoff, David Rogel, Esq. 9999 Collins Avenue
Bal Harbour, Florida 33154

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:

MAMANE LAW LLC 1150 Kane Concourse, Fourth Floor Bay Harbor Islands, FL 33154

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.

CLEDY OF COURT

	CLERK OF COURT		
Date:			
	Signature of Clerk or Denuty Clerk		

# JS 44 (Rev. 1 Sase 1:17-cv-20425-JEM Document 1-2 Entered on Experience to 2/01/2017 Page 1 of 1

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. of initiating the civil docket shee	This form, approved by the t. (SEE INSTRUCTIONS ON I	Undicial Conference of the NEXT PAGE OF THIS FORM.	United States in September 1  NOTICE: Attorneys MUST	974, is required for the use of the Time of the Indicate All Re-filed Cases I	he Clerk of Court for the purpose Below.
I. (a) PLAINTIFFS BE all	ERKANT HAKLI, KA others similarly-situa	RIM LAROUSSI, an	d <b>DEFENDANTS</b>	BAY HARBOUR TOV ASSOCIATION	WER CONDOMINIUM
(c) Attorneys (Firm Name, Ad Mamane Law LLC, 1150 Islands, FL 33154. Tel: 3	0 Kane Concourse, Fo 305-773-6661	urth Floor, Bay Harbo	NOTE: Attorneys (If Known) Or	THE TRACT OF LAND INVOL	ASES, USE THE LOCATION OF VED.
(d) Check County Where Action		☐ MONROE ☐ BROWARD ☐	J PALM BEACH □ MARTIN □ ST. I	UCIE 🔲 INDIAN RIVER 🔲 OKEECH	OBEE  HIGHLANDS
II. BASIS OF JURISDIC	CTION (Place an "X" in	One Box Only)	(For Diversity Cases Only)	RINCIPAL PARTIES	Place an "X" in One Box for Plaintiff, and One Box for Defendant)
U.S. Government Plaintiff	(U.S. Government N	ral Question Not a Party)	P	TF DEF  1 Incorporated or Pri of Business In This	PTF DEF incipal Place ☐ 4 ☐ 4
2 U.S. Government Defendant	<del>_</del>	ersity p of Parties in Item III)	Citizen of Another State	2 Incorporated and P of Business In A	
			Citizen or Subject of a Foreign Country	3 Greign Nation	□ 6 □ 6
IV. NATURE OF SUIT	(Place an "X" in One Box Oni	ly)			
CONTRACT	TO	RTS	FORFEITURE/PENALTY	BANKRUPTCY	OTHER STATUTES
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 (Excl. 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 Foreclosure   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 □ 355 Motor Vehicle □ 370 Motor Personal Injury □ 362 Personal Injury - Med. Malpractice □ CIVIL RIGHTS □ 440 Other Civil Rights □ 441 Voting □ 442 Employment □ 443 Housing/ Accommodations □ 445 Amer. w/Disabilities - Employment □ 446 Amer. w/Disabilities - Other □ 448 Education	PERSONAL INJURY  365 Personal Injury - Product Liability  367 Health Care/ Pharmaceutical Personal Injury Product Liability  368 Asbestos Personal Injury Product Liability	LABOR  LABOR  To Pair Labor Standards Act 720 Labor/Mgmt. Relations 751 Family and Medical Leave Act 790 Other Labor Litigation 791 Empl. Ret. Inc. Security Act	□ 422 Appeal 28 USC 158 □ 423 Withdrawal 28 USC 157  PROPERTY RIGHTS □ 820 Copyrights □ 830 Patent □ 840 Trademark  SOCIAL SECURITY □ 861 HIA (1395ff) □ 862 Black Lung (923) □ 863 DIWC/DIWW (405(g)) □ 864 SSID Title XVI □ 865 RSI (405(g))  FEDERAL TAX SUITS □ 870 Taxes (U.S. Plaintiff or Defendant) □ 871 IRS—Third Party 26 USC 7609	□ 375 False Claims Act □ 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 □ 893 Environmental Matters □ 895 Freedom of Information Act □ 896 Arbitration □ 899 Administrative Procedure Act/Review or Appeal of Agency Decision
1 Original 2 Rem	Court VI belo		another district (specify)	6 Multidistrict Litigation 7	Appeal to District  Remanded from Judge from Magistrate Judgment  Remanded from Appellate Court
VI. RELATED/ RE-FILED CASE(S)	a) Re-fi (See instructions): JUDGE	led Case □YES <b>☑</b> N	(O b) Related Cases	DOCKET NUMBER	
VII. CAUSE OF ACTIO	* * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * *	ages	ling and Write a Brief Stateme for both sides to try entire case	ent of Cause (Do not cite jurisdica	tional statutes unless diversity):
VIII. REQUESTED IN COMPLAINT:		IS A CLASS ACTION	DEMAND \$	,	if demanded in complaint:
ABOVE INFORMATION IS TO DATE	TRUE & CORRECT TO T		WLEDGE TORNEY OF RECORD		
February 1, 2017		/s/ Isaac Ma	mane		

FOR OFFICE USE ONLY RECEIPT#

AMOUNT

IFP

JUDGE

MAG JUDGE

Reset

# **ClassAction.org**

This complaint is part of ClassAction.org's searchable class action lawsuit database and can be found in this post: <u>Bal Harbour Tower Condo Association Hit with FLSA Lawsuit</u>