CV 16-

6268

LINDSAY, M.J.

Helen F. Dalton & Associates, P.C. Roman Avshalumov (RA5508) 69-12 Austin Street Forest Hills, NY 11375 Telephone: 718-263-9591

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

EASTERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK

LOUIS THOMAS and SERGIO MENDEZ MARTINEZ, individually and on behalf of all others similarly situated,

Plaintiffs,

COLLECTIVE ACTION COMPLAINT

-against-

JURY TRIAL DEMANDED

PARKING SYSTEMS GROUP, INC. d/b/a PARKING SYSTEMS, PARKING SYSTEMS PLUS, INC. d/b/a PARKING SYSTEMS, and MARK BARON and LUIS MEDRANO, as individuals,

Defendants.	
 ***************************************	X

Plaintiffs, LOUIS THOMAS and SERGIO MENDEZ MARTINEZ, 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 himself and upon information and belief as to other matters, as follows:

PRELIMINARY STATEMENT

1. Plaintiffs, LOUIS THOMAS and SERGIO MENDEZ MARTINEZ, individually and on behalf of all others similarly situated, through undersigned counsel, brings this action against PARKING SYSTEMS GROUP, INC. d/b/a PARKING SYSTEMS, and SYSTEMS, PARKING SYSTEMS PLUS, INC. d/b/a PARKING SYSTEMS, and MARK BARON and LUIS MEDRANO, as individuals, (hereinafter referred to as "Defendants"), to recover damages for egregious violations of state and federal wage and hour laws arising out of Plaintiffs' employment at PARKING SYSTEMS located at 1305 Old Northern Boulevard, Roslyn, New York 11576.

- 2. Plaintiff **LOUIS THOMAS** was employed by Defendants from on or around December 14, 2013 until on or around April 2, 2016.
- 3. Plaintiff **SERGIO MENDEZ MARTINEZ** was employed by Defendants from on or around May 27, 2013 until in on or around July 1, 2016.
- 4. As a result of the violations of Federal and New York State labor laws delineated below, Plaintiffs seek compensatory damages and liquidated damages in an amount exceeding \$100,000.00. Plaintiff also seeks interest, attorneys' fees, costs, and all other legal and equitable remedies this Court deems appropriate.

JURISDICTION AND VENUE

- 5. 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.
- 6. This Court has supplemental jurisdiction over Plaintiffs' state law claims pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §1367.
- 7. 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.
- 8. This Court is empowered to issue a declaratory judgment pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §§2201 & 2202.

THE PARTIES

- 9. Plaintiff LOUIS THOMAS resides at 13438 Maple Avenue, Flushing, New York 11355, and was employed by Defendants at PARKING SYSTEMS GROUP, INC. d/b/a PARKING SYSTEMS and PARKING SYSTEMS PLUS, INC. d/b/a PARKING SYSTEMS from on or around December 14, 2013 until on or around April 2, 2016.
- 10. Plaintiff SERGIO MENDEZ MARTINEZ resides at 13240 Sanford Avenue, Flushing, New York 11355, and was employed by Defendants at PARKING SYSTEMS GROUP, INC. d/b/a PARKING SYSTEMS and PARKING SYSTEMS PLUS, INC. d/b/a PARKING SYSTEMS from on or around May 27, 2013 until on or around July 1, 2016.
- 11. Upon information and belief, Defendant, PARKING SYSTEMS GROUP, INC. d/b/a PARKING SYSTEMS, is a corporation organized under the laws of New York with a principal executive office at 28 Fourth Street, Valley Stream, New York 11581.

- 12. Upon information and belief, Defendant, PARKING SYSTEMS GROUP, INC. d/b/a PARKING SYSTEMS, is a corporation authorized to do business under the laws of New York.
- 13. Upon information and belief, Defendant MARK BARON owns and/or operates PARKING SYSTEMS GROUP, INC. d/b/a PARKING SYSTEMS.
- 14. Upon information and belief, Defendant MARK BARON is the Chairman of the Board of PARKING SYSTEMS GROUP, INC. d/b/a PARKING SYSTEMS.
- 15. Upon information and belief, Defendant MARK BARON is the Chief Executive Officer of PARKING SYSTEMS GROUP, INC. d/b/a PARKING SYSTEMS.
- 16. Upon information and belief, Defendant MARK BARON is an agent of PARKING SYSTEMS GROUP, INC. d/b/a PARKING SYSTEMS.
- 17. Upon information and belief, Defendant MARK BARON has power over personnel decisions at PARKING SYSTEMS GROUP, INC. d/b/a PARKING SYSTEMS.
- 18. Upon information and belief, Defendant MARK BARON has power over payroll decisions at PARKING SYSTEMS GROUP, INC. d/b/a PARKING SYSTEMS.
- 19. Defendant MARK BARON has the power to hire and fire employees at PARKING SYSTEMS GROUP, INC. d/b/a PARKING SYSTEMS., establish and pay their wages, set their work schedule, and maintains their employment records.
- 20. During all relevant times herein, Defendant MARK BARON was Plaintiffs' employer within the meaning of the FLSA and NYLL.
- 21. Upon information and belief, Defendant LUIS MEDRANO owns and/or operates PARKING SYSTEMS GROUP, INC. d/b/a PARKING SYSTEMS.
- 22. Upon information and belief, Defendant LUIS MEDRANO is the Chairman of the Board of PARKING SYSTEMS GROUP, INC. d/b/a PARKING SYSTEMS.
- 23. Upon information and belief, Defendant LUIS MEDRANO is the Chief Executive Officer of PARKING SYSTEMS GROUP, INC. d/b/a PARKING SYSTEMS.
- 24. Upon information and belief, Defendant LUIS MEDRANO is an agent of PARKING SYSTEMS GROUP, INC. d/b/a PARKING SYSTEMS.
- 25. Upon information and belief, Defendant LUIS MEDRANO has power over personnel decisions at PARKING SYSTEMS GROUP, INC. d/b/a PARKING SYSTEMS.

- 26. Upon information and belief, Defendant LUIS MEDRANO has power over payroll decisions at PARKING SYSTEMS GROUP, INC. d/b/a PARKING SYSTEMS.
- 27. Defendant LUIS MEDRANO has the power to hire and fire employees at PARKING SYSTEMS GROUP, INC. d/b/a PARKING SYSTEMS, establish and pay their wages, set their work schedule, and maintains their employment records.
- 28. During all relevant times herein, Defendant LUIS MEDRANO was Plaintiffs' employer within the meaning of the FLSA and NYLL.
- 29. Upon information and belief, Defendant, PARKING SYSTEMS PLUS, INC. d/b/a PARKING SYSTEMS, is a corporation organized under the laws of New York with a principal executive office at 28 Fourth Street, Valley Stream, New York 11581.
- 30. Upon information and belief, Defendant, PARKING SYSTEMS PLUS, INC. d/b/a PARKING SYSTEMS, is a corporation authorized to do business under the laws of New York.
- 31. Upon information and belief, Defendant MARK BARON owns and/or operates PARKING SYSTEMS PLUS, INC. d/b/a PARKING SYSTEMS.
- 32. Upon information and belief, Defendant MARK BARON is the Chairman of the Board of PARKING SYSTEMS PLUS, INC. d/b/a PARKING SYSTEMS.
- 33. Upon information and belief, Defendant MARK BARON is the Chief Executive Officer of PARKING SYSTEMS PLUS, INC. d/b/a PARKING SYSTEMS.
- 34. Upon information and belief, Defendant MARK BARON is an agent of PARKING SYSTEMS PLUS, INC. d/b/a PARKING SYSTEMS.
- 35. Upon information and belief, Defendant MARK BARON has power over personnel decisions at PARKING SYSTEMS PLUS, INC. d/b/a PARKING SYSTEMS.
- 36. Upon information and belief, Defendant MARK BARON has power over payroll decisions at PARKING SYSTEMS PLUS, INC. d/b/a PARKING SYSTEMS.
- 37. Defendant MARK BARON has the power to hire and fire employees at PARKING SYSTEMS PLUS, INC. d/b/a PARKING SYSTEMS, establish and pay their wages, set their work schedule, and maintains their employment records.
- 38. During all relevant times herein, Defendant MARK BARON was Plaintiffs' employer within the meaning of the FLSA and NYLL.

- 39. Upon information and belief, Defendant LUIS MEDRANO owns and/or operates PARKING SYSTEMS PLUS, INC. d/b/a PARKING SYSTEMS.
- 40. Upon information and belief, Defendant LUIS MEDRANO is the Chairman of the Board of PARKING SYSTEMS PLUS, INC. d/b/a PARKING SYSTEMS.
- 41. Upon information and belief, Defendant LUIS MEDRANO is the Chief Executive Officer of PARKING SYSTEMS PLUS, INC. d/b/a PARKING SYSTEMS.
- 42. Upon information and belief, Defendant LUIS MEDRANO is an agent of PARKING SYSTEMS PLUS, INC. d/b/a PARKING SYSTEMS.
- 43. Upon information and belief, Defendant LUIS MEDRANO has power over personnel decisions at PARKING SYSTEMS PLUS, INC. d/b/a PARKING SYSTEMS.
- 44. Upon information and belief, Defendant LUIS MEDRANO has power over payroll decisions at PARKING SYSTEMS PLUS, INC. d/b/a PARKING SYSTEMS.
- 45. Defendant LUIS MEDRANO has the power to hire and fire employees at PARKING SYSTEMS PLUS, INC. d/b/a PARKING SYSTEMS, establish and pay their wages, set their work schedule, and maintains their employment records.
- 46. During all relevant times herein, Defendant LUIS MEDRANO was Plaintiffs' employer within the meaning of the FLSA and NYLL.
- 47. On information and belief, PARKING SYSTEMS GROUP, INC. d/b/a PARKING SYSTEMS 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.
- 48. On information and belief, PARKING SYSTEMS PLUS, INC. d/b/a PARKING SYSTEMS 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

- 49. Plaintiff LOUIS THOMAS was employed by Defendants at PARKING SYSTEMS located at 1305 Old Northern Boulevard, Roslyn, New York 11576 from on or around December 14, 2013 until on or around April 2, 2016.
- 50. During Plaintiff LOUIS THOMAS' employment by Defendants at PARKING SYSTEMS, Plaintiff's primary duties were as a parking attendant and performing other miscellaneous duties from on or around December 14, 2013 until on or around April 2, 2016.
- 51. Plaintiff LOUIS THOMAS was paid by Defendants approximately \$10.00 per hour in cash from on or around December 14, 2013 until on or around April 2, 2016.
- 52. Although Plaintiff LOUIS THOMAS worked approximately 70 (seventy) hours or more per week during the period of on or around December 14, 2013 until on or around April 1, 2015, 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.
- 53. Plaintiff SERGIO MENDEZ MARTINEZ was employed by Defendants at PARKING SYSTEMS located at 1305 Old Northern Boulevard, Roslyn, New York 11576 from on or around May 27, 2013 until on or around July 1, 2016.
- 54. During Plaintiff SERGIO MENDEZ MARTINEZ' employment by Defendants at PARKING SYSTEMS, Plaintiff's primary duties were as a parking attendant and performing other miscellaneous duties from on or around May 27, 2013 until on or around July 1, 2016.
- 55. Plaintiff SERGIO MENDEZ MARTINEZ was paid by Defendants approximately \$10.00 per hour in cash from on or around May 27, 2013 until on or around July 1, 2016.
- 56. Although Plaintiff SERGIO MENDEZ MARTINEZ worked approximately 50 (fifty) hours or more per week during the period of on around May 27, 2013 until on or around July 1, 2015, 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.

- 57. 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.
- 58. Upon information and belief, Defendants willfully failed to keep payroll records as required by both NYLL and the FLSA.
- 59. As a result of these violations of Federal and New York State labor laws, Plaintiffs seek compensatory damages and liquidated damages in an amount exceeding \$100,000.00. Plaintiff also seeks interest, attorneys' fees, costs, and all other legal and equitable remedies this Court deems appropriate.

COLLECTIVE ACTION ALLEGATIONS

- 60. 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:
- 61. Collective Class: All persons who are or have been employed by the Defendants as parking attendants or other similarly titled personnel with substantially similar job requirements and pay provisions, who were 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 minimum and overtime wage compensation.
- 62. Upon information and belief, Defendants employed between approximately 20 and 25 employees within the past three years subjected to similar payment structures.
- 63. Upon information and belief, Defendants suffered and permitted Plaintiffs and the Collective Class to work more than forty hours per week without appropriate overtime compensation.
- 64. Defendants' unlawful conduct has been widespread, repeated, and consistent.
- 65. Upon information and belief, Defendant had knowledge that Plaintiffs and the Collective Class performed work requiring overtime pay.
- 66. 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.

- 67. Defendants are liable under the FLSA 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 pay 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.
- 68. The questions of law and fact common to the putative class predominate over any questions affecting only individual members.
- 69. The claims of Plaintiffs are typical of the claims of the putative class.
- 70. Plaintiffs and their counsel will fairly and adequately protect the interests of the putative class.
- 71. 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

- 72. Plaintiffs re-allege and incorporate by reference all allegations in all preceding paragraphs.
- 73. Plaintiffs have consented in writing to be a party to this action, pursuant to 29 U.S.C. §216(b).
- 74. 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).
- 75. 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).
- 76. 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).

- 77. 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 the Plaintiffs.
- 78. 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

- 79. Plaintiffs re-allege and incorporate by reference all allegations in all preceding paragraphs.
- 80. At all times relevant to this action, Plaintiffs were employed by Defendants within the meaning of New York Labor Law §§2 and 651.
- 81. 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.
- 82. 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 unpaid 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

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

- 83. Plaintiff re-alleges and incorporates by reference all allegations in all preceding paragraphs.
- 84. Defendants failed to provide Plaintiff with a written notice, in English and in Spanish and/or Portuguese (Plaintiff's primary language), of his rate of pay, regular pay day, and such other information as required by NYLL §195(1).

85. Defendants are liable to Plaintiff in the amount of \$5,000.00 together with costs and attorneys' fees.

FOURTH CAUSE OF ACTION

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

- 86. Plaintiff re-alleges and incorporates by reference all allegations in all preceding paragraphs.
- 87. Defendants failed to provide Plaintiff with wage statements upon each payment of wages, as required by NYLL §195(3)
- 88. Defendants are liable to Plaintiff in the amount of \$5,000.00 together with costs and attorneys' fees.

PRAYER FOR RELIEF

Wherefore, Plaintiff respectfully requests 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 minimum wages;
- 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 ______ day of October 2016.

Roman Avshalumov, Esq. (RA5508)

Helen F. Dalton & Associates, PC

69-12 Austin Street Forest Hills, NY 11375

Telephone: 718-263-9591

Case 2:16-cv-06268-LDW-ARL Document 1-1 Filed 11/10/16 Pawery 2 ageID #: 12

JS 44 (Rev. 1/2013)

4653108147

CIVIL CORN HOED The JS 44 civil cover sheet and the information contained herein neither replace nor supplement the thing 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 LOUIS THOMAS and SERGIO MENDEZ MARTINEZ, individually and on behalf of all others similarly situated,			PARKING SYSTEM	DEFENDANTS PARKING SYSTEMS GROUP, INC. d/b/a PARKING SYSTEMS, PARKING SYSTEMS PLUS, INC. d/b/a PARKING SYSTEMS, and MARK BARON and LUIS MEDRANO, as individuals		
(b) County of Residence of First Listed Plaintiff QUEENS			l l	County of Residence of First Listed Defendant NASSAU		
(EXCEPT IN U.S. PLAINTIFF CASES)				(IN U.S. PLAINTIFF CASES ONLY)		
			THE TRACT	OF LAND INVOLVED.	I DOCATION OF	
(c) Attorneys (Firm Name, Address, and Telephone Number) Helen F. Dalton & Associates, P.C. 69-12 Austin Street			Attorneys (If Known)		• ,	
Forest Hills, NY 11375 (7	18) 263-9591			•		
II. BASIS OF JURISDI		ne Box Only)	. CITIZENSHIP OF P	RINCIPAL PARTIES	Place an "X" in One Box for Plaint	
			(For Diversity Cases Only) and One Box for Defendant) PTF DEF PTF DEF			
U.S. Government Plaintiff	☑ 3 Federal Question (U.S. Government)	Not a Party)	Citizen of This State			
☐ 2 U.S. Government ☐ 4 Diversity Defendant		ip of Parties in Item III)	Citizen of Another State	2		
			Citizen or Subject of a Foreign Country	3 🗇 3 Foreign Nation	□ 6 □ 6	
IV. NATURE OF SUIT	(Place an "X" in One Box On	ly)	r or			
CONTRACT	то	RTS	FORFEITURE/PENALTY	BANKRUPTCY	OTHER STATUTES	
☐ 110 Insurance ☐ 120 Marine ☐ 130 Miller Act ☐ 140 Negotiable Instrument	PERSONAL INJURY ☐ 310 Airplane ☐ 315 Airplane Product Liability	PERSONAL INJURY 365 Personal Injury - Product Liability 367 Health Care/	☐ 625 Drug Related Seizure of Property 21 USC 881 ☐ 690 Other	☐ 422 Appeal 28 USC 158 ☐ 423 Withdrawal 28 USC 157	☐ 375 False Claims Act ☐ 400 State Reapportionment ☐ 410 Antitrust ☐ 430 Banks and Banking	
☐ 150 Recovery of Overpayment	☐ 320 Assault, Libel &	Pharmaceutical		PROPERTY RIGHTS	☐ 450 Commerce	
& Enforcement of Judgment 151 Medicare Act	Slander 330 Federal Employers'	Personal Injury Product Liability		820 Copyrights 830 Patent	☐ 460 Deportation ☐ 470 Racketeer Influenced and	
☐ 152 Recovery of Defaulted Student Loans	Liability 340 Marine	☐ 368 Asbestos Personal Injury Product		☐ 840 Trademark	Corrupt Organizations 480 Consumer Credit	
(Excludes Veterans)	345 Marine Product	Liability	LABOR	SOCIAL SECURITY	490 Cable/Sat TV	
☐ 153 Recovery of Overpayment of Veteran's Benefits	Liability 350 Motor Vehicle	PERSONAL PROPERTY 370 Other Fraud	710 Fair Labor Standards Act Act	☐ 861 HIA (1395ff) ☐ 862 Black Lung (923)	☐ 850 Securities/Commodities/ Exchange	
☐ 160 Stockholders' Suits	355 Motor Vehicle	371 Truth in Lending	☐ 720 Labor/Management	☐ 863 DIWC/DIWW (405(g))	☐ 890 Other Statutory Actions	
☐ 190 Other Contract ☐ 195 Contract Product Liability	Product Liability 360 Other Personal	☐ 380 Other Personal Property Damage	Relations 740 Railway Labor Act	☐ 864 SSID Title XVI ☐ 865 RSI (405(g))	☐ 891 Agricultural Acts ☐ 893 Environmental Matters	
☐ 196 Franchise	Injury	☐ 385 Property Damage	☐ 751 Family and Medical	((5))	895 Freedom of Information	
	☐ 362 Personal Injury - Medical Malpractice	Product Liability	Leave Act 790 Other Labor Litigation		Act ☐ 896 Arbitration	
REAL PROPERTY	CIVIL RIGHTS	PRISONER PETITIONS	791 Employee Retirement	FEDERAL TAX SUITS	☐ 899 Administrative Procedure	
☐ 210 Land Condemnation ☐ 220 Foreclosure	☐ 440 Other Civil Rights ☐ 441 Voting	Habeas Corpus: 463 Alien Detainee	Income Security Act	☐ 870 Taxes (U.S. Plaintiff or Defendant)	Act/Review or Appeal of Agency Decision	
230 Rent Lease & Ejectment	442 Employment	☐ 510 Motions to Vacate		☐ 871 IRS—Third Party	☐ 950 Constitutionality of	
☐ 240 Torts to Land ☐ 245 Tort Product Liability	☐ 443 Housing/ Accommodations	Sentence 530 General		26 USC 7609	State Statutes	
290 All Other Real Property	445 Amer. w/Disabilities -	535 Death Penalty	IMMIGRATION		ļ	
	Employment 446 Amer. w/Disabilities -	Other: 540 Mandamus & Other	☐ 462 Naturalization Application☐ 465 Other Immigration			
	Other	550 Civil Rights	Actions			
	☐ 448 Education	☐ 555 Prison Condition ☐ 560 Civil Detainee -				
		Conditions of Confinement				
V. ORIGIN (Place an "X" i. X 1 Original □ 2 Re		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	Reinstated or	erred from	ict 5	
Proceeding Sta	te Court	Appellate Court	Reopened Anothe (specify,	er District Litigation	and the same of th	
XII. CANOD OD ACTIO	Fair Labor Standa		iling (Do not cite jurisdictional state	tutes unless diversity)		
VI. CAUSE OF ACTION	Drief description of ca	nuse. r unpaid overtime wag	es			
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: XLYes No			
VIII. RELATED CASI			1	1		
IF ANY	(See instructions):	JUDGE		DOCKET NUMBER	34	
10/1/16		CONATURE OF ATTOR	RNEYOFRECORD			
FOR OFFICE USE ONLY RECEIPT # AI	MOUNT	APPLYING IFP	JUDGE	MAG. JUI	DGE	

Case 2:16:cv-06268-LDW-ARL Document 1-1 Filed 11/10/16 Page 2 of 2 PageID #: 13

FIFICATION 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. , do hereby certify that the above captioned civil action is , counsel for 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 or 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) Is the civil action being filed in the Eastern District removed from a New York State Court located in Nassau or Suffolk 1.) 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? YES 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. \times Yes No Are you currently the subject of any disciplinary action (s) in this or any other state or federal court?

No

Attorney Bar Code: RA5508

I certify the accuracy of all information provided above.

Signature: During Courts.

Yes

(If yes, please explain)

ClassAction.org

This complaint is part of ClassAction.org's searchable class action lawsuit database and can be found in this post: Fmr. Attendants File Unpaid Wage Class Action Against Parking Systems