

MICHAEL FAILLACE & ASSOCIATES, P.C.
60 East 42nd Street, Suite 4510
New York, New York 10165
Telephone: (212) 317-1200
Facsimile: (212) 317-1620
Attorneys for Plaintiff

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
EASTERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK**

-----X

CLEMENTE SANTOS, *individually and on
behalf of others similarly situated,*

Plaintiff,

COMPLAINT

-against-

**COLLECTIVE ACTION UNDER
29 U.S.C. § 216(b)**

TERRACE DINER HOLDINGS, LLC
(D/B/A TERRACE DINER), PETER
KAORIS, and JIMMY PAPGEORGE,

ECF Case

Defendants.

-----X

Plaintiff Clemente Santos (“Plaintiff Santos” or “Mr. Santos”), individually and on behalf of others similarly situated, by and through his attorneys, Michael Faillace & Associates, P.C., upon his knowledge and belief, and as against Terrace Diner Holdings, LLC (d/b/a Terrace Diner), (“Defendant Corporation”), Peter Kaoris and Jimmy Papegeorge, (“Individual Defendants”), (collectively, “Defendants”), alleges as follows:

NATURE OF ACTION

1. Plaintiff Santos is a former employee of Defendants Terrace Diner Holdings, LLC (d/b/a Terrace Diner), Peter Kaoris, and Jimmy Papegeorge.
2. Defendants own, operate, or control a diner, located at 212-97 26th Avenue, Bayside, New York 11360 under the name “Terrace Diner”.

3. Upon information and belief, individual Defendants Peter Kaoris and Jimmy Papegeorge, serve or served as owners, managers, principals, or agents of Defendant Corporation and, through this corporate entity, operate or operated the restaurant as a joint or unified enterprise.

4. Plaintiff Santos was employed as a busboy at the diner located at 212-97 26th Avenue, Bayside, New York 11360.

5. Plaintiff Santos was ostensibly employed as a busboy. However, he was required to spend a considerable part of his work day performing non-tipped duties, including but not limited to sweeping and mopping, accommodating and preparing deliveries, preparing salads, throwing out the garbage, deconstructing and tying boxes, cleaning the refrigerators, stocking the fridges, bringing up milk, cups, soup, and coffee from the basement to the kitchen, and cutting lemons and pickles (hereafter the “non-tipped duties”).

6. At all times relevant to this Complaint, Plaintiff Santos worked for Defendants in excess of 40 hours per week, without appropriate minimum wage and overtime compensation for the hours that he worked.

7. Rather, Defendants failed to maintain accurate recordkeeping of the hours worked, failed to pay Plaintiff Santos appropriately for any hours worked, either at the straight rate of pay or for any additional overtime premium.

8. Furthermore, Defendants repeatedly failed to pay Plaintiff Santos wages on a timely basis.

9. Defendants employed and accounted for Plaintiff Santos as a busboy in their payroll, but in actuality his duties required a significant amount of time spent performing the non-tipped duties alleged above.

10. Regardless, at all relevant times, Defendants paid Plaintiff Santos at a rate that was lower than the required tip-credit rate.

11. However, under both the FLSA and NYLL, Defendants were not entitled to take a tip credit because Plaintiff Santos's non-tipped duties exceeded 20% of each workday, or 2 hours per day, whichever is less in each day. 12 N.Y. C.R.R. §146.

12. Upon information and belief, Defendants employed the policy and practice of disguising Plaintiff Santos's actual duties in payroll records by designating him as a busboy instead of as a non-tipped employee. This allowed Defendants to avoid paying Plaintiff Santos at the minimum wage rate and enabled them to pay him at the tip-credit rate (which they still failed to do).

13. Defendants' conduct extended beyond Plaintiff Santos to all other similarly situated employees.

14. At all times relevant to this Complaint, Defendants maintained a policy and practice of requiring Plaintiff Santos and other employees to work in excess of forty (40) hours per week without providing the minimum wage and overtime compensation required by federal and state law and regulations.

15. Plaintiff Santos now brings this action on behalf of himself, and other similarly situated individuals, for unpaid minimum and overtime wages pursuant to the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, 29 U.S.C. § 201 *et seq.* ("FLSA"), and for violations of the N.Y. Labor Law §§ 190 *et seq.* and 650 *et seq.* (the "NYLL"), including applicable liquidated damages, interest, attorneys' fees and costs.

16. Plaintiff Santos seeks certification of this action as a collective action on behalf of himself, individually, and all other similarly situated employees and former employees of Defendants pursuant to 29 U.S.C. § 216(b).

JURISDICTION AND VENUE

17. This Court has subject matter jurisdiction under 28 U.S.C. § 1331 (federal question) and the FLSA, and supplemental jurisdiction over Plaintiff Santos’s state law claims under 28 U.S.C. § 1367(a).

18. Venue is proper in this district under 28 U.S.C. § 1391(b) and (c) because all, or a substantial portion of, the events or omissions giving rise to the claims occurred in this district, Defendants maintain their corporate headquarters and offices within this district, and Defendants operate a diner located in this district. Further, Plaintiff Santos was employed by Defendants in this district.

PARTIES

Plaintiff

19. Plaintiff Clemente Santos (“Plaintiff Santos” or “Mr. Santos”) is an adult individual residing in Queens County, New York.

20. Plaintiff Santos was employed by Defendants at Terrace Diner from approximately 1999 until on or about August 26, 2018.

21. Plaintiff Santos consents to being a party plaintiff pursuant to 29 U.S.C. § 216(b), and brings these claims based upon the allegations herein as a representative party of a prospective class of similarly situated individuals under 29 U.S.C. § 216(b).

Defendants

22. At all relevant times, Defendants owned, operated, or controlled a diner, located at 212-97 26th Avenue, Bayside, New York 11360 under the name “Terrace Diner”.

23. Upon information and belief, Terrace Diner Holdings, LLC (d/b/a Terrace Diner) is a domestic corporation organized and existing under the laws of the State of New York. Upon

information and belief, it maintains its principal place of business at 212-97 26th Avenue, Bayside, New York 11360.

24. Defendant Peter Kaoris is an individual engaging (or who was engaged) in business in this judicial district during the relevant time period. Defendant Peter Kaoris is sued individually in his capacity as owner, officer and/or agent of Defendant Corporation. Defendant Peter Kaoris possessed operational control over Defendant Corporation, an ownership interest in Defendant Corporation, and controlled significant functions of Defendant Corporation. He determined the wages and compensation of the employees of Defendants, including Plaintiff Santos, established the schedules of the employees, maintained employee records, and had the authority to hire and fire employees.

25. Defendant Jimmy Ppageorge is an individual engaging (or who was engaged) in business in this judicial district during the relevant time period. Defendant Jimmy Ppageorge is sued individually in his capacity as owner, officer and/or agent of Defendant Corporation. Defendant Jimmy Ppageorge possessed operational control over Defendant Corporation, an ownership interest in Defendant Corporation, and controlled significant functions of Defendant Corporation. He determined the wages and compensation of the employees of Defendants, including Plaintiff Santos, established the schedules of the employees, maintained employee records, and had the authority to hire and fire employees.

FACTUAL ALLEGATIONS

Defendants Constitute Joint Employers

26. Defendants operate a diner located in the Bayside section of Queens in New York City.

27. Individual Defendants, Peter Kaoris and Jimmy Ppageorge, possess operational control over Defendant Corporation, possess ownership interests in Defendant Corporation, and control significant functions of Defendant Corporation.

28. Defendants are associated and joint employers, act in the interest of each other with respect to employees, pay employees by the same method, and share control over the employees.

29. Each Defendant possessed substantial control over Plaintiff Santos's (and other similarly situated employees') working conditions, and over the policies and practices with respect to the employment and compensation of Plaintiff Santos, and all similarly situated individuals, referred to herein.

30. Defendants jointly employed Plaintiff Santos (and all similarly situated employees) and are Plaintiff Santos's (and all similarly situated employees') employers within the meaning of 29 U.S.C. 201 *et seq.* and the NYLL.

31. In the alternative, Defendants constitute a single employer of Plaintiff Santos and/or similarly situated individuals.

32. Upon information and belief, Individual Defendants Peter Kaoris and Jimmy Ppageorge operated Defendant Corporation as either an alter ego of themselves and/or fail to operate Defendant Corporation as an entity legally separate and apart from themselves, by among other things:

- a) failing to adhere to the corporate formalities necessary to operate Defendant Corporation as a Corporation,
- b) defectively forming or maintaining the corporate entity of Defendant Corporation, by, amongst other things, failing to hold annual meetings or maintaining appropriate corporate records,

- c) transferring assets and debts freely as between all Defendants,
- d) operating Defendant Corporation for their own benefit as the sole or majority shareholders,
- e) operating Defendant Corporation for their own benefit and maintaining control over this corporation as a closed Corporation,
- f) intermingling assets and debts of their own with Defendant Corporation,
- g) diminishing and/or transferring assets of Defendant Corporation to avoid full liability as necessary to protect their own interests, and
- h) Other actions evincing a failure to adhere to the corporate form.

33. At all relevant times, Defendants were Plaintiff Santos's employers within the meaning of the FLSA and New York Labor Law. Defendants had the power to hire and fire Plaintiff Santos, controlled the terms and conditions of employment, and determined the rate and method of any compensation in exchange for Plaintiff Santos's services.

34. In each year from 2012 to 2018, Defendants, both separately and jointly, had a gross annual volume of sales of not less than \$500,000 (exclusive of excise taxes at the retail level that are separately stated).

35. In addition, upon information and belief, Defendants and/or their enterprise were directly engaged in interstate commerce. As an example, numerous items that were used in the restaurant on a daily basis are goods produced outside of the State of New York.

Individual Plaintiff

36. Plaintiff Santos is a former employee of Defendants who ostensibly was employed as a busboy. However, he spent over 20% of each shift performing the non-tipped duties described above.

37. Plaintiff Santos seeks to represent a class of similarly situated individuals under 29 U.S.C. 216(b).

Plaintiff Clemente Santos

38. Plaintiff Santos was employed by Defendants from approximately 1999 until on or about August 26, 2018.

39. Defendants ostensibly employed Plaintiff Santos as a busboy.

40. However, Plaintiff Santos was also required to spend a significant portion of his work day performing the non-tipped duties described above.

41. Although Plaintiff Santos ostensibly was employed as a busboy, he spent over 20% of each day performing non-tipped work throughout his employment with Defendants.

42. Plaintiff Santos regularly handled goods in interstate commerce, such as food and other supplies produced outside the State of New York.

43. Plaintiff Santos's work duties required neither discretion nor independent judgment.

44. Throughout his employment with Defendants, Plaintiff Santos regularly worked in excess of 40 hours per week.

45. From approximately September 2012 until on or about December 2017, Plaintiff Santos worked from approximately 8:00 a.m. until on or about 3:30 p.m., six days a week (typically 45 hours per week).

46. From approximately January 2018 until on or about August 26, 2018, Plaintiff Santos worked from approximately 10:00 a.m. until on or about 3:30 p.m., two days a week and from approximately 8:00 a.m. until on or about 3:30 p.m., three days a week (typically 33.5 hours per week).

47. Throughout his employment, Defendants paid Plaintiff Santos his wages by check.

48. From approximately September 2012 until on or about December 2017, Defendants paid Plaintiff Santos \$5.50 per hour.

49. From approximately January 2018 until on or about August 26, 2018, Defendants paid Plaintiff Santos \$8.65 per hour.

50. From approximately July 3, 2018 until on or about August 26, 2018, Defendants did not pay Plaintiff Santos any wages for his work.

51. Plaintiff Santos's pay did not vary even when he was required to stay later or work a longer day than his usual schedule.

52. For example, Defendants required Plaintiff Santos to work an additional 30 minutes past his scheduled departure time every day, and did not pay him for the additional time he worked.

53. Defendants never granted Plaintiff Santos any breaks or meal periods of any kind.

54. Plaintiff Santos was never notified by Defendants that his tips were being included as an offset for wages.

55. Defendants did not account for these tips in any daily or weekly accounting of Plaintiff Santos's wages.

56. Plaintiff Santos was not required to keep track of his time, nor to his knowledge, did the Defendants utilize any time tracking device such as punch cards, that accurately reflected his actual hours worked.

57. No notification, either in the form of posted notices or other means, was ever given to Plaintiff Santos regarding overtime and wages under the FLSA and NYLL.

58. Defendants did not provide Plaintiff Santos an accurate statement of wages, as required by NYLL 195(3).

59. Defendants did not give any notice to Plaintiff Santos, in English and in Spanish (Plaintiff Santos's primary language), of his rate of pay, employer's regular pay day, and such other information as required by NYLL §195(1).

60. Defendants required Plaintiff Santos to purchase "tools of the trade" with his own funds—including 15 pairs of pants, 20 shirts, and three pairs of non-slip shoes.

Defendants' General Employment Practices

61. At all times relevant to this Complaint, Defendants maintained a policy and practice of requiring Plaintiff Santos (and all similarly situated employees) to work in excess of 40 hours a week without paying him appropriate minimum wage and overtime compensation as required by federal and state laws.

62. Plaintiff Santos was a victim of Defendants' common policy and practices which violate his rights under the FLSA and New York Labor Law by, *inter alia*, not paying him the wages he was owed for the hours he worked.

63. Defendants' pay practices resulted in Plaintiff Santos not receiving payment for all his hours worked, and resulted in Plaintiff Santos's effective rate of pay falling below the required minimum wage rate.

64. Defendants habitually required Plaintiff Santos to work additional hours beyond his regular shifts but did not provide him with any additional compensation.

65. Defendants required Plaintiff Santos and all other busboys to perform general non-tipped tasks in addition to their primary duties as busboys.

66. Plaintiff Santos and all similarly situated employees, ostensibly were employed as tipped employees by Defendants, although their actual duties included a significant amount of time spent performing the non-tipped duties outlined above.

67. Plaintiff Santos's duties were not incidental to his occupation as a tipped worker, but instead constituted entirely unrelated general restaurant work with duties, including the non-tipped duties described above.

68. Plaintiff Santos and all other tipped workers were paid at a rate that was lower than the lower tip-credit rate by Defendants

69. However, under state law, Defendants were not entitled to a tip credit because the tipped worker's and Plaintiff Santos's non-tipped duties exceeded 20% of each workday (or 2 hours a day, whichever is less) (12 N.Y.C.R.R. § 146).

70. New York State regulations provide that an employee cannot be classified as a tipped employee on any day in which he or she has been assigned to work in an occupation in which tips are not customarily received. (12 N.Y.C.R.R. §§137-3.3 and 137-3.4). Similarly, under federal regulation 29 C.F.R. §531.56(e), an employer may not take a tip credit for any employee time if that time is devoted to a non-tipped occupation.

71. In violation of federal and state law as codified above, Defendants classified Plaintiff Santos and other tipped workers as tipped employees, and paid them at a rate that was lower than the lower tip-credit rate when they should have classified them as non-tipped employees and paid them at the minimum wage rate.

72. Defendants failed to inform Plaintiff Santos who received tips that Defendants intended to take a deduction against Plaintiff Santos's earned wages for tip income, as required by the NYLL before any deduction may be taken.

73. Defendants failed to inform Plaintiff Santos who received tips, that his tips were being credited towards the payment of the minimum wage.

74. Defendants failed to maintain a record of tips earned by Plaintiff Santos who worked as a busboy for the tips he received. Defendants willfully disregarded and purposefully evaded recordkeeping requirements of the FLSA and NYLL by failing to maintain accurate and complete timesheets and payroll records.

75. Defendants failed to post at the workplace, or otherwise provide to employees, the required postings or notices to employees regarding the applicable wage and hour requirements of the FLSA and NYLL.

76. Upon information and belief, these practices by Defendants were done willfully to disguise the actual number of hours Plaintiff Santos (and similarly situated individuals) worked, and to avoid paying Plaintiff Santos properly for his full hours worked.

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

78. Defendants' unlawful conduct was intentional, willful, in bad faith, and caused significant damages to Plaintiff Santos and other similarly situated former workers.

79. Defendants failed to provide Plaintiff Santos and other employees with accurate wage statements at the time of their payment of wages, containing: the dates of work covered by that payment of wages; name of employee; name of employer; address and phone number of employer; rate or rates of pay and basis thereof, whether paid by the hour, shift, day, week, salary, piece, commission, or other; gross wages; deductions; allowances, if any, claimed as part of the minimum wage; net wages; the regular hourly rate or rates of pay; the overtime rate or rates of pay; the number of regular hours worked; and the number of overtime hours worked, as required by NYLL §195(3).

80. Defendants failed to provide Plaintiff Santos and other employees, at the time of hiring and on or before February 1 of each subsequent year, a statement in English and the employees' primary language, containing: the rate or rates of pay and basis thereof, whether paid by the hour, shift, day, week, salary, piece, commission, or other; allowances, if any, claimed as part of the minimum wage, including tip, meal, or lodging allowances; the regular pay day designated by the employer; the name of the employer; any "doing business as" names used by the employer; the physical address of the employer's main office or principal place of business, and a mailing address if different; and the telephone number of the employer, as required by New York Labor Law §195(1).

FLSA COLLECTIVE ACTION CLAIMS

81. Plaintiff Santos brings his FLSA minimum wage, overtime compensation, and liquidated damages claims as a collective action pursuant to FLSA Section 16(b), 29 U.S.C. § 216(b), on behalf of all similarly situated persons (the "FLSA Class members"), i.e., persons who are or were employed by Defendants or any of them, on or after the date that is three years before the filing of the complaint in this case (the "FLSA Class Period").

82. At all relevant times, Plaintiff Santos and other members of the FLSA Class were similarly situated in that they had substantially similar job requirements and pay provisions, and have been subject to Defendants' common practices, policies, programs, procedures, protocols and plans including willfully failing and refusing to pay them the required minimum wage, overtime pay at a one and one-half their regular rates for work in excess of forty (40) hours per workweek under the FLSA, and willfully failing to keep records under the FLSA.

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

FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION

VIOLATION OF THE MINIMUM WAGE PROVISIONS OF THE FLSA

84. Plaintiff Santos repeats and realleges all paragraphs above as though fully set forth herein.

85. At all times relevant to this action, Defendants were Plaintiff Santos's employers within the meaning of the Fair Labor Standards Act, 29 U.S.C. § 203(d). Defendants had the power to hire and fire Plaintiff Santos (and the FLSA Class Members), controlled the terms and conditions of their employment, and determined the rate and method of any compensation in exchange for their employment.

86. At all times relevant to this action, Defendants were engaged in commerce or in an industry or activity affecting commerce.

87. Defendants constitute an enterprise within the meaning of the Fair Labor Standards Act, 29 U.S.C. § 203 (r-s).

88. Defendants failed to pay Plaintiff Santos (and the FLSA Class members) at the applicable minimum hourly rate, in violation of 29 U.S.C. § 206(a).

89. Defendants' failure to pay Plaintiff Santos (and the FLSA Class members) at the applicable minimum hourly rate was willful within the meaning of 29 U.S.C. § 255(a).

90. Plaintiff Santos (and the FLSA Class members) were damaged in an amount to be determined at trial.

SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION

VIOLATION OF THE OVERTIME PROVISIONS OF THE FLSA

91. Plaintiff Santos repeats and realleges all paragraphs above as though fully set forth herein.

92. Defendants, in violation of 29 U.S.C. § 207(a)(1), failed to pay Plaintiff Santos (and the FLSA Class members) overtime compensation at a rate of one and one-half times the regular rate of pay for each hour worked in excess of forty hours in a work week.

93. Defendants' failure to pay Plaintiff Santos (and the FLSA Class members), overtime compensation was willful within the meaning of 29 U.S.C. § 255(a).

94. Plaintiff Santos (and the FLSA Class members) were damaged in an amount to be determined at trial.

THIRD CAUSE OF ACTION

VIOLATION OF THE NEW YORK MINIMUM WAGE ACT

95. Plaintiff Santos repeats and realleges all paragraphs above as though fully set forth herein.

96. At all times relevant to this action, Defendants were Plaintiff Santos's employers within the meaning of the N.Y. Lab. Law §§ 2 and 651. Defendants had the power to hire and fire Plaintiff Santos, controlled the terms and conditions of his employment, and determined the rates and methods of any compensation in exchange for his employment.

97. Defendants, in violation of NYLL § 652(1) and the supporting regulations of the New York State Department of Labor, paid Plaintiff Santos less than the minimum wage.

98. Defendants' failure to pay Plaintiff Santos the minimum wage was willful within the meaning of N.Y. Lab. Law § 663.

99. Plaintiff Santos was damaged in an amount to be determined at trial.

FOURTH CAUSE OF ACTION

VIOLATION OF THE OVERTIME PROVISIONS

OF THE NEW YORK STATE LABOR LAW

100. Plaintiff Santos repeats and realleges all paragraphs above as though fully set forth herein.

101. Defendants, in violation of N.Y. Lab. Law § 190 *et seq.*, and supporting regulations of the New York State Department of Labor, failed to pay Plaintiff Santos overtime compensation at rates of one and one-half times the regular rate of pay for each hour worked in excess of forty hours in a work week.

102. Defendants' failure to pay Plaintiff Santos overtime compensation was willful within the meaning of N.Y. Lab. Law § 663.

103. Plaintiff Santos was damaged in an amount to be determined at trial.

FIFTH CAUSE OF ACTION

VIOLATION OF THE NOTICE AND RECORDKEEPING

REQUIREMENTS OF THE NEW YORK LABOR LAW

104. Plaintiff Santos repeats and realleges all paragraphs above as though fully set forth herein.

105. Defendants failed to provide Plaintiff Santos with a written notice, in English and in Spanish (Plaintiff Santos's primary language), containing: the rate or rates of pay and basis thereof, whether paid by the hour, shift, day, week, salary, piece, commission, or other; allowances, if any, claimed as part of the minimum wage, including tip, meal, or lodging allowances; the regular pay day designated by the employer; the name of the employer; any "doing business as" names used by the employer; the physical address of the employer's main office or principal place of business, and a mailing address if different; and the telephone number of the employer, as required by NYLL §195(1).

106. Defendants are liable to Plaintiff Santos in the amount of \$5,000, together with costs and attorneys' fees.

SIXTH CAUSE OF ACTION

VIOLATION OF THE WAGE STATEMENT PROVISIONS

OF THE NEW YORK LABOR LAW

107. Plaintiff Santos repeats and realleges all paragraphs above as though fully set forth herein.

108. With each payment of wages, Defendants failed to provide Plaintiff Santos with an accurate statement listing each of the following: the dates of work covered by that payment of wages; name of employee; name of employer; address and phone number of employer; rate or rates of pay and basis thereof, whether paid by the hour, shift, day, week, salary, piece, commission, or other; gross wages; deductions; allowances, if any, claimed as part of the minimum wage; net wages; the regular hourly rate or rates of pay; the overtime rate or rates of pay; the number of regular hours worked; and the number of overtime hours worked, as required by NYLL 195(3).

109. Defendants are liable to Plaintiff Santos in the amount of \$5,000, together with costs and attorneys' fees.

SEVENTH CAUSE OF ACTION

RECOVERY OF EQUIPMENT COSTS

110. Plaintiff Santos repeats and realleges all paragraphs above as though fully set forth herein.

111. Defendants required Plaintiff Santos to pay, without reimbursement, the costs and expenses for purchasing and maintaining equipment and "tools of the trade" required to perform his

job, further reducing his wages in violation of the FLSA and NYLL. 29 U.S.C. § 206(a); 29 C.F.R. § 531.35; N.Y. Lab. Law §§ 193 and 198-b.

112. Plaintiff Santos was damaged in an amount to be determined at trial.

EIGHTH CAUSE OF ACTION

VIOLATION OF THE TIMELY PAYMENT PROVISIONS

OF THE NEW YORK LABOR LAW

113. Plaintiff Santos repeats and realleges all paragraphs above as though set forth fully herein.

114. Defendants did not pay Plaintiff Santos on a regular weekly basis, in violation of NYLL §191.

115. Defendants are liable to Plaintiff Santos in an amount to be determined at trial.

PRAYER FOR RELIEF

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff Santos respectfully requests that this Court enter judgment against Defendants by:

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

(b) Declaring that Defendants violated the minimum wage provisions of, and associated rules and regulations under, the FLSA as to Plaintiff Santos and the FLSA Class members;

(c) Declaring that Defendants violated the overtime wage provisions of, and associated rules and regulations under, the FLSA as to Plaintiff Santos and the FLSA Class members;

(d) Declaring that Defendants violated the recordkeeping requirements of, and associated rules and regulations under, the FLSA with respect to Plaintiff Santos's and the FLSA Class members' compensation, hours, wages, and any deductions or credits taken against wages;

(e) Declaring that Defendants' violations of the provisions of the FLSA were willful as to Plaintiff Santos and the FLSA Class members;

(f) Awarding Plaintiff Santos and the FLSA Class members damages for the amount of unpaid minimum wage, overtime compensation, and damages for any improper deductions or credits taken against wages under the FLSA as applicable;

(g) Awarding Plaintiff Santos and the FLSA Class members liquidated damages in an amount equal to 100% of his damages for the amount of unpaid minimum wage and overtime compensation, and damages for any improper deductions or credits taken against wages under the FLSA as applicable pursuant to 29 U.S.C. § 216(b);

(h) Declaring that Defendants violated the minimum wage provisions of, and rules and orders promulgated under, the NYLL as to Plaintiff Santos;

(i) Declaring that Defendants violated the overtime wage provisions of, and rules and orders promulgated under, the NYLL as to Plaintiff Santos;

(j) Declaring that Defendants violated the timely payment provisions of the NYLL as to Plaintiff Santos;

(k) Declaring that Defendants violated the notice and recordkeeping requirements of the NYLL with respect to Plaintiff Santos's compensation, hours, wages and any deductions or credits taken against wages;

(l) Declaring that Defendants' violations of the provisions of the NYLL were willful as to Plaintiff Santos;

(m) Awarding Plaintiff Santos damages for the amount of unpaid minimum wage and overtime compensation, and for any improper deductions or credits taken against wages as applicable

(n) Awarding Plaintiff Santos damages for Defendants' violation of the NYLL notice and recordkeeping provisions, pursuant to NYLL §§198(1-b), 198(1-d);

(o) Awarding Plaintiff Santos liquidated damages in an amount equal to one hundred percent (100%) of the total amount of minimum wage and overtime compensation shown to be owed pursuant to NYLL § 663 as applicable; and liquidated damages pursuant to NYLL § 198(3);

(p) Awarding Plaintiff Santos and the FLSA Class members pre-judgment and post-judgment interest as applicable;

(q) Awarding Plaintiff Santos and the FLSA Class members the expenses incurred in this action, including costs and attorneys' fees;

(r) Providing that if any amounts remain unpaid upon the expiration of ninety days following issuance of judgment, or ninety days after expiration of the time to appeal and no appeal is then pending, whichever is later, the total amount of judgment shall automatically increase by fifteen percent, as required by NYLL § 198(4); and

(s) All such other and further relief as the Court deems just and proper.

JURY DEMAND

Plaintiff Santos demands a trial by jury on all issues triable by a jury.

Dated: New York, New York

September 12, 2018

MICHAEL FAILLACE & ASSOCIATES, P.C.

By: /s/ Michael Faillace
Michael Faillace [MF-8436]
60 East 42nd Street, Suite 4510
New York, New York 10165
Telephone: (212) 317-1200
Facsimile: (212) 317-1620
Attorneys for Plaintiff

Michael Faillace & Associates, P.C.

Employment and Litigation Attorneys

60 E 42nd Street, Suite 4510
New York, New York 10165

Telephone: (212) 317-1200
Facsimile: (212) 317-1620

Faillace@employmentcompliance.com

September 11, 2018

BY HAND

TO: Clerk of Court,

I hereby consent to join this lawsuit as a party plaintiff.

(Yo, por medio de este documento, doy mi consentimiento para formar parte de la demanda como uno de los demandantes.)

Name / Nombre: Clemente Santos

Legal Representative / Abogado: Michael Faillace & Associates, P.C.

Signature / Firma:



Date / Fecha: 11 de septiembre 2018

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

CLEMENTE SANTOS, individually and on behalf of 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) Michael A. Faillace, Michael Faillace & Associates, P.C. 60 East 42nd Suite 4510 New York, NY 10165

DEFENDANTS

TERRACE DINER HOLDINGS, LLC (D/B/A TERRACE DINER), PETER KAORIS, and JIMMY PAPGEORGE,

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

Table with columns for Plaintiff (PTF) and Defendant (DEF) citizenship: Citizen of This State, Citizen of Another State, Citizen or Subject of a Foreign Country, Incorporated or Principal Place of Business In This State, Incorporated and Principal Place of Business In Another State, Foreign Nation.

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

Large table with categories: CONTRACT, REAL PROPERTY, TORTS, CIVIL RIGHTS, PRISONER PETITIONS, FORFEITURE/PENALTY, LABOR, IMMIGRATION, BANKRUPTCY, SOCIAL SECURITY, FEDERAL TAX SUITS, OTHER 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, 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): Plaintiffs seek unpaid overtime wages pursuant to The Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, 29 U.S.C. § 201 et seq. Brief description of cause: unpaid overtime wages

VII. REQUESTED IN COMPLAINT:

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

VIII. RELATED CASE(S) IF ANY

(See instructions): JUDGE DOCKET NUMBER

DATE 09/12/2018 SIGNATURE OF ATTORNEY OF RECORD /s/ Michael Faillace

FOR OFFICE USE ONLY

RECEIPT # AMOUNT APPLYING IFP JUDGE MAG. JUDGE

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, Michael Faillace, counsel for Plaintiff, 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 or omissions giving rise to the claim or claims, or a substantial part thereof, occur in the Eastern District? Yes

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

(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

I certify the accuracy of all information provided above.

Signature: /s/ Michael Faillace

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

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

for the

Eastern District of New York

CLEMENTE SANTOS, individually and on behalf of others similarly situated,

Plaintiff(s)

v.

TERRACE DINER HOLDINGS, LLC (D/B/A TERRACE DINER), PETER KAORIS, and JIMMY PAPGEORGE,

Defendant(s)

Civil Action No.

SUMMONS IN A CIVIL ACTION

To: (Defendant's name and address) TERRACE DINER HOLDINGS, LLC (D/B/A TERRACE DINER) 212-97 26th Avenue Bayside, New York 11360

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: Michael A. Faillace MICHAEL FAILLACE & ASSOCIATES, P.C. 60 East 42nd Street, Suite 4510 New York, New York 10165

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

Civil Action No. _____

PROOF OF SERVICE

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

This summons for *(name of individual and title, if any)* _____
was received 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 summons 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 summons 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 is true.

Date: _____

Server's signature

Printed name and title

Server's address

Additional information regarding attempted service, etc:

Print

Save As...

Reset

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

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

for the

Eastern District of New York

CLEMENTE SANTOS, individually and on behalf of others similarly situated,

Plaintiff(s)

v.

TERRACE DINER HOLDINGS, LLC (D/B/A TERRACE DINER), PETER KAORIS, and JIMMY PAPGEORGE,

Defendant(s)

Civil Action No.

SUMMONS IN A CIVIL ACTION

To: (Defendant's name and address) PETER KAORIS 212-97 26th Avenue Bayside, New York 11360

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: Michael A. Faillace MICHAEL FAILLACE & ASSOCIATES, P.C. 60 East 42nd Street, Suite 4510 New York, New York 10165

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

Civil Action No. _____

PROOF OF SERVICE

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

This summons for *(name of individual and title, if any)* _____
was received 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 summons 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 summons 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 is true.

Date: _____

Server's signature

Printed name and title

Server's address

Additional information regarding attempted service, etc:

Print

Save As...

Reset

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

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

for the

Eastern District of New York

CLEMENTE SANTOS, individually and on behalf of others similarly situated,

Plaintiff(s)

v.

TERRACE DINER HOLDINGS, LLC (D/B/A TERRACE DINER), PETER KAORIS, and JIMMY PAPGEORGE,

Defendant(s)

Civil Action No.

SUMMONS IN A CIVIL ACTION

To: (Defendant's name and address) JIMMY PAPGEORGE 212-97 26th Avenue Bayside, New York 11360

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: Michael A. Faillace MICHAEL FAILLACE & ASSOCIATES, P.C. 60 East 42nd Street, Suite 4510 New York, New York 10165

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

Civil Action No. _____

PROOF OF SERVICE

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

This summons for *(name of individual and title, if any)* _____
was received 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 summons 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 summons 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 is true.

Date: _____

Server's signature

Printed name and title

Server's address

Additional information regarding attempted service, etc:

Print

Save As...

Reset

ClassAction.org

This complaint is part of ClassAction.org's searchable class action lawsuit database and can be found in this post: [Wage and Hour Suit Filed by Former Terrace Diner Busboy](#)
