UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT EASTERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK	
JANN ORTEGA, WIDMAN SANCHEZ and FELIPE ESTEVEZ, on behalf of themselves and all others similarly situated,	
Plaintiffs, -against- BRACCO'S CLAM & OYSTER BAR, INC. d/b/a BRACCO'S CLAM & OYSTER BAR, MICHAEL BRACCO, JONATHAN BRACCO, ROBERT BRACCO, and GERARD BRACCO,	Case No.: 17-cv-6189 COLLECTIVE & CLASS ACTION COMPLAINT
Defendants.	-X

Plaintiffs Jann Ortega, Widman Sanchez and Felipe Estevez, on behalf of themselves and all others similarly situated (collectively referred to as "Plaintiffs"), by and through their attorneys, Frank & Associates, P.C., bring this action against Defendants Bracco's Clam & Oyster Bar, Inc., d/b/a Bracco's Clam & Oyster Bar, Michael Bracco, Jonathan Bracco, Robert Bracco, and Gerard Bracco (collectively referred to as "Defendants") and respectfully allege as follows:

INTRODUCTION

- 1. Plaintiffs bring this action to recover unpaid overtime wages owed to them by Defendants, pursuant to the Fair Labor Standards Act, 29 U.S.C. §201 *et seq.*, ("FLSA"), Article 19 of New York Labor Law Article §650 *et seq.*, and the supporting New York State Department of Labor Regulations, 12 N.Y.C.R.R. Part 142, 2.2 ("New York Labor Law"). Specifically, Defendants failed to pay Plaintiffs one and half (1 ½) times their normal rate of pay for all hours worked in excess of forty (40) in a single workweek.
 - 2. Plaintiffs further allege that Defendants failed to compensate them for one (1)

additional hour of pay, at the basic minimum wage rate for each day the spread of hours worked exceeded ten (10) hours, throughout the entirety of their employment with Defendants.

- 3. Plaintiffs further allege that, pursuant to New York Labor Law § 195, Defendants failed to provide them with notice of their rate of pay, the basis thereof, the employer's regular pay day, the name, address and telephone number of the employer and other information required by the statute upon commencement of their employment.
- 4. Plaintiffs also bring this action based upon Defendants' intentional breach of its fiduciary duties to Plaintiffs. Specifically, Plaintiffs commenced their employment with Defendants with the expectation that Defendants would make proper contributions to Social Security, Workers' Compensation, Unemployment Insurance, New York Disability Insurance, and Medicare on behalf of Plaintiffs. Defendants breached this duty by failing to pay the abovementioned contributions on behalf of Plaintiffs throughout the entirety of their employment.
- 5. Plaintiffs also bring this action based upon Defendants' intentional conversion and intentional fraudulent withholdings of the above-mentioned contributions that should have been made on Plaintiffs' behalf. Defendants retained benefits and monetary value by unlawfully retaining payments, which should have been contributed towards Social Security, Workers' Compensation, Unemployment Insurance, New York Disability Insurance, and Medicare, thereby denying Plaintiffs the benefits associated with such programs.
- 6. Punitive damages are required due to Defendants' continuous, willful fraudulent activity in unlawful payroll practices over the last six (6) years.

JURISDICTION AND VENUE

7. This Court has jurisdiction over the federal law claims pursuant to 29 U.S.C. § 201, et seq., and 28 U.S.C. § 1331, and supplemental jurisdiction over all state law claims pursuant to

28 U.S.C. § 1367.

8. Venue is proper in the Eastern District of New York pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1391, because the events or omissions giving rise to the claim for unlawful employment practices occurred in Nassau County, New York.

PARTIES

- 9. At all times relevant to the Complaint, Plaintiff Jann Ortega ("Plaintiff Ortega") resided at 160 Guy Lombardo Avenue, Apartment 3G, Freeport, New York 11520.
- 10. At all times relevant to the Complaint, Plaintiff Widman Sanchez ("Plaintiff Sanchez") resided at 51 Saint Marks Avenue, Freeport, New York 11520.
- 11. At all times relevant to the Complaint, Plaintiff Felipe Estevez ("Plaintiff Estevez") resided at 85 Westside Avenue, Freeport, New York 11520.
- 12. At all times relevant to the Complaint, Plaintiffs were employed by Defendants as dishwashers, food preparers, and kitchen aides in their full-service restaurant establishment.
- 13. At all times relevant to the Complaint, Plaintiffs were "employees" within the meaning of the FLSA, 29 U.S.C. § 203(e) and New York Labor Law § 190(2).
- 14. At all times relevant to the Complaint, Defendants Bracco's Clam & Oyster Bar, Inc. was and still is a domestic business corporation incorporated under the laws of the State of New York, with their primary place of business at 319 Woodcleft Avenue, Freeport, New York 11520.
- 15. At all times relevant to the Complaint, Defendants Bracco's Clam & Oyster Bar, Inc. was an "employer" within the meaning of the FLSA, 29 U.S.C. §203(d) and New York Labor Law §190(3).
 - 16. At all times relevant to the Complaint, Defendants Michael Bracco, Jonathan

Bracco, Robert Bracco, and Gerard Bracco were "employers" within the meaning of the FLSA, 29 U.S.C. §203(d) and New York Labor Law §190(3).

- 17. Upon information and belief, Defendants Michael Bracco, Jonathan Bracco, Robert Bracco, and Gerard Bracco are shareholders and owners of Defendant Bracco's Clam & Oyster Bar, Inc.
- 18. Upon information and belief, Defendant Michael Bracco, Jonathan Bracco, Robert Bracco, and Gerard Bracco had authority over personnel and payroll decisions for Defendant Bracco's Clam & Oyster Bar, Inc.
- 19. At all relevant times, Defendant Bracco's Clam & Oyster Bar, Inc. was "an enterprise engaged in interstate commerce" within the meaning of the FLSA § 207(a).
- 20. At all relevant times, Defendant Bracco's Clam & Oyster Bar, Inc. had employees engaged in commerce or in the production of goods for commerce and handling, selling or otherwise working on goods or materials that have been moved in or produced for commerce by any person.
- 21. Upon information and belief, at all relevant times, Defendant Bracco's Clam & Oyster Bar, Inc. had annual gross volume of sales in excess of \$500,000.

FACTUAL ALLEGATIONS

Plaintiff Ortega

- 22. Plaintiff Ortega began working for Defendants in April 2011 as a kitchen aide. Plaintiff Ortega continues to work for Defendants and who job duties are including, *inter alia*, preparing food and cleaning and washing dishes.
- 23. Plaintiff Ortega works during the summer season only, from April to October, each year since he commenced his employment with Defendants.

- 24. Plaintiff Ortega works on Monday, Tuesday, Wednesday, and Sunday from approximately 8:00 a.m. to 10:00 p.m., and Friday and Saturdays from approximately 8:00 until 11:00 p.m. Thursday was Plaintiff Ortega's only day off.
 - 25. On average, Plaintiff Ortega works approximately eighty-six (86) hours a week.
- 26. From April 2011 to May 2016, Plaintiff Ortega was paid \$10.00 an hour, in cash, regardless of the number of hours worked.
- During this time, Plaintiff Ortega was never paid overtime wages at a rate no less than one and a half (1 ½) times his normal rate of pay for all hours worked in excess of forty (40). For example, during the week of June 8, 2015, Plaintiff Ortega worked eighty-five (85) hours, but was only paid \$10.00 an hour for each hour worked.
- 28. Defendants also failed to compensate Plaintiff Ortega one (1) additional hour of pay, at the basic minimum wage rate for each day the spread of hours he worked exceeded ten (10) hours, throughout the entirety of his employment.
- 29. Each week, Defendants ripped up the accurate timecards Plaintiff Ortega handwrote to describe his work on behalf of the Defendants and forced him to sign forged and unauthentic records which fraudulently stated Plaintiff Ortega had worked only forty (40) hours each week.
- 30. Defendants did not have a clock in/out machine or any other recording device to keep account of Plaintiff Ortega's actual hours worked.
- 31. Since Plaintiff Ortega did not receive a paystub or any other documentation evidencing his pay, hours worked or schedule, Defendants failed to comply with the notice and recordkeeping requirements of New York Labor Law § 195. Further, Defendants did not provide Plaintiff Ortega, at the time of his hire, or anytime thereafter, with written notice, in his primary language, Spanish, of his rate of pay, the basis thereof, any allowances claimed by the employer,

the employer's regular pay day, the name of the employer, the employer's address and the employer's telephone number.

- 32. Upon information and belief, since Plaintiff Ortega was paid solely in cash during this time, Defendants fraudulently failed to pay any payroll taxes on Plaintiff Ortega's wages and failed to make proper contributions to Social Security, Workers' Compensation, Unemployment Insurance, New York Disability Insurance, and Medicare on Plaintiff Ortega's behalf.
- 33. By employing Plaintiff Ortega, Defendants violated its fiduciary responsibility to its employee. Specifically, Defendants had a fiduciary duty to pay Plaintiff Ortega proper wages for all work performed for Defendants' benefit, and to make mandatory contributions on Plaintiff Ortega's behalf for Social Security benefits, Workers' Compensation Insurance, Unemployment Insurance, New York Disability Insurance, and Medicare coverage.
- 34. Plaintiff Ortega commenced his employment with Defendants with the expectation that proper contributions to Social Security, Workers' Compensation, Unemployment Insurance, New York Disability Insurance, and Medicare would be made on his behalf. However, Defendants failed to make any such contributions.
- 35. In fact, rather than making these contributions, Defendants fraudulently converted the contributions for their own use, excluded Plaintiff Ortega from the use and enjoyment of the benefits he expected to receive. By converting these contributions, Defendants were unjustly enriched.
- 36. Further, Defendants willfully failed to pay any payroll taxes on Plaintiff Ortega's wages, thus defrauding the Internal Revenue Service and New York State Department of Taxation, in violation of Federal and State law.
 - 37. Throughout his employment with Defendants, Plaintiff Ortega complained about

not being paid proper overtime wages. Beginning in June 2016, after years of complaining, Defendants finally began to pay wages for Plaintiff's overtime hours worked.

38. After instituting the proper payment of Plaintiff Ortega's overtime wages, Defendants commenced payment to him by check, with deductions being made for payroll taxes and contributions to Social Security, Workers' Compensation, Unemployment Insurance, New York Disability Insurance, and Medicare. Whether such deductions and contributions were actually made to the appropriate governmental municipalities are not confirmed at the time and this Complaint if filed with the Court.

Plaintiff Estevez

- 39. Plaintiff Estevez worked for Defendants from April 2012 to April 2017 as a kitchen aide, whose job duties included, *inter alia*, preparing food and cleaning and washing dishes.
- 40. During the winter season, November to March, Plaintiff Estevez worked Tuesday and Wednesday from 8:00 a.m. until approximately 6:00 p.m., and Thursday through Sunday from approximately 8:00 a.m. to approximately 11:00 p.m. Monday was Plaintiff Estevez's only day off. On average, Plaintiff Estevez worked approximately seventy-two (72) hours a week.
- 41. During the summer season, April to October, Plaintiff Estevez worked from 8:00 a.m. until approximately 2:00 a.m. seven (7) days a week. On average, Plaintiff Estevez worked approximately ninety-eight (98) hours a week.
- 42. From April 2012 until in or about May 2016, Plaintiff Estevez was paid \$9.00 an hour, in cash, regardless of the number of hours worked.
- 43. During this time, Plaintiff Estevez was never paid overtime wages at a rate no less than one and a half (1 ½) times his normal rate of pay for all hours worked in excess of forty (40). For example, during the week of June 9, 2014, Plaintiff worked ninety-eight (98) hours, but was

only paid \$9.00 an hour for each hour worked.

- 44. Defendants also failed to compensate Plaintiff Estevez one (1) additional hour of pay, at the basic minimum wage rate for each day the spread of hours he worked exceeded ten (10) hours, throughout the entirety of his employment.
- 45. Each week, Defendants ripped up the accurate timecards Plaintiff Estevez handwrote to describe his work on behalf of the Defendants and forced him to sign forged and unauthentic records which fraudulently stated Plaintiff Ortega had worked only forty (40) hours each week.
- 46. Defendants did not have a clock in/out machine or any other recording device to keep account of Plaintiff Estevez's hours worked.
- 47. Since Plaintiff Estevez did not receive a paystub or any other documentation evidencing his pay, hours worked or schedule, Defendants failed to comply with the notice and recordkeeping requirements of New York Labor Law § 195. Further, Defendants did not provide Plaintiff Estevez, at the time of his hire, or anytime thereafter, with written notice, in his primary language, of his rate of pay, the basis thereof, any allowances claimed by the employer, the employer's regular pay day, the name of the employer, the employer's address and the employer's telephone number.
- 48. Upon information and belief, since Plaintiff Estevez was paid in cash during this time, Defendants fraudulently failed to pay any payroll taxes on Plaintiff Estevez's wages and failed to make proper contributions to Social Security, Workers' Compensation, Unemployment Insurance, New York Disability Insurance, and Medicare on Plaintiff Estevez's behalf.
- 49. By employing Plaintiff Estevez, Defendants had a fiduciary duty to Plaintiff Estevez. Specifically, Defendants had a fiduciary duty to pay Plaintiff Estevez proper wages for

all work performed for Defendants' benefit and to make proper contributions on Plaintiff's behalf to Social Security, Workers' Compensation, Unemployment Insurance, New York Disability Insurance, and Medicare. Defendants breached their fiduciary duty to Plaintiff Estevez by failing to make proper contributions on his behalf for the work he performed.

- 50. Plaintiff Estevez commenced his employment with Defendants with the expectation that proper contributions to Social Security, Workers' Compensation, Unemployment Insurance, New York Disability Insurance, and Medicare would be made on his behalf. However, Defendants failed to make any such contributions.
- 51. In fact, rather than making these contributions, Defendants fraudulently converted the contributions for their own use, excluded Plaintiff Estevez from the use and enjoyment of them and subjected Plaintiff Estevez to harm. By converting these contributions, Defendants were unjustly enriched.
- 52. Further, Defendants willfully failed to pay any payroll taxes on Plaintiff Estevez's wages, thus defrauding the Internal Revenue Service and New York State Department of Taxation, in violation of Federal and State law.
- 53. On or about June 2014, Plaintiff Estevez injured his back on the job while lifting heavy boxes to a high-elevated shelf. Plaintiff Estevez went to see a doctor who informed him that he would need back surgery. However, since Plaintiff Estevez was not covered by Workers' Compensation, due to Defendants' failure to make proper contributions, Plaintiff Estevez was unable to get the required surgery, thus causing permanent damage to Plaintiff Estevez's back.
- 54. On or about June 2016, after years of complaining, Defendants decided to finally begin paying Plaintiff Estevez proper overtime wages. Therefore, Defendants began paying Plaintiff Estevez solely by check, evidencing the proper number of hours worked, with proper

payroll taxes and deductions being made to Social Security, Workers' Compensation, Unemployment Insurance, New York Disability Insurance, and Medicare. Whether such deductions and contributions were actually made to the appropriate governmental municipalities are not confirmed at the time and this Complaint if filed with the Court.

Plaintiff Sanchez

- 55. Plaintiff Sanchez worked for Defendants from April 2011 to May 2017 as a kitchen aide, whose job duties included, *inter alia*, preparing food and cleaning and washing dishes.
- 56. During the winter season, November to March, Plaintiff Sanchez only worked Friday through Sunday from 8:00 a.m. until approximately 6:00 p.m.
- 57. During the summer season, April to October, Plaintiff Sanchez worked from 8:00 a.m. until approximately 2:00 a.m. seven (7) days a week. On average, Plaintiff Sanchez worked approximately ninety-eight (98) hours a week.
- 58. Throughout the entirety of his employment, Plaintiff Sanchez was paid \$12.00 an hour, in cash, regardless of the number of hours worked.
- 59. During this time, Plaintiff Sanchez was never paid overtime wages at a rate no less than one and a half (1 ½) times his normal rate of pay for all hours worked in excess of forty (40). For example, during the week of July 18, 2016, Plaintiff worked ninety-six (96) hours, but was only paid \$12.00 an hour for each hour worked.
- 60. Defendants also failed to compensate Plaintiff Sanchez one (1) additional hour of pay, at the basic minimum wage rate for each day the spread of hours he worked exceeded ten (10) hours, throughout the entirety of his employment.
- 61. Each week, Defendants ripped up the accurate timecards Plaintiff Sanchez handwrote to describe his work on behalf of the Defendants and forced him to sign forged and

unauthentic records which fraudulently stated Plaintiff Ortega had worked only forty (40) hours each week.

- 62. Defendants did not have a clock in/out machine or any other recording device to keep account of Plaintiff Sanchez's hours worked.
- 63. Since Plaintiff Sanchez did not receive a paystub or any other documentation evidencing his pay, hours worked or schedule, Defendants failed to comply with the notice and recordkeeping requirements of New York Labor Law § 195. Further, Defendants did not provide Plaintiff Sanchez, at the time of his hire, or anytime thereafter, with written notice, in his primary language, of his rate of pay, the basis thereof, any allowances claimed by the employer, the employer's regular pay day, the name of the employer, the employer's address and the employer's telephone number.
- 64. Upon information and belief, since Plaintiff Sanchez was paid in cash during this time, Defendants fraudulently failed to pay any payroll taxes on Plaintiff Sanchez's wages and failed to make proper contributions to Social Security, Workers' Compensation, Unemployment Insurance, New York Disability Insurance, and Medicare on Plaintiff Sanchez's behalf.
- 65. By employing Plaintiff Sanchez, Defendants had a fiduciary duty to Plaintiff Sanchez. Specifically, Defendants had a fiduciary duty to pay Plaintiff Sanchez proper wages for all work performed for Defendants' benefit and to make proper contributions on Plaintiff's behalf to Social Security, Workers' Compensation, Unemployment Insurance, New York Disability Insurance, and Medicare. Defendants breached their fiduciary duty to Plaintiff Sanchez by failing to make proper contributions on his behalf for the work he performed.
- 66. Plaintiff Sanchez commenced his employment with Defendants with the expectation that proper contributions to Social Security, Workers' Compensation, Unemployment

Insurance, New York Disability Insurance, and Medicare would be made on his behalf. However, throughout the entirety of Plaintiff Sanchez's employment, Defendants failed to make any such contributions.

- 67. In fact, rather than making these contributions, Defendants fraudulently converted the contributions for their own use, excluded Plaintiff Sanchez from the use and enjoyment of them and subjected Plaintiff Sanchez to harm. By converting these contributions, Defendants were unjustly enriched.
- 68. Further, Defendants willfully failed to pay any payroll taxes on Plaintiff Sanchez's wages, thus defrauding the Internal Revenue Service and New York State Department of Taxation, in violation of Federal and State law.
- 69. On or about May 2017, Plaintiff Sanchez severely burned his hand on the job while helping in the kitchen. Since Plaintiff Sanchez was not covered by Workers' Compensation, due to Defendants' failure to make proper contributions, Plaintiff Sanchez was unable to get the medical treatment he needed. Plaintiff Sanchez asked if could have one-week off to heal from the burns, instead Defendants decided to terminate Plaintiff Sanchez.

COLLECTIVE ACTION CLAIMS

- 70. Plaintiffs bring their FLSA claims as a collective action, pursuant to 29 U.S.C. § 216(b) on behalf of all similarly situated non-exempt persons who are or were employed by Defendants within three years from the filing of this Complaint ("FLSA Collective").
- 71. At all relevant times, Plaintiffs and other members of the FLSA Collective, have had substantially similar job requirements and pay provisions.
- 72. At all relevant times, Plaintiffs and other members of the FLSA Collective, have been subject to Defendants' common practices, policies, programs, procedures, protocols and

plans of willfully failing and refusing to pay them proper overtime wages at a rate of at least one and one-half (1 ½) times their regular rate for every hour of work in excess of forty (40) hours per workweek.

- 73. The claims of Plaintiffs stated herein are similar to those of the Defendants' other employees.
- 74. The FLSA Collective is readily identifiable and ascertainable through the use of Defendants' records. The FLSA Collective should be notified of and allowed to opt-in to this action pursuant to 29 U.S.C. § 216(b). Unless the Court promptly issues such a notice, the FLSA Collective, who have been unlawfully deprived of proper overtime wages in violation of the FLSA, will be unable to secure compensation to which they are entitled, and which has been unlawfully withheld by Defendants.

FEDERAL RULES OF CIVIL PROCEDURE RULE 23 CLASS ACTION ALLEGATIONS

- 75. Plaintiffs repeat and reallege each and every allegation in the preceding paragraphs as if set forth fully herein.
- 76. Plaintiffs represent a class ("Rule 23 Class") consisting of all kitchen aides and dishwashers employed by Defendants from 2014 to the date of judgment. Plaintiffs and the members of the proposed class have been subjected to the same unlawful practices
- 77. Plaintiffs bring these claims as a class action pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 23 on behalf of all similarly situated non-exempt employees of Defendants who were: (1) not paid proper overtime wages for all hours worked in excess of forty (40) each workweek; (2) not paid spread of hours pay for all days in which the spread of hours exceeded ten (10); (3) not given proper pay rate notices; and (4) on whose behalf contributions were not made to Federal and State mandated benefit programs.

- 78. Plaintiffs are members of the Class they seek to represent.
- 79. Plaintiffs reserve the right to amend the Class definition based on discovery.

A. Efficiency of Class Prosecution of Class Claims

- 80. Upon information and belief, there are many current and former employees who are similarly situated to Plaintiffs, who have been underpaid in violation of the FLSA and New York Labor Law. The named Plaintiffs are representatives of those workers and are acting on behalf of Defendants' current and former employees' interest as well as their own interest in bringing this action.
- 81. Certification of this class is the most efficient and economical means for resolving questions of law and fact that are common to Plaintiffs and members of the proposed class.
- 82. Plaintiffs' individual claims and their resolution will resolve the common questions of the proposed class.
- 83. Plaintiffs seek remedies to eliminate Defendants' willful violation of the FLSA and to recover overtime wages rightfully earned and due to the members of the proposed class.
- 84. Plaintiffs also seek to eliminate Defendants' unlawful practices which led to the denial of mandated Federal and State benefits of employment and thereby caused Defendants to be unjustly enriched at the expense of Plaintiffs and members of the proposed class.
- 85. Plaintiffs have standing to seek such relief because of the effect Defendants' conduct has had on him individually and on the kitchen aides generally. These injuries are redressable through systemic relief, such as equitable and injunctive relief, as well as other relief as this Court sees fit.
- 86. A class action is superior to other available methods for the fair and efficient adjudication of this litigation, particularly in the context of a wage and hour litigation like the

present action, where individual plaintiffs may lack the financial resources to vigorously prosecute a lawsuit in federal court against a corporate defendant. Class action treatment will permit a large number of similarly situated persons to prosecute their common claims in a single forum simultaneously, efficiently, and without the unnecessary duplication of the efforts and expense that numerous individual actions engender. The adjudication of individual litigation claims would result in a great expenditure of Court and public resources. However, treating the claims as a class action would result in a significant savings of these costs. The members of the Rule 23 Class have been damaged and are entitled to recovery as a result of Defendants' common and uniform policies, practices, and procedures. Although the relative damages suffered by individual Rule 23 Class Members are not *de minimis*, such damages are small compared to the expense and burden of individual prosecution of this litigation. Additionally, class treatment is superior because it will obviate the need for unduly duplicative litigation that might result in inconsistent judgments about Defendants' practices.

B. Numerosity and Impracticability of Joinder

- 87. The proposed Rule 23 Class is so numerous that joinder of all members is impracticable.
- 88. The Rule 23 Class Members are readily ascertainable. For purposes of notice and other purposes related to this action, their names and addresses are readily available from Defendants.
- 89. Unless the Court promptly issues such notice, persons similarly situated to Plaintiffs, who have been unlawfully deprived of minimum and overtime pay in violation of the FLSA and New York Labor Law, will be unable to secure compensation to which they are entitled, and which has been unlawfully withheld from them by the Defendants.

90. Current employees are often afraid to assert their rights out of fear of direct or indirect retaliation. Former employees are fearful of bringing claims because doing so can harm their employment, future employment, and future efforts to secure employment. Class actions provide class members who are not named in the complaint a degree of anonymity which allows for the vindication of their rights while eliminating or reducing those risks.

C. Common Questions of Law and Fact

- 91. The adjudication of Plaintiffs' claims will directly result in the adjudication of numerous questions of law and fact common to the members of the proposed class.
- 92. These common issues include, but are not limited to; (a) whether Defendants unlawfully failed to pay proper overtime compensation for hours worked in excess of forty (40) per week in violation of the FLSA and New York Labor Law; (b) whether Defendants failed to pay spread of hours pay for all days in which the spread of hours exceeded ten (10); (c) whether Defendants failed to provide notice of the pay rate to Plaintiff and the Rule 23 Class; (e) the nature and extent of Rule 23 Class-wide injury and the appropriate measure of damages for the class; and (f) whether Defendants' general practice of failing and/or refusing to pay Plaintiffs and the Rule 23 Class proper compensation was done willfully or with reckless disregard of the federal and state wage and hour laws.
- 93. The policies, procedures, and practices implemented by Defendants were applied to all members of the proposed class.
- 94. The common issues of law and fact affecting the proposed members of the class predominate over any issues affecting Plaintiffs solely.

D. Typicality of Claims and Relief Sought

95. Plaintiffs' claims are typical of the claims of the proposed Rule 23 Class they seek

to represent. Plaintiffs' claims are typical of those claims which could be alleged by any member of the Rule 23 Class, and the relief sought is typical of the relief which would be sought by each member of the proposed class in separate actions.

96. Plaintiffs seek the following relief for their individual claims and for the claims of the members of the proposed class: (1) proper overtime wages for all hours worked in excess of forty (40) hours per week at a rate of one and one-half times his standard rate of pay; (2) unpaid spread of hours pay; (3) an equal amount of liquidated damages; (4) damages for Defendants' failure to provide proper and accurate notice of Plaintiffs' pay rate; and (5) damages for Defendants' failure to make contributions to Federal and State mandated benefit programs.

E. Adequacy of Representation

- 97. Plaintiffs' interests are akin to those of the members of the proposed class.
- 98. Plaintiffs are willing and able to represent the members of the proposed class and will fairly and adequately represent and protect the interest of the Rule 23 Class.
- 99. Plaintiffs retained counsel competent and experienced in complex class actions and in labor and employment litigation for over fifty (50) years. Plaintiffs' counsel can competently litigate the individual and class claims sufficiently to satisfy Rule 23(a)(4) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure.

FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION Failure to Pay Overtime in Violation of the FLSA

- 100. Plaintiffs and the FLSA Collective repeat and reallege each and every allegation in the preceding paragraphs as if set forth fully herein.
- 101. Defendants required Plaintiffs and the FLSA Collective to work in excess of forty (40) hours per week and willfully failed to compensate Plaintiffs and the FLSA Collective for the time worked in excess of forty (40) hours each week at a rate of at least one and one-half times

their regular hourly rate of pay in violation of the FLSA, 29 U.S.C. § 207(a)(1).

- 102. Defendants willfully violated the FLSA by knowingly and intentionally failing to pay Plaintiffs and the FLSA Collective overtime wages.
- 103. Because Defendants' violations of the FLSA have been willful, a three-year statute of limitations applies pursuant to 29 U.S.C. § 255.
- 104. As a result of Defendants' willful and unlawful failure to pay Plaintiffs and the FLSA Collective overtime wages, they are entitled to recover their unpaid overtime wages, liquidated damages, attorneys' fees and costs pursuant to 29 U.S.C. § 216(b).

SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION Failure to Pay Overtime in Violation of New York Labor Law

- 105. Plaintiffs and the Rule 23 Class repeat and reallege each and every allegation in the preceding paragraphs as if set forth fully herein.
- 106. Defendants required Plaintiffs and the Rule 23 Class to work in excess of forty (40) hours per week and willfully failed to compensate Plaintiffs and the Rule 23 Class for the time worked in excess of forty (40) hours each week at a rate of at least one and one-half times their regular hourly rate in violation of New York Labor Law.
- 107. Defendants willfully violated New York Labor Law by knowingly and intentionally failing to pay Plaintiffs and the Rule 23 Class overtime wages. Thus a six (6) year statute of limitations applies.
- 108. Due to Defendants' violation of the New York Labor Law, Plaintiffs and the Rule 23 Class Members are entitled to recover from Defendants their unpaid overtime wages, liquidated damages, reasonable attorneys' fees and costs of this action, and pre-judgment and post-judgment interest.

THIRD CAUSE OF ACTION

Failure to Pay Spread of Hours Pay in Violation of New York Labor Law

- 109. Plaintiffs and the Rule 23 Class repeat and reallege each and every allegation in the preceding paragraphs as if set forth fully herein.
- 110. Defendants willfully failed to pay Plaintiffs and the Rule 23 Class at the basic New York State minimum wage rate, before allowances, for each day they worked in which the spread of hours worked exceeded ten (10) in violation of New York Labor Law.
- 111. Due to Defendants' violations, Plaintiffs and the Rule 23 Class are entitled to recover for each day of his employment, spread of hours pay, plus interest at the statutory compounded rate of 9% per annum, liquidated damages, reasonable attorneys' fees and the costs of this action.

FOURTH CAUSE OF ACTION

Failure to Provide Notice of Pay Rate in Violation of New York Labor Law § 195(1)

- 112. Plaintiffs and the Rule 23 Class repeat and reallege each and every allegation in the preceding paragraphs as if set forth fully herein.
- 113. Defendants failed to provide Plaintiffs and the Rule 23 Class with notice, in English and in their primary language, of their rate of pay, the basis thereof, allowances claimed as part of the minimum wage; the employer's regular pay day, the name, address and telephone number of the employer and other information required by New York Labor Law § 195(1).
- 114. Defendants' violations of the New York Labor Law and its supporting regulations entitle Plaintiffs and the Rule 23 Class Members to recover damages of \$50.00 per work day, up to a maximum of \$5,000 and attorneys' fees and costs.

FIFTH CAUSE OF ACTION

Conversion

115. Plaintiffs and the Rule 23 Class repeat and reallege each and every allegation in the

preceding paragraphs as if set forth fully herein.

- 116. Defendants unlawfully converted benefits and contributions that should have been made to Workers' Compensation, Unemployment Insurance, New York Disability Insurance, and Medicare on Plaintiffs and the Rule 23 Class' behalf.
- 117. Defendants intentionally, purposely and fraudulently converted these funds for their own benefit.
- 118. Defendants intended to fraudulently convert these contributions for the purpose of exploitation for their own financial benefit and, in essence, to steal Plaintiffs and the Rule 23 Class' money.
- 119. Defendants interfered with Plaintiffs and the Rule 23 Class' right to these contributions, and continue to possess these funds to this day.
- 120. Plaintiffs and the Rule 23 Class are entitled to recover from Defendants his actual, compensatory, expectation, and punitive damages in an amount to be determined at trial, but in any event, no less than \$1,000,000.

SIXTH CAUSE OF ACTION Fraud

- 121. Plaintiffs and the Rule 23 Class repeat and reallege each and every allegation in the preceding paragraphs as if set forth fully herein.
- 122. Defendants fraudulently and intentionally withheld benefits and contributions to Workers' Compensation, Unemployment Insurance, New York Disability Insurance, and Medicare, which should have been made on Plaintiffs and the Rule 23 Class' behalf.
- 123. Defendants intended to fraudulently withhold these contributions for the purpose of exploitation for their own financial benefit and, in essence, to steal Plaintiffs and the Rule 23 Class' money.

- 124. Plaintiffs and the Rule 23 Class justifiably relied on Defendants, as their employer, that proper contributions would be made to Workers' Compensation, Unemployment Insurance, New York Disability Insurance, and Medicare on their behalf.
- 125. Upon information and belief, Defendants represented to Plaintiffs and the Rule 23 Class that these contributions would be made on their behalf for all hours worked. As a result of Defendants' misrepresentations, Plaintiffs and the Rule 23 Class suffered financially.
- 126. As a result of Defendants' actions, Plaintiffs and the Rule 23 Class are entitled to recover from Defendants their actual, compensatory, expectation, and punitive damages in an amount to be determined at trial, but in any event, no less than \$1,000,000.

SEVENTH CAUSE OF ACTION Breach of Fiduciary Duty

- 127. Plaintiffs and the Rule 23 Class repeat and reallege each and every allegation in the preceding paragraphs as if set forth fully herein.
- 128. Defendants had a fiduciary duty to Plaintiffs and the Rule 23 Class as their employer to ensure that proper contributions were made to Workers' Compensation, Unemployment Insurance, New York Disability Insurance, and Medicare.
- 129. Defendants breached its duty to Plaintiffs and the Rule 23 Class when it failed to make such contributions.
- 130. Due to Defendants' breach, Plaintiffs and the Rule 23 Class suffered actual damages, including but not limited to, not having contributions made to Workers' Compensation, Unemployment Insurance, New York Disability Insurance, and Medicare.
- 131. As a result of Defendants' actions, Plaintiffs and the Rule 23 Class are entitled to recover from Defendants his actual, compensatory, expectation, and punitive damages in an amount to be determined at trial, but in any event, no less than \$1,000,000.

EIGHTH CAUSE OF ACTION Unjust Enrichment

- 132. Plaintiffs and the Rule 23 Class repeat and reallege each and every allegation in the preceding paragraphs as if set forth fully herein.
- 133. Defendants retained benefits, property, and monetary value by paying Plaintiffs and the Rule 23 Class in cash and retaining payments which should have been contributed toward Workers' Compensation, Unemployment Insurance, New York Disability Insurance, and Medicare. thereby denying Plaintiffs and the Rule 23 Class the benefits associated with these programs.
- 134. As a result of Defendants' actions, Plaintiffs and the Rule 23 Class are entitled to recover from Defendants his actual, compensatory, expectation, and punitive damages in an amount to be determined at trial, but in any event, no less than \$1,000,000.

NINTH CAUSE OF ACTION PUNITIVE DAMAGES

- 135. Plaintiffs, Collective Action members and the Rule 23 Class repeat and reallege each and every allegation in the preceding paragraphs as if set forth fully herein.
- 136. Defendants have engaged in unlawful fraudulent payroll practices over the last six(6) years.
- 137. Defendants have willfully defrauded dozens of employees out of proper overtime and spread of hours wages and fraudulently withheld payroll taxes and benefits that should have been contributed to governmental municipalities, including, but not limited to, the Internal Revenue Service, the New York State Department of Taxation, and the Social Security Administration.
 - 138. These actions were committed with malicious intent and are the exact acts that

punitive damages are appropriate for, in an effort to deter Defendants from committing such fraudulent acts in the future.

139. As a result of these actions, Plaintiffs, Collective Action members and the Rule 23 Class are entitled to punitive damages, in an amount to be determined at trial, but in any event, no less than \$5,000,000.

PRAYER FOR RELIEF

WHEREFORE, Plaintiffs, individually and on behalf of all similarly situated Collective Action members and Rule 23 Class members, respectfully request that this Court grant the following relief:

- (i) Unpaid wages, spread of hours pay, unpaid overtime wages, front pay, back pay and an additional and equal amount as liquidated damages, plus interest at the statutory compounded rate of 9% per annum pursuant to New York Labor Law;
- (ii) Actual, compensatory and expectational damages suffered, due to Defendants' failure to make proper contributions to: Workers' Compensation, Unemployment Insurance, New York Disability Insurance, and Medicare;
- (iii) Declaring Defendants willfully, intentionally and fraudulently converted funds that should have been contributed to Workers' Compensation, Unemployment Insurance, New York Disability Insurance, and Medicare.;
- (iv) Provide a permanent injunction enjoining Defendants, its agents, employees, officers and successors in interest and those acting in concert with Defendants, from engaging in the illegal and unlawful customs, policies and practices described herein;
- (v) Damages in the amount of \$5,000.00 for each Rule 23 Class Member for Defendants' violations of New York Labor Law § 195;
- (vi) Punitive damages for violating the aforementioned statutes, in an amount no less than \$5,000,000.00;

- (vii) Compensatory damages for emotional distress and mental anguish, in an amount to be determined at trial
- (viii) All recoverable attorneys' fees and costs incurred in prosecuting these claims; and
 - (ix) Such other relief as this Court deems just and proper.

Dated: Farmingdale, New York October 24, 2017 FRANK & ASSOCIATES, P.C.

Neutro Front

By:

Neil M. Frank, Esq. 500 Bi-County Blyd St

500 Bi-County Blvd., Suite 465 Farmingdale, New York 11735

T: (631) 756-0400 F: (631) 756-0547

E: nfrank@laborlaws.com

Attorneys for Plaintiffs

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.)

I. (a) PLAINTIFFS Jahn Ortega, Widman Sanchez, and Felipe Estevez, on behalf of themselves and all others similarly situated				DEFENDANTS Bracco's Clam & C Michael Bracco, Jo					
(b) County of Residence of First Listed Plaintiff Nassau County (EXCEPT IN U.S. PLAINTIFF CASES)				County of Residence NOTE: IN LAND CO THE TRACT	(IN U.S. PL	d Defendant AINTIFF CASES O N CASES, USE TI VOLVED.	•	OF	
(c) Attorneys (Firm Name, A Frank & Associates, P.C. 500 Bi-County Boulevard (631) 756-0400	•		35	Attorneys (If Known)					
II. BASIS OF JURISDI	ICTION (Place an "X" in C	ne Box Only)	III. CI	TIZENSHIP OF P	RINCIPA	L PARTIES	(Place an "X" in	One Box fo	or Plaintiff
U.S. Government	3 Federal Question (U.S. Government)	Not a Party)		(For Diversity Cases Only) PT en of This State	_	Incorporated or Pri		or Defenda PTF 4	nt) DEF
☐ 2 U.S. Government Defendant	☐ 4 Diversity (Indicate Citizensh	ip of Parties in Item III)				Incorporated and P of Business In A		0 5	□ 5
				en or Subject of a reign Country	3 🗇 3	Foreign Nation		□ 6	
IV. NATURE OF SUIT						here for: Nature o			
CONTRACT 110 Insurance 120 Marine 130 Miller Act 140 Negotiable Instrument	PERSONAL INJURY ☐ 310 Airplane ☐ 315 Airplane Product Liability	PERSONAL INJUR 365 Personal Injury - Product Liability 367 Health Care/	Y 62	5 Drug Related Seizure of Property 21 USC 881 0 Other	☐ 422 Appea ☐ 423 Withd		☐ 375 False Cla ☐ 376 Qui Tam	aims Act 1 (31 USC)	-
☐ 150 Recovery of Overpayment & Enforcement of Judgment ☐ 151 Medicare Act ☐ 152 Recovery of Defaulted Student Loans (Excludes Veterans)	☐ 320 Assault, Libel & Slander ☐ 330 Federal Employers' Liability ☐ 340 Marine ☐ 345 Marine Product	Pharmaceutical Personal Injury Product Liability 368 Asbestos Personal Injury Product Liability	I		☐ 820 Copyr ☐ 830 Patent ☐ 835 Patent	- Abbreviated Orug Application	☐ 410 Antitrust☐ 430 Banks an☐ 450 Commer☐ 460 Deportat☐ 470 Racketee☐ Commen Commen €	nd Banking rce tion	ed and
☐ 153 Recovery of Overpayment of Veteran's Benefits ☐ 160 Stockholders' Suits ☐ 190 Other Contract ☐ 195 Contract Product Liability ☐ 196 Franchise	Liability 350 Motor Vehicle 355 Motor Vehicle Product Liability 360 Other Personal Injury 362 Personal Injury -	PERSONAL PROPER 370 Other Fraud 371 Truth in Lending 380 Other Personal Property Damage 385 Property Damage Product Liability	Ø 710 □ 720 □ 740	LABOR 0 Fair Labor Standards Act 0 Labor/Management Relations 0 Railway Labor Act 1 Family and Medical	SOCIAL: 861 HIA (862 Black	SECURITY 1395ff) Lung (923) C/DIWW (405(g)) Title XVI	480 Consumo 490 Cable/Sa 550 Securitie Exchang 890 Other St 581 Agricult	er Credit at TV es/Commod ge atutory Ac ural Acts nental Matt	dities/ tions
REAU PROPERTY	Medical Malpractice	PRISONER PETITION	NS 79	Leave Act O Other Labor Litigation	FEDERA	L TAX-SUITS	□ 895 Freedom Act	of Inform	ation
☐ 210 Land Condemnation ☐ 220 Foreclosure ☐ 230 Rent Lease & Ejectment ☐ 240 Torts to Land ☐ 245 Tort Product Liability ☐ 290 All Other Real Property	☐ 440 Other Civil Rights ☐ 441 Voting ☐ 442 Employment ☐ 443 Housing/ Accommodations ☐ 445 Amer. w/Disabilities -	Habeas Corpus: 463 Alien Detainee 510 Motions to Vacate Sentence 530 General 535 Death Penalty Other:	o 79	1 Employce Retirement Income Security Act IMMIGRATION	☐ 870 Taxes or De: ☐ 871 IRS— 26 US	(U.S. Plaintiff fendant)	☐ 896 Arbitration	trative Pro- iew or App Decision tionality of	eal of
	Employment 446 Amer. w/Disabilities - Other 448 Education			2 Naturalization Application 5 Other Immigration Actions					
		Remanded from (Appellate Court	□ 4 Reins Reop		erred from er District	☐ 6 Multidistr Litigation Transfer	l -	Multidist Litigation Direct Fil	n -
VI. CAUSE OF ACTIO	120115 (0.8.2017	et seq.	re filing (D	o not cite jurisdictional state	tutes unless div	ersity):	.,		
VII. REQUESTED IN COMPLAINT:		IS A CLASS ACTION		EMAND \$ 5,000,000.00		HECK YES only JRY DEMAND:		complain	nt:
VIII. RELATED CASE IF ANY	E(S) (See instructions):	JUDGE				NUMBER			
DATE 10/24/2017		SIGNATURE OF AT	TORNEY O	FRECORD Ne	tres.	Fred			
FOR OFFICE USE ONLY RECEIPT # AM	MOUNT	APPLYING IFP		JUDGE		MAG. JUD	OGE		

exclusiv	e of intere	CERTIFICATION OF ARBITRATION ELIGIBILITY Rule 83.10 provides that with certain exceptions, actions seeking money damages only in an amount not in excess of \$150,000, est and costs, are eligible for compulsory arbitration. The amount of damages is presumed to be below the threshold amount unless a contrary is filed.
I, <u>Neil M</u> ineligi	1. Frank, Esq ble for c	, counsel for Plaintiffs , do hereby certify that the above captioned civil action is ompulsory arbitration for the following reason(s):
	X	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:
N/A		
		RELATED CASE STATEMENT (Section VIII on the Front of this Form)
provide because same ju case: (A	s that "A contact the cases dge and many involves	s 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) sivil case is "related" to another civil case for purposes of this guideline when, because of the similarity of facts and legal issues or arise from the same transactions or events, a substantial saving of judicial resources is likely to result from assigning both cases to the agistrate judge." Rule 50.3.1 (b) provides that "A civil case shall not be deemed "related" to another civil case merely because the civil identical legal issues, or (B) involves the same parties." Rule 50.3.1 (c) further provides that "Presumptively, and subject to the power mine otherwise pursuant to paragraph (d), civil cases shall not be deemed to be "related" unless both cases are still pending before the
		NY-E DIVISION OF BUSINESS RULE 50.1(d)(2)
1.)		ivil action being filed in the Eastern District removed from a New York State Court located in Nassau or Suffolk
2.)		answered "no" above: the events or omissions giving rise to the claim or claims, or a substantial part thereof, occur in Nassau or Suffolk ? YES
	b) Did Distric	the events or omissions giving rise to the claim or claims, or a substantial part thereof, occur in the Eastern
Suffoll	answer to County, folk Coun	o question 2 (b) is "No," does the defendant (or a majority of the defendants, if there is more than one) reside in Nassau or or, in an interpleader action, does the claimant (or a majority of the claimants, if there is more than one) reside in Nassau ty? N/A
0. 04		Note: A corporation shall be considered a resident of the County in which it has the most significant contacts).
		BAR ADMISSION
I am cı	ırrently a	dmitted in the Eastern District of New York and currently a member in good standing of the bar of this court. Yes No

No

I certify the accuracy of all information provided above.

Yes

Nestro Front

Are you currently the subject of any disciplinary action (s) in this or any other state or federal court? (If yes, please explain)

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

for the

	or the
Eastern Distri	ct of New York
Jann Ortega, Widman Sanchez, and Felipe Estevez, on behalf of themselves and all others similarly situated Plaintiff(s) V. Bracco's Clam & Oyster Bar, Inc. d/b/a Bracco's Clam & Oyster Bar, Michael Bracco, Jonathan Bracco, Robert Bracco, and Gerard Bracco)))) Civil Action No. 17-cv-6189)))
* **	A CIVIL ACTION
SUMMONS IN	A CIVIL ACTION
To: (Defendant's name and address) Bracco's Clam & Oyster Bacco's	ar, Inc. d/b/a Bracco's Clam & Oyster Bar of State
A lawsuit has been filed against you.	
are the United States or a United States agency, or an offic	ou (not counting the day you received it) — or 60 days if you er or employee of the United States described in Fed. R. Civ. swer to the attached complaint or a motion under Rule 12 of on must be served on the plaintiff or plaintiff's attorney,
Frank & Associates, P.C. 500 Bi-County Boulevard, Farmingdale, New York 11	
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
	, y

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

Civil Action No. 17-cv-6189

PROOF OF SERVICE

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

was re	ceived by me on (date)	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·			
	☐ I personally served	the summons on the individual at	(place)		
			on (date)	; or	
	☐ I left the summons	at the individual's residence or us	aual place of abode with (name)		
		, a person	of suitable age and discretion who res	sides there,	
	on (date)	, and mailed a copy to th	ne individual's last known address; or		
	☐ I served the summo	ns on (name of individual)		, who) is
	designated by law to a	accept service of process on behal	f of (name of organization)		
			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 \$	0.00	
	I declare under penalty	of perjury that this information i	s true.		
Date:	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·			,	
			Server's signature		
			Printed name and title		_
			Server's address		

Additional information regarding attempted service, etc:

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

for the

10.	
Eastern Distric	t of New York
Jann Ortega, Widman Sanchez, and Felipe Estevez, on behalf of themselves and all others similarly situated)))
Plaintiff(s))
v.	Civil Action No. 17-cv-6189
Bracco's Clam & Oyster Bar, Inc. d/b/a Bracco's Clam & Oyster Bar, Michael Bracco, Jonathan Bracco, Robert Bracco, and Gerard Bracco)))
Defendant(s)	,)
SUMMONS IN A	A CIVIL ACTION
Tot (Defendants were and address)	
To: (Defendant's name and address) Michael Bracco 319 Woodcleft Avenue Freeport, New York 11520	
	ou (not counting the day you received it) — or 60 days if you r or employee of the United States described in Fed. R. Civ. wer to the attached complaint or a motion under Rule 12 of a must be served on the plaintiff or plaintiff's attorney,
Frank & Associates, P.C. 500 Bi-County Boulevard, S Farmingdale, New York 117	
If you fail to respond, judgment by default will be early 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. 17-cv-6189

PROOF OF SERVICE

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

of individual and title, if any)		
· ·		
he summons on the individual at	(place)	
	on (date)	; or
t the individual's residence or us	ual place of abode with (name)	
, a person	of suitable age and discretion who res	ides there,
, and mailed a copy to th	e individual's last known address; or	
is on (name of individual)		, who is
ccept service of process on behal	f of (name of organization)	
	on (date)	; or
ons unexecuted because		; or
for travel and \$	for services, for a total of \$	0.00
of perjury that this information is	s true.	
	Server's signature	
	Printed name and title	
	the summons on the individual at the individual's residence or us , a person , and mailed a copy to the son (name of individual) except service of process on behaltons unexecuted because	the summons on the individual at (place) on (date) the individual's residence or usual place of abode with (name) , a person of suitable age and discretion who res , and mailed a copy to the individual's last known address; or son (name of individual) cept service of process on behalf of (name of organization) on (date) for travel and \$ for services, for a total of \$ of perjury that this information is true. Server's signature

Additional information regarding attempted service, etc:

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

for the

Eastern I	District of New York
Jann Ortega, Widman Sanchez, and Felipe Estevez, on behalf of themselves and all others similarly situated)))
Plaintiff(s))
v.	Civil Action No. 17-cv-6189
Bracco's Clam & Oyster Bar, Inc. d/b/a Bracco's Clam & Oyster Bar, Michael Bracco, Jonathan Bracco, Robert Bracco, and Gerard Bracco)))
Defendant(s)	_
SUMMON	S IN A CIVIL ACTION
To: (Defendant's name and address)	
Jonathan Bracco	
319 Woodcleft Avenu	
Freeport, New York 1	1520
A lawsuit has been filed against you.	
are the United States or a United States agency, or an P. 12 (a)(2) or (3) — you must serve on the plaintiff a	on you (not counting the day you received it) — or 60 days if you officer or employee of the United States described in Fed. R. Civ. an answer to the attached complaint or a motion under Rule 12 of motion must be served on the plaintiff or plaintiff's attorney,
Frank & Associates, F 500 Bi-County Boulev Farmingdale, New Yo	vard, Suite 465
If you fail to respond, judgment by default we You also must file your answer or motion with the co	ill be entered against you for the relief demanded in the complaint.
	DOUGLAS C. PALMER CLERK OF COURT
Date:	
	Signature of Clerk or Deputy Clerk

Civil Action No. 17-cv-6189

PROOF OF SERVICE

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

This summons for (na	ame of individual and title, if any)		
eceived by me on (date)	• •		
☐ I personally serve	d the summons on the individual at	(place)	
		on (date)	; or
☐ I left the summons	s at the individual's residence or us	ual place of abode with (name)	•
	, a person	of suitable age and discretion who res	ides there,
on (date)	, and mailed a copy to the	ne individual's last known address; or	
☐ I served the summ	ons on (name of individual)		, who is
designated by law to	accept service of process on behal	f of (name of organization)	
	., ,	on (date)	; or
☐ I returned the sum	mons unexecuted because		; or
Other (specify):			
My fees are \$	for travel and \$	for services, for a total of \$	0.00
I declare under penal	ty of perjury that this information is	s true.	
		Server's signature	
		Printed name and title	
	.	Server's address	

Additional information regarding attempted service, etc:

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

	for the
Eastern Distr	rict of New York
Jann Ortega, Widman Sanchez, and Felipe Estevez, on behalf of themselves and all others similarly situated Plaintiff(s) v. Bracco's Clam & Oyster Bar, Inc. d/b/a Bracco's Clam & Oyster Bar, Michael Bracco, Jonathan Bracco, Robert Bracco, and Gerard Bracco))))) Civil Action No. 17-cv-6189)))
SUMMONS II	N A CIVIL ACTION
To: (Defendant's name and address) Robert Bracco 319 Woodcleft Avenue Freeport, New York 1152	20
A lawsuit has been filed against you.	
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 icer or employee of the United States described in Fed. R. Civ. nswer to the attached complaint or a motion under Rule 12 of tion must be served on the plaintiff or plaintiff's attorney,
Frank & Associates, P.Ç. 500 Bi-County Boulevard Farmingdale, New York 1	, Suite 465
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. 17-cv-6189

PROOF OF SERVICE

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

	This summons for (nan	ne of individual and title, if any)		
was re	ceived by me on (date)		- ·	
	☐ I personally served	the summons on the indivi	dual at (place)	
			on (date)	; or
	☐ I left the summons	at the individual's residence	e or usual place of abode with (name)	
		, a	person of suitable age and discretion w	ho resides there,
	on (date)	, and mailed a cop	by to the individual's last known addre	ss; or
	☐ I served the summo	ns on (name of individual)		, who is
	designated by law to a	accept service of process or	n behalf of (name of organization)	
			on (date)	; or
	☐ I returned the summ	nons unexecuted because		; or
	Other (specify):			
	My fees are \$	for travel and \$	for services, for a total	of \$
	I declare under penalty	of perjury that this inform	action is true.	
Date:			Server's signature	
			server's signature	
			Printed name and title	
			Server's address	

Additional information regarding attempted service, etc:

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

for the

	for the
Eastern Distr	ict of New York
Jann Ortega, Widman Sanchez, and Felipe Estevez, on behalf of themselves and all others similarly situated)))
Plaintiff(s)	
v.	Civil Action No. 17-cv-6189
Bracco's Clam & Oyster Bar, Inc. d/b/a Bracco's Clam & Oyster Bar, Michael Bracco, Jonathan Bracco, Robert Bracco, and Gerard Bracco)))
Defendant(s)	j
SUMMONS IN	A CIVIL ACTION
00.2.2.2.4.1.0	-
To: (Defendant's name and address) Gerard Bracco 319 Woodcleft Avenue Freeport, New York 11520	0
A lawsuit has been filed against you.	
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 on must be served on the plaintiff or plaintiff's attorney,
Frank & Associates, P.C. 500 Bi-County Boulevard, Farmingdale, New York 1	
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)

Additional information regarding attempted service, etc:

Civil Action No. 17-cv-6189

PROOF OF SERVICE

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

	This summons for (nam	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)	; or
	☐ I left the summons at the individual's residence or usual place of abode with (name)			
	, a person of suitable age and discretion who resides there,			
	on (date) , and mailed a copy to the individual's last known address; or			
	☐ I served the summo	ons on (name of individual)		, who is
	designated by law to accept service of process on behalf of (name of organization)			
			on (date)	; or
	☐ I returned the sumn	nons unexecuted because	eservició e e en el como de eservició de el como de el	; or
	Other (specify):			
	My fees are \$	for travel and \$	for services, for a total of \$	0.00
	I declare under penalty	of perjury that this information	ı is true.	
Date:	 		Server's signature	-
			Printed name and title	
			Server's address	

ClassAction.org

This complaint is part of ClassAction.org's searchable class action lawsuit database and can be found in this post: <u>Bracco's Clam & Oyster Bar Hit with Wage and Hour Lawsuit</u>