# UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK

ANGEL SAMANIEGO,	individually and or
behalf of all others similar	rly situated,

Plaintiff,

V.

LANDSCAPE DESIGN & CONTRACTING INC., a Domestic Business Corporation; BLOCK'S NURSERY, INC., a Domestic Business Corporation; and BARRY BLOCK, individually;

Defendants.

CASE NO
COLLECTIVE ACTION COMPLAINT
ECF CASE
JURY TRIAL DEMANDED

## **CLASS / COLLECTIVE ACTION COMPLAINT**

ANGEL SAMANIEGO ("Plaintiff"), by and through his undersigned attorneys, hereby submits the following complaint against LANDSCAPE DESIGN & CONTRACTING INC. ("Barry Block Landscape"), BLOCK'S NURSERY, INC. ("Block's Nursery"), and BARRY BLOCK, individually ("Block") (collectively "Defendants"), and alleges:

#### NATURE OF THE ACTION

- 1. This action seeks to redress Defendants systematic policy and practice of requiring employees to work overtime hours, without properly paying overtime wages as required by the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, 29 U.S.C. §§ 201 *et seq.* ("FLSA"), New York Labor Law, N.Y. Lab. Law, Art. 19 § 650 *et seq.* ("NYLL"), and Rules and Regulations of the State of New York ("NYCRR") § 142-2.
- 2. The FLSA, NYLL and NYCRR require employers to compensate employees for all hours worked, and at an overtime rate for all work completed over 40 hours per week.

However, Defendants systematically failed to properly compensate Plaintiff and those similarly situated at the proper overtime rate for all work over 40 hours per week.

3. Plaintiff brings his FLSA claims against Defendants as a collective action pursuant to 29 U.S.C. § 216 on behalf of all employees Defendants have employed for any length of time during the maximum allowable limitations period.

# **JURISDICTION AND VENUE**

- 4. This Court also has jurisdiction under the provisions of the FLSA pursuant to 29 U.S.C. § 216(b) and under 28 U.S.C. § 1331 (federal questions jurisdiction), and supplemental jurisdiction over Plaintiff's NYLL and NYCRR claims pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1367.
- 5. Venue is appropriate in this District pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1391(b)(2), because Plaintiff resides in this District, worked for Defendants in this District and suffered the losses at issue in this District.

## **PARTIES**

- 6. ANGEL SAMANIEGO is a resident of Mastic, New York.
- 7. At times relevant hereto, Plaintiff worked full time as a non-exempt Laborer for Defendants (2008 through 2012 and again from March, 2014 through March, 2017).
- 8. LANDSCAPE DESIGN & CONTRACTING INC. is a New York Corporation with its principal office located at 2 Tuthill Point Farm Rd, East Moriches, New York 11940.

#### Exhibit A.

- 9. BLOCK'S NURSERY, INC. is a New York Corporation with its principal office located at 2 Tuthill Point Farm Rd, East Moriches, New York 11940. **Exhibit B**.
- 10. BARRY BLOCK is the Owner of Barry Block Landscape and Block's Nursery, and resident of East Moriches, New York.

11. At all times relevant hereto, Defendants jointly employed Plaintiff. To that end, Plaintiff simultaneously was directed by Defendants and performed work for all of the Defendants within the same workweeks, throughout his employment.

#### **EMPLOYMENT RELATIONSHIP**

- 12. Defendants each had the power to hire and fire Plaintiff.
- 13. Defendants each controlled Plaintiff's work schedule.
- 14. Defendants each scheduled Plaintiff and other laborers to certain shifts.
- 15. Defendants each required Plaintiff and other laborers to work a certain number of days during the week.
- 16. Defendants each determined the rate and the method of payment of all laborers including Plaintiff.
- 17. At all times relevant hereto, Defendants operated their business with a common business purpose, with common management, and with the same employees.
- 18. At all material times, Defendants have been employers within the meaning of 3(d) of the FLSA. 29 U.S.C. § 203(d).
- 19. Moreover, the Fair Labor Standards Act ("FLSA") defines the term "employer" broadly to include "any person acting directly or indirectly in the interest of an employer in relation to any employee." 29 U.S.C. § 203(d).
- 20. Defendant Barry Block is the Owner and Executive Officer of Barry Block Landscape.
- 21. Defendant Barry Block directs the day-to-day business operation of Barry Block Landscape.

- 22. Defendant Barry Block has responsibility for the supervision of the laborers at Barry Block Landscape.
- 23. Defendant Barry Block is responsible for the compensation or lack thereof paid to laborers at Barry Block Landscape.
  - 24. Defendant Barry Block is the Owner of Block's Nursery.
- 25. Defendant Barry Block directs the day-to-day business operation of Block's Nursery.
- 26. Defendant Barry Block has responsibility for the supervision of the laborers at Block's Nursery.
- 27. Defendant Barry Block is responsible for the compensation or lack thereof paid to laborers at Block's Nursery.
- 28. Defendant Barry Block has the authority to hire and fire employees of Barry Block Landscape, the authority to direct and supervise the work of employees of Barry Block Landscape, the authority to sign on the business' checking accounts of Barry Block Landscape, including payroll accounts of Barry Block Landscape, and the authority to make decisions regarding employee compensation and capital expenditures of Barry Block Landscape.
- 29. Defendant Barry Block has the authority to hire and fire employees of Block's Nursery, the authority to direct and supervise the work of employees of Block's Nursery, the authority to sign on the business' checking accounts of Block's Nursery, including payroll accounts of Block's Nursery, and the authority to make decisions regarding employee compensation and capital expenditures of Block's Nursery.
- 30. Additionally, Defendant Barry Block was responsible for the day-to-day affairs of both businesses.

- 31. Defendant Barry Block was responsible for determining whether the businesses complied with the Fair Labor Standards Act.
- 32. Defendant Barry Block controlled the nature, pay structure, and employment relationship of the Plaintiff and Class Members.
- 33. At all times relevant hereto, Defendant Barry Block assigned Plaintiff his duties on a day to day basis and interchangeably assigned him to perform work for both Block's Nursery and Barry Block Landscaping.

#### **BACKGROUND FACTS**

- 34. Plaintiff was jointly employed by Barry Block Landscaping as a Laborer during the relevant time from on or about year 2011 through on or about March 2017.
- 35. Plaintiff was jointly employed by Block's Nursery as a Laborer during the relevant time from on or about year 2011 through on or about March 2017.
- 36. During the relevant time period from on or about year 2011 through on or about March 2017, Plaintiff was employed as a full-time employee and worked approximately sixty (60) hours per week at an hourly rate between \$10.00 and \$14.00.
- 37. Throughout the relevant period, Plaintiff was not paid proper overtime premiums for all hours worked over 40 hours per week.
- 38. Throughout the relevant period, Defendant Block regularly required employees, including Plaintiff, to perform overtime work for Corporate Defendants, Barry Block Landscaping and Block's Nursery.
- 39. Throughout the relevant period, and in violation of state and federal law,
  Defendants knowingly permitted, encouraged, and required Plaintiff to work overtime hours
  without properly paying him proper overtime wages.

- 40. Plaintiff estimates that he worked on average, at least twenty (20) unpaid overtime hours per week for Defendants.
- 41. Despite the fact that Defendants were a joint enterprise and/or jointly employed Plaintiff and their other employees, Defendants failed to pay Plaintiff and other similarly situated employees proper overtime when they worked in excess of 40 hours per week for the combined entities.

#### ENTERPRISE AND INDIVIDUAL COVERAGE

- 42. At all material times, Defendants were each an enterprise engaged in commerce or in the production of goods for commerce within the meaning of the FLSA because they have had employees engaged in commerce. 29 U.S.C. § 203(s)(1).
- 43. At all material times, each Defendant was an enterprise engaged in commerce or in the production of good for commerce and subject to the enterprise coverage of the FLSA.
- 44. Specifically, Defendants' employees have sold goods—such as trees and a variety of plants—that have been moved or produced in interstate commerce to Defendants' patrons. Additionally, Defendants' employees, including Plaintiff, have handled materials that have been moved or produced in interstate commerce, which were used in the course of Defendants' business operations.
- 45. Defendants advertise on the internet and process credit cards from out of state patrons.
- 46. At all times relevant hereto, Defendants have had, and continue to have, a combined annual gross business volume in excess of \$500,000.00 per annum.
- 47. At all times relevant hereto, each Defendant has had, and continues to have, an annual gross business volume in excess of \$500,000.00 per annum.

48. At all material times, Plaintiff was an individual employee who engaged in commerce or in the production of goods for commerce as required by 29 USC § 206-207.

# **FLSA COLLECTIVE ACTION ALLEGATIONS**

49. Plaintiff brings a collective action pursuant to 29 U.S.C. §216(b) on behalf of a proposed collective defined to include:

All non-exempt employees employed during the maximum limitations period by Defendants who worked in excess of 40 hours per week for the combined entities but whom were not paid time and one half their regular rate of pay for all such hours worked in excess of 40 each week.

- 50. Plaintiff is a member of the proposed collective he seeks to represent, because he worked for Defendants as a Laborer during the relevant period and suffered the overtime violation alleged above relating to time work in excess of his forty (40) hour work week.
- 51. This action may be properly maintained as a collective action on behalf of the putative Class because, during the relevant period:
  - a. Plaintiff and the Class members had the same employers;
  - Plaintiff and the Class members were governed by the same compensation policies, practices and systems;
  - c. Plaintiff and the Class members were subjected to the same policies relating to overtime work;
  - d. Plaintiff and the Class members were governed by the same payroll policies,
     practices and systems;
  - e. Plaintiff and the Class members were working for joint-enterprises;
- 52. Plaintiff estimates that the collective group, including both current and former employees over the relevant period, will include at least 500 members. The precise number of

members should be readily available from Defendants' personnel, scheduling, time and payroll records, and from input received from the Class members as part of the notice and "opt-in" process provided by 29 U.S.C. §216(b). Given the composition and size of the Class, its members may be informed of the pendency of this action directly via U.S. mail, e-mail and/or the posting of written notices at Defendants' work sites.

## **CLAIMS FOR RELIEF**

# COUNT I - VIOLATION OF THE FAIR LABOR STANDARDS ACT (On Behalf Of The FLSA Collective)

- 53. Plaintiff repeats, re-alleges and incorporates by reference each of the foregoing allegations as though fully set forth herein.
  - 54. Defendants are an "employer" as defined by 29 U.S.C. § 203(d).
  - 55. Plaintiff is an "employee" as defined by 29 U.S.C. § 203(e)(1).
- 56. The wages Defendants paid to Plaintiff and the collective group members are "wages" as defined by 29 U.S.C. § 203(m).
- 57. Defendants are an "enterprise" engaged in commerce within the meaning of 29 U.S.C. § 203(r).
- 58. Plaintiff and the collective group members are similarly situated individuals within the meaning of 29 U.S.C. §216(b) with the FLSA's requirements, and Plaintiff and the collective group members were covered employees entitled to the FLSA's protections.
- 59. Defendant failed to compensate Plaintiff and other similarly situated employees for overtime wages. Plaintiff and the collective group members regularly worked for Defendant for more than 40 hours in some weeks but were not paid proper overtime premiums in violation of FLSA, 29 U.S.C. § 207(a)(1).

- 60. Throughout the relevant period, Defendants paid Plaintiff at a rate between \$10.00 and \$14.00 per hour.
- 61. Throughout the time period, Defendants were obligated to comply with the FLSA requirements, Plaintiff was a covered employee entitled to the FLSA's protections, and Plaintiff was not exempt from receiving wages required by the FLSA for any reason.
- 62. Defendants violated the FLSA by knowingly permitting Plaintiff to work overtime hours without paying a properly-calculated overtime premium wage for each overtime hour he worked in excess of a forty (40) hour work week.
- 63. In failing to ensure that Plaintiff actually received all overtime wages owed,

  Defendants acted knowingly and with reckless disregard of clearly applicable FLSA provisions.
- 64. Defendants have no good faith justification or defense for failing to pay Plaintiff and the collective group members all wages mandated by the FLSA.
- 65. Pursuant to the FLSA, Plaintiff is entitled to recover from Defendants the unpaid overtime wages and liquidated damages equal in amount Plaintiff and the collective group's unpaid overtime wages, plus attorney's fees and costs.

# COUNT II - VIOLATION OF NEW YORK LABOR LAW §§ 650 et seq.

- 66. Plaintiff repeats, re-alleges and incorporates by reference each of the foregoing allegations as though fully set forth herein.
- 67. NYLL § 652 requires that every employee must be paid for "each hour worked" by their employer.
- 68. Through their conduct described above, Defendants have engaged in a widespread pattern, policy, and practice of violating the NYLL.

- 69. At all relevant times, Plaintiff has been an employee of Defendants, and Defendants have been the employer of Plaintiff within the meaning of the NYLL §§ 650 *et seq*.
- 70. Through their knowing or intentional failure to pay agreed upon hourly wages to Plaintiff, Defendants have willfully violated the NYLL, Article 19, §§ 650 *et seq*.
- 71. Defendants regularly required Plaintiff to work overtime hours without due compensation.
- 72. Plaintiff was required to work for Defendants and was not properly paid for all hours worked.
- 73. NYLL § 663(1) provides that Plaintiff and all other employees are entitled to recover the amount of any such underpayments.
- 74. NYLL § 663(1) further provides that Plaintiff is entitled to an award of his costs incurred in pursuing this claim, an award of reasonable attorneys' fees incurred in pursuing this claim and an award of prejudgment interest at the applicable rate.
- 75. Under NYLL § 663(1), Defendants are liable for a penalty in the amount of 100% of the total of the amount due during the relevant period as Defendants cannot prove a good faith basis to believe that its underpayment was in compliance with the law.
- 76. Due to Defendants' willful violations of the NYLL, Plaintiff is entitled to recover from Defendants his unpaid wages, liquidated damages as provided for by the NYLL, reasonable attorneys' fees, costs, and pre-judgment and post-judgment interest.

#### COUNT III - VIOLATION OF THE NYLL § 650 AND NYCRR § 142-2

77. Plaintiff repeats, re-alleges and incorporates by reference each of the foregoing allegations as though fully set forth herein.

- 78. Through their conduct described above, Defendants have engaged in a widespread pattern, policy, and practice of violating the NYLL.
- 79. At all relevant times, Plaintiff has been an employee of Defendants, and Defendants have been the employer of Plaintiff within the meaning of the NYLL §§ 650 *et seq*.
- 80. Through their knowing or intentional failure to pay proper overtime wages to Plaintiff, Defendants have willfully violated the NYLL, Article 19, §§ 650 *et seq.*, and the supporting New York State Department of Labor Regulations.
- 81. NYLL § 650 *et seq*. confers power upon the Commissioner of Labor and the wage board to recommend regulations with respect to overtime rates.
- 82. Accordingly, NYCRR § 142-2 provides for overtime rate compensation within the state of New York.
  - 83. Plaintiff is an "Employee" of Defendants as defined by NYCRR § 142-2.14.
- 84. NYCRR § 142-2.2 requires an employer to "pay an employee for overtime at a wage rate of one and one-half times the employees regular rate . . ." in accordance with, and subject to the exemptions of sections 7 and 13 of 29 U.S.C. 201 *et seq.*, the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, as amended.
- 85. Defendants failed to pay Plaintiff the required overtime rate when he worked more than forty (40) hours per week.
- 86. Accordingly, Plaintiff performed work for which he was not properly compensated, and work of which Defendants had actual or constructive knowledge.
- 87. Defendants have no good faith justification or defense for failing to pay Plaintiff and the collective group members all wages mandated by the NYCRR.

- 88. NYLL § 663(1) provides that Plaintiff and all other employees are entitled to recover the amount of any such underpayments.
- 89. NYLL § 663(1) further provides that Plaintiff is entitled to an award of his costs incurred in pursuing this claim, an award of reasonable attorneys' fees incurred in pursuing this claim and an award of prejudgment interest at the applicable rate.
- 90. Under NYLL § 663(1) Defendants are liable for a penalty in the amount of 100% of the total of the amount due during the relevant period as Defendant cannot prove a good faith

## **PRAYER FOR RELIEF**

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff respectfully prays for an Order:

- A. Conditionally certifying this matter to proceed as a collective action pursuant to 29 U.S.C. 216(b);
- B. requiring Defendants to provide the names and current (or best known) addresses of all members of the identified Collective and Class;
- C. finding that Defendants willfully violated the applicable provisions of the FLSA by failing to pay all required wages to Plaintiff and the collective group members;
- D. finding that Defendants willfully violated the applicable provisions of the NYLL by failing to pay all required wages to Plaintiff and the New York Class members;
- E. granting judgment in favor of Plaintiff and the members of the collective group and Class on all Counts;
- F. awarding all available compensatory damages in an amount to be determined;
- G. awarding all available statutory damages;
- H. awarding an equal amount of liquidated damages as provided by the FLSA;

I. awarding reasonable attorneys' fees and reimbursement of all costs and expenses

incurred in litigating this action;

J. awarding all available equitable and injunctive relief precluding the continuation of

the policies and practices pled in this Complaint;

K. awarding any further relief the Court deems just, necessary and proper;

L. granting leave to add additional plaintiffs by motion, the filing of written consent

forms, or any other method approved by the Court; and

M. maintaining jurisdiction over this action to ensure Defendant's compliance with the

foregoing.

**DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL** 

Plaintiff, by and through his undersigned counsel, hereby demands a jury trial in the above-

captioned matter.

Dated: December 7, 2017.

Respectfully submitted,

/s/ Andrew R. Frisch

Andrew R. Frisch, Esq. NY Bar No.: 3957115

MORGAN & MORGAN, P.A.

600 North Pine Island Road, Suite 400

Plantation, Fl. 33324

Tel: 954-WORKERS

Fax: 954-327-3013

E-mail: <u>AFrisch@forthepeople.com</u>

# Case 2:17-cv-07153 Document 1-1 Filed 12/07/17 Page 1 of 2 PageID #: 14

JS 44 (Rev. 11/27/17

# **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	· ·			DEFENDANTS					
ANGEL SAMANIEGO				LANDSCAPE DESIGN & CONTRACTING INC., BLOCK'S NURSERY, INC. and BARRY BLOCK					
(b) County of Residence of First Listed Plaintiff Suffolk County  (EXCEPT IN U.S. PLAINTIFF CASES)				County of Residence  NOTE: IN LAND CO THE TRACT		TIFF CASES O		)F	
(c) Attorneys (Firm Name, Andrew R. Frisch, Esq. / 600 N Pine Island Road, Ph: 954-327-5355	Address, and Telephone Number Morgan & Morgan Suite 400, Plantation	プ FL 33324		Attorneys (If Known)					
II. BASIS OF JURISDI	CTION (Place an "X" in O	ne Box Only)		TIZENSHIP OF P	RINCIPAL I	PARTIES (			
☐ 1 U.S. Government					orporated <i>or</i> Pri of Business In T		PTF    4	DEF	
☐ 2 U.S. Government Defendant	☐ 4 Diversity (Indicate Citizenship of Parties in Item III)		Citiz	en of Another State		orporated <i>and</i> P of Business In A		□ 5	□ 5
				en or Subject of a  reign Country	3 □ 3 For	reign Nation		□ 6	<b>6</b>
IV. NATURE OF SUIT							f Suit Code De		
CONTRACT  110 Insurance 120 Marine	PERSONAL INJURY  ☐ 310 Airplane	PERSONAL INJUR  365 Personal Injury -	Y 3 62	25 Drug Related Seizure of Property 21 USC 881	☐ 422 Appeal 28☐ 423 Withdraw	B USC 158 al	☐ 375 False Cla ☐ 376 Qui Tam	(31 USC	
□ 130 Miller Act □ 140 Negotiable Instrument □ 150 Recovery of Overpayment	□ 315 Airpiane Product Liability □ 320 Assault, Libel & Slander □ 330 Federal Employers' Liability □ 340 Marine □ 345 Marine Product Liability □ 350 Motor Vehicle □ 355 Motor Vehicle □ 355 Motor Vehicle □ 375 Motor Vehicle □ 360 Other Personal Injury □ 360 Personal Injury Medical Malpractice □ CIVIL RIGHTS □ 440 Other Civil Rights □ 441 Voting □ 442 Employment □ 443 Housing/ Accommodations □ 445 Amer. w/Disabilities - Employment □ 446 Amer. w/Disabilities - Other □ 448 Education	Product Liability  367 Health Care/ Pharmaceutical Personal Injury Product Liability  368 Asbestos Personal Injury Product Liability PERSONAL PROPEF 370 Other Fraud 371 Truth in Lending 380 Other Personal Property Damage Product Liability  PRISONER PETITION Habeas Corpus: 463 Alien Detainee 510 Motions to Vacate Sentence 530 General	77 2 78 3 78 3 78 3 78 3 78 3 78 3 78 3	LABOR 10 Fair Labor Standards Act 20 Labor/Management Relations 40 Railway Labor Act 51 Family and Medical Leave Act 20 Other Labor Litigation 91 Employee Retirement Income Security Act  IMMIGRATION 52 Naturalization Application 55 Other Immigration Actions	28 USC 1  PROPERTY  \$20 Copyright  \$30 Patent - A New Drug  \$40 Trademar!  \$62 Black Lur  \$63 DIWC/DI  \$64 SSID Title  \$65 RSI (405)  FEDERAL T  \$70 Taxes (U. or Defenc  \$71 IRS—Thi  26 USC 7	BIGHTS  S  bbreviated g Application k  CURITY  5ff)  og (923)  WW (405(g))  c XVI  g))  CAX SUITS  S. Plaintiff  dant)  rd Party	3729(a);  3729(a);  400 State Rei.  410 Antitrust  430 Banks ar  450 Commer  460 Deportat  470 Racketee Corrupt (  480 Consum  490 Cable/Sa  850 Securitie Exchang  890 Other St  891 Agricult  893 Environn  895 Freedom Act  896 Arbitrati  899 Adminis	apportions to the desired apportions to the Banking receion error Influence Organizati er Credit at TV ss/Common get atutory Actural Acts mental Mat and Informativative Profession tionality of the Banking Profession the Banking Profes	g  ced and cions  dities/ ctions  tters nation  coccdure peal of
	Cite the U.S. Civil State Labor Standa Brief description of canon-payment of public UNDER RULE 2	Appellate Court  autite under which you a ards Act of 1938, 29 ause: proper overtime cor IS A CLASS ACTION 3, F.R.Cv.P.	Reo re filing (A 9 U.S.C mpensa	(specify) Do not cite jurisdictional stat . §§ 201 et seg. ("FL	er District ) tutes unless diversi SA") and New CHEC JURY	Litigation Transfer  hy: v York State  CK YES only v DEMAND:	e local laws.	Multidis Litigatio Direct Fi complain	on - ile
DATE 1		SIGNATURE OF AT		OF RECORD	DOCKET N	OWBEK			
FOR OFFICE HER ONLY		Andrew R. Fris	ch						
FOR OFFICE USE ONLY	AOLINIT.	A DDI VING IED		HIDGE		MAG HID	GE		

# Case 2:17-cv-07153 Document 1-1 Filed 12/07/17 Page 2 of 2 PageID #: 15

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.

	PENCE FOR SULL					
-,	REWR. FRISCH gible for compulsory arbitration for the		ounsel for ANGEL SAMANIEGO eason(s):		, do hereby certify that the above captioned civil acti	.01
[	monetary damages sought	are in exce	ss of \$150,000, exclusive of int	erest and	d costs,	
	the complaint seeks injuncti	ve relief,				
	the matter is otherwise ineli	gible for the	e following reason			
	DISCLOSURE	STATE	MENT - FEDERAL RU	JLES (	CIVIL PROCEDURE 7.1	
	ldentify any parent	corporatio	n and any publicly held corpora	tion that o	owns 10% or more or its stocks:	
		The	re is no such corpora	ation.		
	RELATED CA	ASE ST	ATEMENT (Section V	III on ti	he Front of this Form)	
to another substantia deemed " "Presump	er civil case for purposes of this guideline when ial saving of judicial resources is likely to resul "related" to another civil case merely because	n, because o t from assign the civil case	f the similarity of facts and legal issuing both cases to the same judge ale: (A) involves identical legal issues,	ues or beca nd magistra or (B) invo	ront of this form. Rule 50.3.1 (a) provides that "A civil case is "relate ause the cases arise from the same transactions or events, a rate judge." Rule 50.3.1 (b) provides that "A civil case shall not be rolves the same parties." Rule 50.3.1 (c) further provides that shall not be deemed to be "related" unless both cases are still	₃d"
		NY-E D	IVISION OF BUSINESS	RULE 5	50.1(d)(2)	
1.)	Is the civil action being filed in County?	the East	ern District removed from No	ı a New	√ York State Court located in Nassau or Suffolk	
2.)	If you answered "no" above: a) Did the events or omissions County?  Yes	giving ri	se to the claim or claims, No	or a su	ubstantial part thereof, occur in Nassau or Suffo	ıΙk
	b) Did the events or omissions District?	giving ri	se to the claim or claims, No	or a su	ubstantial part thereof, occur in the Eastern	
	c) If this is a Fair Debt Collection received:	Practice	Act case, specify the Count	y in whi	ich the offending communication was	
Suffolk		n, does the No	e claimant (or a majority of t	he claim	ants, if there is more than one) reside in Nassau or nants, if there is more than one) reside in Nassau or as the most significant contacts).	
	,		BAR ADMIS		,	
	I am currently admitted in the Fas	tern Distri			nber in good standing of the bar of this court.	
	✓ am corrently durinted in the Ede	Yes	ot of from Torreating partonia,		No	
	Are you currently the subject of		ainlinery action (a) in this	or onv		
	Are you currently the subject of					
	ш	Yes	(If yes, please explain		No	
	I certify the accuracy of all info	rmation	orovided above.			

# United States District Court

for the

Eastern District of New York

ANGEL SAMANIEGO	) ) )		
Plaintiff(s) V.	Civil Action No.		
LANDSCAPE DESIGN & CONTRACTING INC. BLOCK'S NURSERY, INC. BARRY BLOCK	) ) )		
Defendant(s)	)		
SUMMONS IN A CIVIL ACTION			
To: (Defendant's name and address)			

LANDSCAPE DESIGN & CONTRACTING INC.

Barry Block, Registered Agent
2 Tuthill Point Farm Rd

East Moriches, New York 11940

A lawsuit has been filed against you.

Within 21 days after service of this summons on you (not counting the day you received it) — or 60 days if you are the United States or a United States agency, or an officer or employee of the United States described in Fed. R. Civ. P. 12 (a)(2) or (3) — you must serve on the plaintiff an answer to the attached complaint or a motion under Rule 12 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure. The answer or motion must be served on the plaintiff or plaintiff's attorney, whose name and address are:

Andrew R. Frisch, Esq. MORGAN & MORGAN 600 N Pine Island Road, Suite 400 Plantation, FL 33324 Ph: 954-327-5355 / Fax: 954-327-3013

If you fail to respond, judgment by default will be entered against you for the relief demanded in the complaint. You also must file your answer or motion with the court.

DOUGLAS C. PALMER CLERK OF COURT

Date:	
Date.	Signature of Clerk or Deputy Clerk

# United States District Court

for the

Eastern District of New York

ANGEL SAMANIEGO	) ) )
Plaintiff(s) V.	) ) Civil Action No.
LANDSCAPE DESIGN & CONTRACTING INC. BLOCK'S NURSERY, INC. BARRY BLOCK	) ) )
Defendant(s)	)
SUMMONS II	N A CIVIL ACTION

To: (Defendant's name and address)
LANDSCAPE DESIGN & CONTRACTING INC.
Barry Block, Registered Agent
2 Tuthill Point Farm Rd
East Moriches, New York 11940

A lawsuit has been filed against you.

Within 21 days after service of this summons on you (not counting the day you received it) — or 60 days if you are the United States or a United States agency, or an officer or employee of the United States described in Fed. R. Civ. P. 12 (a)(2) or (3) — you must serve on the plaintiff an answer to the attached complaint or a motion under Rule 12 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure. The answer or motion must be served on the plaintiff or plaintiff's attorney, whose name and address are:

Andrew R. Frisch, Esq. MORGAN & MORGAN 600 N Pine Island Road, Suite 400 Plantation, FL 33324 Ph: 954-327-5355 / Fax: 954-327-3013

If you fail to respond, judgment by default will be entered against you for the relief demanded in the complaint. You also must file your answer or motion with the court.

DOUGLAS C. PALMER CLERK OF COURT

Date:	Signature of Clerk or Deputy Clerk

# UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

for the

Eastern District of New York				
ANGEL SAMANIEGO	) ) )			
Plaintiff(s) V.	) ) Civil Action No.			
LANDSCAPE DESIGN & CONTRACTING INC. BLOCK'S NURSERY, INC. BARRY BLOCK	) ) )			
Defendant(s)	)			
SUMMONS IN	A CIVIL ACTION			
To: (Defendant's name and address)  BARRY BLOCK  2 Tuthill Point Farm Rd  East Moriches, New York 11940				
A lawsuit has been filed against you.				
Within 21 days after service of this summons on you (not counting the day you received it) — or 60 days if you are the United States or a United States agency, or an officer or employee of the United States described in Fed. R. Civ. P. 12 (a)(2) or (3) — you must serve on the plaintiff an answer to the attached complaint or a motion under Rule 12 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure. The answer or motion must be served on the plaintiff or plaintiff's attorney, whose name and address are:				
Andrew R. Frisch, Esq. MORGAN & MORGAN 600 N Pine Island Road, St Plantation, FL 33324 Ph: 954-327-5355 / Fax: 95				
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

# **ClassAction.org**

This complaint is part of ClassAction.org's searchable class action lawsuit database and can be found in this post: <u>Landscape Design & Contracting</u>, <u>Block's Nursery Facing Former Employee's Unpaid OT Claims</u>