

**CV 16-6269**

FILED  
CLERK

Helen F. Dalton & Associates, P.C.  
Roman Avshalumov (RA 5508)  
69-12 Austin Street  
Forest Hills, NY 11375  
Telephone: 718-263-9591

2016 NOV 10 PM 4:35

U.S. DISTRICT COURT  
EASTERN DISTRICT  
OF NEW YORK

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
EASTERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK

-----X  
JOSE PINTOR and NELSON HIDALGO, individually and on  
behalf of all others similarly situated,

**COLLECTIVE ACTION  
COMPLAINT**

Plaintiff,

JURY TRIAL  
DEMANDED

-against-

PARK KING AT JFK, LLC, PARK KING AT JFK II, INC.,  
PARK KING AT JFK III, INC., and TONY MICCICHE and  
KRISTEN SWABY, as individuals,

**CHEN, J.**

Defendants.

**KUO, M.J.**

-----X  
Plaintiffs, **JOSE PINTOR and NELSON HIDALGO, individually and on behalf of all others  
similarly situated**, (hereinafter referred to as "Plaintiffs"), by their attorneys at Helen F. Dalton  
& Associates, P.C., alleges, upon personal knowledge as to themselves and upon information and  
belief as to other matters, as follows:

**PRELIMINARY STATEMENT**

1. Plaintiffs, **JOSE PINTOR and NELSON HIDALGO, individually and on behalf of  
all others similarly situated**, through undersigned counsel, bring this action against  
**PARK KING AT JFK, LLC, PARK KING AT JFK II, INC., PARK KING AT  
JFK III, INC., and TONY MICCICHE and KRISTEN SWABY, as individuals**,  
(hereinafter referred to as "Defendants"), to recover damages for egregious violations  
of federal and state overtime laws and unpaid wages arising out of Plaintiffs'  
employment by Defendants at **PARK KING JFK** located at 249-15 Rockaway  
Boulevard, Rosedale, New York 11417.

2. Plaintiff **JOSE PINTOR** was employed by Defendants at **PARK KING JFK** located at 249-15 Rockaway Boulevard, Rosedale, New York 11417 as a parking attendant and driver and performing other miscellaneous duties from on or around May 1, 2016 until on or around August 3, 2016.
3. Plaintiff **NELSON HIDALGO** was employed by Defendants at **PARK KING JFK** located at 249-15 Rockaway Boulevard, Rosedale, New York 11417 as a parking attendant and driver and performing other miscellaneous duties from on or around January 6, 2016 until on or around July 20, 2016.

### **JURISDICTION AND VENUE**

4. This Court has subject matter jurisdiction over Plaintiffs' federal claims pursuant to the FLSA, 29 U.S.C. §216 and 28 U.S.C. §1331.
5. This Court has supplemental jurisdiction over Plaintiff's state law claims pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §1367.
6. Venue is proper in the EASTERN District of New York pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §1391(b) because a substantial part of the events or omissions giving rise to the claims occurred in this district.
7. This Court is empowered to issue a declaratory judgment pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §§2201 & 2202.

### **THE PARTIES**

8. Plaintiff, **JOSE PINTOR**, residing at 104-34 89<sup>th</sup> Avenue, Richmond Hill, New York 11418, was employed by Defendants from on or around May 1, 2016 until on or around August 3, 2016.
9. Plaintiff, **NELSON HIDALGO**, residing at 2224 79<sup>th</sup> Street, East Elmhurst, New York 11370, was employed by Defendants from on or around January 6, 2016 until on or around July 20, 2016.
10. Upon information and belief, Defendant, **PARK KING AT JFK, LLC**, is a corporation organized under the laws of New York with a principal executive office at 249-15 Rockaway Boulevard, Rosedale, New York 11417.

11. Upon information and belief, Defendant, PARK KING AT JFK, LLC, is a corporation authorized to do business under the laws of New York.
12. Upon information and belief, Defendant TONY MICCICHE owns and/or operates PARK KING AT JFK, LLC.
13. Upon information and belief, Defendant TONY MICCICHE manages PARK KING AT JFK, LLC.
14. Upon information and belief, Defendant TONY MICCICHE is the Chairman of the Board of PARK KING AT JFK, LLC.
15. Upon information and belief, Defendant TONY MICCICHE is the Chief Executive Officer of PARK KING AT JFK, LLC.
16. Upon information and belief, Defendant TONY MICCICHE is an agent of PARK KING AT JFK, LLC.
17. Upon information and belief, Defendant TONY MICCICHE has power over personnel decisions at PARK KING AT JFK, LLC.
18. Upon information and belief, Defendant TONY MICCICHE has power over payroll decisions at PARK KING AT JFK, LLC.
19. Defendant TONY MICCICHE has the power to hire and fire employees at PARK KING AT JFK, LLC., establish and pay their wages, set their work schedule, and maintains their employment records.
20. Upon information and belief, Defendant KRISTEN SWABY owns and/or operates PARK KING AT JFK, LLC.
21. Upon information and belief, Defendant KRISTEN SWABY manages PARK KING AT JFK, LLC.
22. Upon information and belief, Defendant KRISTEN SWABY is the Chairman of the Board of PARK KING AT JFK, LLC.
23. Upon information and belief, Defendant KRISTEN SWABY is the Chief Executive Officer of PARK KING AT JFK, LLC.
24. Upon information and belief, Defendant KRISTEN SWABY is an agent of PARK KING AT JFK, LLC.
25. Upon information and belief, Defendant KRISTEN SWABY has power over personnel decisions at PARK KING AT JFK, LLC.

26. Upon information and belief, Defendant KRISTEN SWABY has power over payroll decisions at PARK KING AT JFK, LLC.
27. Defendant KRISTEN SWABY has the power to hire and fire employees at PARK KING AT JFK, LLC., establish and pay their wages, set their work schedule, and maintains their employment records.
28. Upon information and belief, Defendant, PARK KING AT JFK II, INC., is a corporation organized under the laws of New York with a principal executive office at 249-15 Rockaway Boulevard, Rosedale, New York 11417.
29. Upon information and belief, Defendant, PARK KING AT JFK II, INC., is a corporation authorized to do business under the laws of New York.
30. Upon information and belief, Defendant TONY MICCICHE owns and/or operates PARK KING AT JFK II, INC.
31. Upon information and belief, Defendant TONY MICCICHE manages PARK KING AT JFK II, INC.
32. Upon information and belief, Defendant TONY MICCICHE is the Chairman of the Board of PARK KING AT JFK II, INC.
33. Upon information and belief, Defendant TONY MICCICHE is the Chief Executive Officer of PARK KING AT JFK II, INC.
34. Upon information and belief, Defendant TONY MICCICHE is an agent of PARK KING AT JFK II, INC.
35. Upon information and belief, Defendant TONY MICCICHE has power over personnel decisions at PARK KING AT JFK II, INC.
36. Upon information and belief, Defendant TONY MICCICHE has power over payroll decisions at PARK KING AT JFK II, INC.
37. Defendant TONY MICCICHE has the power to hire and fire employees at PARK KING AT JFK II, INC., establish and pay their wages, set their work schedule, and maintains their employment records.
38. Upon information and belief, Defendant KRISTEN SWABY owns and/or operates PARK KING AT JFK II, INC.
39. Upon information and belief, Defendant KRISTEN SWABY manages PARK KING AT JFK II, INC.

40. Upon information and belief, Defendant KRISTEN SWABY is the Chairman of the Board of PARK KING AT JFK II, INC.
41. Upon information and belief, Defendant KRISTEN SWABY is the Chief Executive Officer of PARK KING AT JFK II, INC.
42. Upon information and belief, Defendant KRISTEN SWABY is an agent of PARK KING AT JFK II, INC.
43. Upon information and belief, Defendant KRISTEN SWABY has power over personnel decisions at PARK KING AT JFK II, INC.
44. Upon information and belief, Defendant KRISTEN SWABY has power over payroll decisions at PARK KING AT JFK II, INC.
45. Defendant KRISTEN SWABY has the power to hire and fire employees at PARK KING AT JFK II, INC., establish and pay their wages, set their work schedule, and maintains their employment records.
46. Upon information and belief, Defendant, PARK KING AT JFK III, INC., is a corporation organized under the laws of New York with a principal executive office at 249-15 Rockaway Boulevard, Rosedale, New York 11417.
47. Upon information and belief, Defendant, PARK KING AT JFK III, INC., is a corporation authorized to do business under the laws of New York.
48. Upon information and belief, Defendant TONY MICCICHE owns and/or operates PARK KING AT JFK III, INC.
49. Upon information and belief, Defendant TONY MICCICHE manages PARK KING AT JFK III, INC.
50. Upon information and belief, Defendant TONY MICCICHE is the Chairman of the Board of PARK KING AT JFK III, INC.
51. Upon information and belief, Defendant TONY MICCICHE is the Chief Executive Officer of PARK KING AT JFK III, INC.
52. Upon information and belief, Defendant TONY MICCICHE is an agent of PARK KING AT JFK III, INC.
53. Upon information and belief, Defendant TONY MICCICHE has power over personnel decisions at PARK KING AT JFK III, INC.

54. Upon information and belief, Defendant TONY MICCICHE has power over payroll decisions at PARK KING AT JFK III, INC.
55. Defendant TONY MICCICHE has the power to hire and fire employees at PARK KING AT JFK III, INC., establish and pay their wages, set their work schedule, and maintains their employment records.
56. Upon information and belief, Defendant KRISTEN SWABY owns and/or operates PARK KING AT JFK III, INC.
57. Upon information and belief, Defendant KRISTEN SWABY manages PARK KING AT JFK III, INC.
58. Upon information and belief, Defendant KRISTEN SWABY is the Chairman of the Board of PARK KING AT JFK III, INC.
59. Upon information and belief, Defendant KRISTEN SWABY is the Chief Executive Officer of PARK KING AT JFK III, INC.
60. Upon information and belief, Defendant KRISTEN SWABY is an agent of PARK KING AT JFK III, INC.
61. Upon information and belief, Defendant KRISTEN SWABY has power over personnel decisions at PARK KING AT JFK III, INC.
62. Upon information and belief, Defendant KRISTEN SWABY has power over payroll decisions at PARK KING AT JFK III, INC.
63. Defendant KRISTEN SWABY has the power to hire and fire employees at PARK KING AT JFK III, INC., establish and pay their wages, set their work schedule, and maintains their employment records.
64. During all relevant times herein, Defendant TONY MICCICHE was Plaintiffs' employer within the meaning of the FLSA and NYLL.
65. During all relevant times herein, Defendant KRISTEN SWABY was Plaintiffs' employer within the meaning of the FLSA and NYLL.
66. On information and belief, PARK KING AT JFK, LLC. is, at present and has been at all times relevant to the allegation in the complaint, an enterprise engaged in interstate commerce within the meaning of the FLSA in that the entity (i) has had employees engaged in commerce or in the production of goods for commerce, and handle, sell or otherwise work on goods or material that have been moved in or produced for

commerce by any person: and (ii) has had an annual gross volume of sales of not less than \$500,000.00.

67. On information and belief, PARK KING AT JFK II, INC. is, at present and has been at all times relevant to the allegation in the complaint, an enterprise engaged in interstate commerce within the meaning of the FLSA in that the entity (i) has had employees engaged in commerce or in the production of goods for commerce, and handle, sell or otherwise work on goods or material that have been moved in or produced for commerce by any person: and (ii) has had an annual gross volume of sales of not less than \$500,000.00.
68. On information and belief, PARK KING AT JFK III, INC., is, at present and has been at all times relevant to the allegation in the complaint, an enterprise engaged in interstate commerce within the meaning of the FLSA in that the entity (i) has had employees engaged in commerce or in the production of goods for commerce, and handle, sell or otherwise work on goods or material that have been moved in or produced for commerce by any person: and (ii) has had an annual gross volume of sales of not less than \$500,000.00.

#### **FACTUAL ALLEGATIONS**

69. Plaintiff **JOSE PINTOR** was employed by Defendants from on or around May 1, 2016 until on or around August 3, 2016.
70. Plaintiff **JOSE PINTOR** was employed by Defendants at 249-15 Rockaway Boulevard, Rosedale, New York 11417 as a parking attendant and driver and performing other miscellaneous duties.
71. Upon information and belief, Plaintiff **JOSE PINTOR** worked approximately 72 (seventy-two) hours or more per week from on or around May 1, 2016 until on or around August 3, 2016.
72. Upon information and belief, Plaintiff **JOSE PINTOR** was paid by Defendants approximately \$720.00 per week from on or around May 1, 2016 until on or around August 3, 2016.
73. Although Plaintiff **JOSE PINTOR** worked approximately 72 (seventy-two) hours or more per week during the period of his employment by Defendants, Defendants did

not pay Plaintiff time and a half (1.5) for hours worked over forty (40), a blatant violation of the overtime provisions contained in the FLSA and NYLL.

74. Plaintiff **JOSE PINTOR** is also owed payment for his first and last weeks of work during his employment with Defendants, for which he was not compensated.
75. Plaintiff **NELSON HIDALGO** was employed by Defendants from on or around January 6, 2016 until on or around August 20, 2016.
76. Plaintiff **NELSON HIDALGO** was employed by Defendants at 249-15 Rockaway Boulevard, Rosedale, New York 11417 as a parking attendant and driver and performing other miscellaneous duties.
77. Upon information and belief, Plaintiff **NELSON HIDALGO** worked approximately 55 (fifty-five) hours or more per week from on or around January 6, 2016 until on or around August 20, 2016.
78. Upon information and belief, Plaintiff **NELSON HIDALGO** was paid by Defendants approximately \$1,000.00 per week from on or around January 6, 2016 until on or around August 20, 2016.
79. Although Plaintiff **NELSON HIDALGO** worked approximately 55 (fifty-five) hours or more per week during the period of his employment by Defendants, Defendants did not pay Plaintiff time and a half (1.5) for hours worked over forty (40), a blatant violation of the overtime provisions contained in the FLSA and NYLL.
80. Plaintiff **NELSON HIDALGO** is also owed payment for his first week of work during his employment with Defendants, for which he was not compensated.
81. Upon information and belief, Defendants willfully failed to post notices of the minimum wage and overtime wage requirements in a conspicuous place at the location of their employment as required by both the NYLL and the FLSA.
82. Upon information and belief, Defendants willfully failed to keep payroll records as required by both NYLL and the FLSA.
83. As a result of these violations of Federal and New York State labor laws, Plaintiff seeks compensatory damages and liquidated damages in an amount exceeding \$100,000.00. Plaintiff also seeks interest, attorney's fees, costs, and all other legal and equitable remedies this Court deems appropriate.



**COLLECTIVE ACTION ALLEGATIONS**

84. Plaintiffs bring this action on behalf of themselves and other employees similarly situated as authorized under the FLSA, 29 U.S.C. § 216(b). The employees similarly situated are:
85. Collective Class: All persons who are or have been employed by the Defendants as parking attendants and drivers or other similarly titled personnel with substantially similar job requirements and pay provisions, who were or are performing the same sort of functions for Defendants, other than the executive and management positions, who have been subject to Defendants' common practices, policies, programs, procedures, protocols and plans including willfully failing and refusing to pay required overtime wages.
86. Upon information and belief, Defendants employed approximately 20-30 (twenty-to-thirty) employees at any given point within the past six years subjected to similar payment structures.
87. Defendants' unlawful conduct has been widespread, repeated, and consistent.
88. Upon information and belief, Defendants had knowledge that their conduct was in violation of the FLSA and NYLL.
89. Defendants' conduct as set forth in this Complaint, was willful and in bad faith, and has caused significant damages to Plaintiffs and the Collective Class.
90. Defendants are liable under the FLSA and NYLL for failing to properly compensate Plaintiffs and the Collective Class, and as such, notice should be sent to the Collective Class. There are numerous similarly situated current and former employees of Defendants who have been denied overtime wage compensation in violation of the FLSA and NYLL who would benefit from the issuance of a Court-supervised notice of the present lawsuit, and the opportunity to join the present lawsuit. Those similarly situated employees are known to Defendants and are readily identifiable through Defendants' records.
91. The questions of law and fact common to the putative class predominate over any questions affecting only individual members.
92. The claims of Plaintiffs are typical of the claims of the putative class.

93. Plaintiffs and their counsel will fairly and adequately protect the interests of the putative class.
94. A collective action is superior to other available methods for the fair and efficient adjudication of this controversy.

### **FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION**

#### **Overtime Wages Under The Fair Labor Standards Act**

95. Plaintiffs re-allege and incorporate by reference all allegations in all preceding paragraphs.
96. Plaintiffs have consented in writing to be a party to this action, pursuant to 29 U.S.C. §216(b).
97. At all times relevant to this action, Plaintiffs were engaged in commerce or the production of goods for commerce within the meaning of 29 U.S.C. §§206(a) and 207(a).
98. At all times relevant to this action, Defendants were employers engaged in commerce or the production of goods for commerce within the meaning of 29 U.S.C. §§206(a) and 207(a).
99. Defendants willfully failed to pay Plaintiffs overtime wages for hours worked in excess of forty (40) hours per week at a wage rate of one and a half (1.5) times the regular wage, to which Plaintiffs were entitled under 29 U.S.C. §§206(a) in violation of 29 U.S.C. §207(a)(1).
100. Defendants' violations of the FLSA as described in this Complaint have been willful and intentional. Defendants have not made a good effort to comply with the FLSA with respect to the compensation of Plaintiffs.
101. Due to Defendants' FLSA violations, Plaintiffs are entitled to recover from Defendants, jointly and severally, their unpaid wages and an equal amount in the form of liquidated damages, as well as reasonable attorneys fees and costs of the action, including interest, pursuant to the FLSA, specifically 29 U.S.C. §216(b).

### **SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION**

#### **Overtime Wages Under New York Labor Law**

102. Plaintiffs re-allege and incorporate by reference all allegations in all preceding paragraphs.
103. At all times relevant to this action, Plaintiffs were employed by Defendants within the meaning of New York Labor Law §§2 and 651.
104. Defendants failed to pay Plaintiffs overtime wages for hours worked in excess of forty hours per week at a wage rate of one and a half (1.5) times the regular wage to which Plaintiffs were entitled under New York Labor Law §652, in violation of 12 N.Y.C.R.R. 137-1.3.
105. Due to Defendants' New York Labor Law violations, Plaintiffs are entitled to recover from Defendants, jointly and severally, their unpaid overtime wages and an amount equal to their overtime wages in the form of liquidated damages, as well as reasonable attorneys' fees and costs of the action, including interest in accordance with NY Labor Law §198(1-a).

### THIRD CAUSE OF ACTION

#### **Unpaid Wages Under The Fair Labor Standards Act**

106. Plaintiffs re-allege and incorporate by reference all allegations in all preceding paragraphs.
107. At all times relevant to this action, Plaintiffs were engaged in commerce or the production of goods for commerce within the meaning of 29 U.S.C. §§206(a) and 207(a).
108. At all times relevant to this action, Defendants were employers engaged in commerce or the production of goods for commerce within the meaning of 29 U.S.C. §§206(a) and 207(a).
109. Defendants willfully failed to pay Plaintiffs' wages for hours worked in violation of 29 U.S.C. §206(a).
110. Defendants' violations of the FLSA as described in this Complaint have been willful and intentional. Defendants have not made a good effort to comply with the FLSA with respect to compensating the Plaintiffs.
111. Due to Defendants' FLSA violations, Plaintiffs are entitled to recover from Defendants, jointly and severally, their unpaid wages and an equal amount in the

form of liquidated damages, as well as reasonable attorneys fees and costs of the action, including interest, pursuant to the FLSA, specifically 29 U.S.C. §216(b).

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

##### **Unpaid Wages Under The New York Labor Law**

112. Plaintiffs re-allege and incorporate by reference all allegations in all preceding paragraphs.
113. At all times relevant to this action, Plaintiff was employed by Defendants within the meaning of New York Labor Law §§2 and 651.
114. Defendants failed to pay Plaintiff wages for hours worked in violation of New York Labor Law Article 6.
115. Due to Defendants' New York Labor Law violations, Plaintiff is entitled to recover from Defendants, jointly and severally, her unpaid wages and an amount equal to their unpaid wages in the form of liquidated damages, as well as reasonable attorney's fees and costs of the action, including interest in accordance with NY Labor Law §198 (1-a).

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

##### **Violation of the Notice and Recordkeeping Requirements of the New York Labor Law**

116. Plaintiffs re-allege and incorporate by reference all allegations in all preceding paragraphs.
117. Defendants failed to provide Plaintiffs with a written notice, in English and in Spanish (Plaintiffs' primary language), of their rate of pay, regular pay day, and such other information as required by NYLL §195(1).
118. Defendants are liable to Plaintiffs in the amount of \$5,000.00 per Plaintiff together with costs and attorneys' fees.

#### **SIXTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

##### **Violation of the Wage Statement Requirements of the New York Labor Law**

119. Plaintiffs re-allege and incorporate by reference all allegations in all preceding paragraphs.

120. Defendants failed to provide Plaintiffs with wage statements upon each payment of wages, as required by NYLL §195(3)
121. Defendants are liable to Plaintiffs in the amount of \$5,000.00 per Plaintiff together with costs and attorneys' fees.

**PRAYER FOR RELIEF**


Wherefore, Plaintiffs respectfully request that judgment be granted:

- a. Declaring Defendants' conduct complained herein to be in violation of the Plaintiffs' rights under the FLSA, the New York Labor Law, and its regulations;
- b. Awarding Plaintiffs' unpaid overtime wages;
- c. Awarding Plaintiffs unpaid wages for weeks in which Defendants did not compensate Plaintiffs;
- d. Awarding Plaintiffs liquidated damages pursuant to 29 U.S.C. §216 and New York Labor Law §§198(1-a), 663(1);
- e. Awarding Plaintiffs prejudgment and post-judgment interest;
- f. Awarding Plaintiffs the costs of this action together with reasonable attorneys' fees; and
- g. Awarding such and further relief as this court deems necessary and proper.

**DEMAND FOR TRIAL BY JURY**

Pursuant to Rule 38(b) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, Plaintiffs demand a trial by jury on all questions of fact raised by the complaint.

Dated: This 21 day of October 2016.

  
Roman Avshalumov (RA 5508)  
Helen F. Dalton & Associates, PC  
69-12 Austin Street  
Forest Hills, NY 11375  
Telephone: 718-263-9591  
Fax: 718-263-9598

JS 44 (Rev. 1/2013)

# CV 16 CIVIL COVER SHEET

0269

The JS 44 civil cover sheet and the information 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**  
 JOSE PINTOR and NELSON HIDALGO, individually and on behalf of all others similarly situated,

(b) County of Residence of First Listed Plaintiff: QUEENS  
 (EXCEPT IN U.S. PLAINTIFF CASES)

(c) Attorneys (Firm Name, Address, and Telephone Number)  
 Helen F. Dalton & Associates, P.C.  
 69-12 Austin Street  
 Forest Hills, NY 11375 (718) 263-9591

**DEFENDANTS**  
 PARK KING AT JFK, LLC., PARK KING AT JFK II, INC., PARK KING AT JFK III, INC., TONY MICCICHE, and KRISTEN SWABY, as individuals

County of Residence of First Listed Defendant: QUEENS  
 (IN U.S. PLAINTIFF CASES ONLY)

NOTE: IN LAND CONDEMNATION CASES, USE THE LOCATION OF THE TRACT OF LAND INVOLVED.

Attorneys (If Known)

**II. BASIS OF JURISDICTION** (Place an "X" in One Box Only)

1 U.S. Government Plaintiff

3 Federal Question (U.S. Government Not a Party)

2 U.S. Government Defendant

4 Diversity (Indicate Citizenship of Parties in Item III)

**III. CITIZENSHIP OF PRINCIPAL PARTIES** (Place an "X" in One Box for Plaintiff and One Box for Defendant)

	PTF	DEF		PTF	DEF
Citizen of This State	<input type="checkbox"/> 1	<input type="checkbox"/> 1	Incorporated or Principal Place of Business In This State	<input type="checkbox"/> 4	<input type="checkbox"/> 4
Citizen of Another State	<input type="checkbox"/> 2	<input type="checkbox"/> 2	Incorporated and Principal Place of Business In Another State	<input type="checkbox"/> 5	<input type="checkbox"/> 5
Citizen or Subject of a Foreign Country	<input type="checkbox"/> 3	<input type="checkbox"/> 3	Foreign Nation	<input type="checkbox"/> 6	<input type="checkbox"/> 6

**IV. NATURE OF SUIT** (Place an "X" in One Box Only)

CONTRACT	TORTS	FORFEITURE/PENALTY	BANKRUPTCY	OTHER STATUTES	
<input type="checkbox"/> 110 Insurance <input type="checkbox"/> 120 Marine <input type="checkbox"/> 130 Miller Act <input type="checkbox"/> 140 Negotiable Instrument <input type="checkbox"/> 150 Recovery of Overpayment & Enforcement of Judgment <input type="checkbox"/> 151 Medicare Act <input type="checkbox"/> 152 Recovery of Defaulted Student Loans (Excludes Veterans) <input type="checkbox"/> 153 Recovery of Overpayment of Veteran's Benefits <input type="checkbox"/> 160 Stockholders' Suits <input type="checkbox"/> 190 Other Contract <input type="checkbox"/> 195 Contract Product Liability <input type="checkbox"/> 196 Franchise	<b>PERSONAL INJURY</b> <input type="checkbox"/> 310 Airplane <input type="checkbox"/> 315 Airplane Product Liability <input type="checkbox"/> 320 Assault, Libel & Slander <input type="checkbox"/> 330 Federal Employers' Liability <input type="checkbox"/> 340 Marine <input type="checkbox"/> 345 Marine Product Liability <input type="checkbox"/> 350 Motor Vehicle <input type="checkbox"/> 355 Motor Vehicle Product Liability <input type="checkbox"/> 360 Other Personal Injury <input type="checkbox"/> 362 Personal Injury - Medical Malpractice	<input type="checkbox"/> 365 Personal Injury - Product Liability <input type="checkbox"/> 367 Health Care/Pharmaceutical Personal Injury Product Liability <input type="checkbox"/> 368 Asbestos Personal Injury Product Liability <b>PERSONAL PROPERTY</b> <input type="checkbox"/> 370 Other Fraud <input type="checkbox"/> 371 Truth in Lending <input type="checkbox"/> 380 Other Personal Property Damage <input type="checkbox"/> 385 Property Damage Product Liability	<input type="checkbox"/> 625 Drug Related Seizure of Property 21 USC 881 <input type="checkbox"/> 690 Other <b>LABOR</b> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 710 Fair Labor Standards Act <input type="checkbox"/> 720 Labor/Management Relations <input type="checkbox"/> 740 Railway Labor Act <input type="checkbox"/> 751 Family and Medical Leave Act <input type="checkbox"/> 790 Other Labor Litigation <input type="checkbox"/> 791 Employee Retirement Income Security Act <b>IMMIGRATION</b> <input type="checkbox"/> 462 Naturalization Application <input type="checkbox"/> 465 Other Immigration Actions	<input type="checkbox"/> 422 Appeal 28 USC 158 <input type="checkbox"/> 423 Withdrawal 28 USC 157 <b>PROPERTY RIGHTS</b> <input type="checkbox"/> 820 Copyrights <input type="checkbox"/> 830 Patent <input type="checkbox"/> 840 Trademark <b>SOCIAL SECURITY</b> <input type="checkbox"/> 861 HIA (1395ff) <input type="checkbox"/> 862 Black Lung (923) <input type="checkbox"/> 863 DIWC/DIWW (405(g)) <input type="checkbox"/> 864 SSID Title XVI <input type="checkbox"/> 865 RSI (405(g)) <b>FEDERAL TAX SUITS</b> <input type="checkbox"/> 870 Taxes (U.S. Plaintiff or Defendant) <input type="checkbox"/> 871 IRS—Third Party 26 USC 7609	<input type="checkbox"/> 375 False Claims Act <input type="checkbox"/> 400 State Reapportionment <input type="checkbox"/> 410 Antitrust <input type="checkbox"/> 430 Banks and Banking <input type="checkbox"/> 450 Commerce <input type="checkbox"/> 460 Deportation <input type="checkbox"/> 470 Racketeer Influenced and Corrupt Organizations <input type="checkbox"/> 480 Consumer Credit <input type="checkbox"/> 490 Cable/Sat TV <input type="checkbox"/> 850 Securities/Commodities/Exchange <input type="checkbox"/> 890 Other Statutory Actions <input type="checkbox"/> 891 Agricultural Acts <input type="checkbox"/> 893 Environmental Matters <input type="checkbox"/> 895 Freedom of Information Act <input type="checkbox"/> 896 Arbitration <input type="checkbox"/> 899 Administrative Procedure Act/Review or Appeal of Agency Decision <input type="checkbox"/> 950 Constitutionality of State Statutes

**V. ORIGIN** (Place an "X" in One Box Only)

1 Original Proceeding     2 Removed from State Court     3 Remanded from Appellate Court     4 Reinstated or Reopened     5 Transferred from Another District (specify)     6 Multidistrict Litigation

**VI. CAUSE OF ACTION** Cite the U.S. Civil Statute under which you are filing (Do not cite jurisdictional statutes unless diversity):  
Fair Labor Standards Act  
 Brief description of cause:  
Compensation for unpaid overtime wages

**VII. REQUESTED IN COMPLAINT:**  CHECK IF THIS IS A CLASS ACTION UNDER RULE 23, F.R.Cv.P.    DEMAND \$ 100,000.00    CHECK YES only if demanded in complaint: JURY DEMAND:  Yes  No

**VIII. RELATED CASE(S) IF ANY** (See instructions): JUDGE \_\_\_\_\_ DOCKET NUMBER \_\_\_\_\_

DATE: 10/21/16    SIGNATURE OF ATTORNEY OF RECORD: 

FOR OFFICE USE ONLY: RECEIPT # \_\_\_\_\_ AMOUNT \_\_\_\_\_ APPLYING IFP \_\_\_\_\_ JUDGE \_\_\_\_\_ MAG. JUDGE \_\_\_\_\_

4653108148

U.S. District Court  
 EASTERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK  
 2016 NOV 10 PM 4:34  
 FILED  
 CLERK

**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, \_\_\_\_\_, counsel for \_\_\_\_\_, 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 of 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? NO
- 2.) 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? NO
  - b) Did the events of 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.  
 Yes  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

Attorney Bar Code: RA5508

I certify the accuracy of all information provided above.  
Signature: 

# ClassAction.org

This complaint is part of ClassAction.org's searchable class action lawsuit database and can be found in this post: [Former JFK Airport Parking Attendants File Overtime Pay Class Action](#)

---