UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT	
EASTERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK	
	X
JOSE URQUILLA, on behalf of himself, individually,	_
and on behalf of all others similarly-situated,	

Plaintiff,

COMPLAINT

Docket No.:

-against-

Jury Trial Demanded

JOSEPH SOFIELD CITY-SCAPE, INC., and CITY-SCAPE LANDSCAPING, INC., and CHRISTOPHER "DUKE" SOFIELD, an individual, and VINCENT SOFIELD, an individual,

Defendants.
X

JOSE URQUILLA ("Plaintiff"), on behalf of himself, individually, and on behalf of all others similarly-situated, (collectively as "FLSA Plaintiffs"), by and through his attorneys, BORRELLI & ASSOCIATES, P.L.L.C., as and for his Complaint against JOSEPH SOFIELD CITY-SCAPE, INC., and CITY-SCAPE LANDSCAPING, INC., and CHRISTOPHER "DUKE" SOFIELD, an individual ("Duke Sofield"), and VINCENT SOFIELD, an individual ("Vincent Sofield"), (all four, together, as "Defendants"), alleges upon knowledge as to himself and his own actions and upon information and belief as to all other matters as follows:

NATURE OF CASE

1. This is a civil action for damages and equitable relief based upon Defendants' willful violations of Plaintiff's rights guaranteed to him by: (i) the overtime provisions of the Fair Labor Standards Acts ("FLSA"), 29 U.S.C. § 207(a); (ii) the overtime provisions of the New York Labor Law ("NYLL"), NYLL § 160; N.Y. Comp. Codes R. & Regs. ("NYCCRR") tit. 12, § 142-2.2; (iii) the NYLL's requirement that employers provide on each payday proper wage

statements to their employees containing specific categories of accurate information, NYLL § 195(3); (iv) the FLSA's anti-retaliation provision, 29 U.S.C. § 215(3); (v) one of the NYLL's anti-retaliation provisions, N.Y. Lab. Law § 215(1); and (vi) any other claim(s) that can be inferred from the facts set forth herein.

- 2. Plaintiff worked for Defendants, two corporations that operate as a single enterprise and that together run a landscaping business, and that business's co-owners and day-to-day overseers, as a landscaper, from in or about April 2008 to on or about August 19, 2016. Throughout his employment, but as is relevant herein, for the six-year period pre-dating the commencement of this action, Defendants required Plaintiff to work, and Plaintiff did work, at least sixty hours per week during the spring and fall seasons. However, Defendants failed to compensate Plaintiff at the statutorily-required overtime rate of one and one-half times his regular rate of pay for any hours that he worked per week in excess of forty during those seasons. Additionally, Defendants failed to provide Plaintiff with proper wage statements on each payday as the NYLL requires.
- 3. Defendants paid and treated all of their non-managerial employees who worked for them in the same manner.
- 4. Accordingly, Plaintiff brings this lawsuit against Defendants pursuant to the collective action provisions of the FLSA, 29 U.S.C. § 216(b), on behalf of himself, individually, and on behalf of all other persons similarly-situated during the applicable FLSA limitations period who suffered damages as a result of Defendants' violations of the FLSA. Plaintiff brings his claims under the NYLL and its implementing regulations on behalf of himself, individually, and on behalf of any FLSA Plaintiff who opts into this action.

5. Further, on an individual basis only, Plaintiff brings claims against Defendants for violations of the anti-retaliation provisions of the FLSA and NYLL, as after Plaintiff complained to Defendants that they were not paying him overtime for all of his hours worked per week in excess of forty, Defendants retaliated by constructively discharging Plaintiff and threatening him with interference with future job prospects.

JURISDICTION AND VENUE

- 6. The jurisdiction of this Court is invoked pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1331, as this action arises under 29 U.S.C. § 201, *et seq*. The supplemental jurisdiction of the Court is invoked pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1367 over all state law claims.
- 7. Venue is appropriate in this Court pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1391(b)(2), as a substantial part of the acts and/or omissions giving rise to the claims for relief occurred within this judicial district.

PARTIES

- 8. At all relevant times, Plaintiff was an "employee" entitled to protection as defined by the FLSA and the NYLL.
- 9. At all relevant times, Defendant Joseph Sofield City-Scape Inc. was and is a corporation organized under the laws of the State of New York with its principal place of business located at 5 Willis Avenue, Floral Park, New York 11001.
- 10. At all relevant times, Defendant City-Scape Landscaping Inc. was and is a corporation organized under the laws of the State of New York with its principal place of business also located at 5 Willis Avenue, Floral Park, New York 11001.
- 11. Since at least 2001, but in any event, at all times during the six year period predating the commencement of this action, both Defendant Joseph Sofield City-Scape Inc. and

Defendant City-Scape Landscaping Inc. have operated, in effect, as a single enterprise. In that respect, both corporations operated from the same principal location, were run by the same two individuals, and used employees interchangeably.

- 12. At all relevant times, Defendant Duke Sofield was the co-owner and a day-to-day overseer of Defendant Joseph Sofield City-Scape Inc. and Defendant City-Scape Landscaping Inc., who in that capacity, along with Defendant Vincent Sofield, set forth the employment terms for all employees of either corporation with respect to their hours worked and rates and methods of pay.
- 13. At all relevant times, Defendant Vincent Sofield was the co-owner and a day-to-day overseer of Defendant Joseph Sofield City-Scape Inc. and Defendant City-Scape Landscaping Inc., who in that capacity, along with Defendant Duke Sofield, set forth the employment terms for all employees of either corporation with respect to their hours worked and rates and methods of pay.
- 14. At all relevant times, all Defendants were employers within the meaning of the FLSA, the NYLL, and the NYCCRR. Additionally, both corporate defendants' qualifying annual business, either together or individually, exceeded and exceeds \$500,000, and the corporations were engaged in interstate commerce within the meaning of the FLSA as they use goods, equipment, and other materials in the course of their business, such as plants, fertilizer, hoses, and tools, much of which originates in states other than New York, the combination of which subjects Defendants to the FLSA's overtime requirements as an enterprise.

COLLECTIVE ACTION ALLEGATIONS

15. Plaintiff seeks to bring this suit to recover from Defendants full payment of all unpaid overtime compensation and liquidated damages under the applicable provisions of the FLSA, 29 U.S.C. § 216(b), individually, on his own behalf, as well as on behalf of those in the following collective:

Current and former non-employees of Defendants who, during the applicable FLSA limitations period, performed any work for Defendants and who give consent to file a claim to recover damages for overtime compensation that is legally due to them for time worked in excess of forty hours per week ("FLSA Plaintiffs").

- 16. Defendants treated Plaintiff and all FLSA Plaintiffs similarly in that Plaintiff and all FLSA Plaintiffs: (1) performed similar tasks, as described in the "Background Facts" section below; (2) were subject to the same laws and regulations; (3) were paid in the same or similar manner; (4) were required to work in excess of forty hours each workweek; and (5) were not paid the required rate of one and one-half times their respective regular rates of pay for all hours worked over forty in a workweek.
- 17. At all relevant times, Defendants were aware of the requirement to pay Plaintiff and all FLSA Plaintiffs at an amount equal to one and one-half times their respective regular rates of pay for all hours worked each workweek above forty, yet Defendants purposefully chose not to do so. Thus, Plaintiff and all FLSA Plaintiffs are victims of Defendants' pervasive practice of willfully refusing to pay their employees overtime compensation, in violation of the FLSA.

BACKGROUND FACTS

- 18. Defendant Joseph Sofield City-Scape Inc. and Defendant City-Scape Landscaping Inc. provide landscaping services to customers in New York City.
- 19. Defendant Duke Sofield personally hired and forced Plaintiff's separation of employment and was responsible for the hiring and firing of many other employees of Defendants.
- 20. Defendant Vincent Sofield signed checks and paid all employees of Defendants, and whenever Duke Sofield was not present, hired and fired employees.
- 21. Defendants employed Plaintiff to work as a landscaper from in or about April 2008 to on or about August 19, 2016. Throughout his employment, Plaintiff's duties consisted of cutting grass and hedges, planting, cleaning, moving tools and equipment, and weeding. Plaintiff primarily performed these tasks at different job sites in New York City.
- 22. Throughout his employment, and more specifically, during the six-year period pre-dating the commencement of this action, during the spring and fall seasons, specifically from March until the middle of June and then from September through December, Plaintiff generally worked from 6:00 a.m. to 4:00 p.m., six days per week, without being permitted to take scheduled or uninterrupted breaks during his shifts, for a total of sixty hours per week, although Plaintiff's hours varied from week-to-week.
- 23. From at least May 2011 until August 2015, for the spring and fall seasons, Defendants paid Plaintiff a flat weekly salary of \$745.00, which was intended to and operates to cover only his first forty hours worked per week, making his regular hourly rate \$18.63.
- 24. In or around September 2015, Defendants increased Plaintiff's weekly compensation to \$770 per week for the spring and fall seasons, which was again intended to and

operates to cover only his first forty hours worked per week, making his regular hourly rate

\$19.25.

25. In or around April 2016, Defendants increased Plaintiff's weekly compensation to

\$795.00 per week for the spring and fall seasons, which was again intended to and operates to

cover only his first forty hours worked per week, making his regular hourly rate \$19.88. This

was Plaintiff's rate of pay until the end of his employment with Defendants on August 19, 2016.

26. Throughout Plaintiff's employment, Defendants never paid Plaintiff any wages at

any rate for any hours that Plaintiff worked in excess of forty per week.

27. By way of example only, during the week of June 6 through June 12, 2016,

Plaintiff worked the following schedule:

Monday: 6:00 a.m. until 3:00 p.m.

Tuesday: 6:00 a.m. until 4:00 p.m.

Wednesday: 6:00 a.m. until 3:30 p.m.

Thursday: 6:00 a.m. until 5:00 p.m.

Friday: 6:00 a.m. until 3:00 p.m.

Saturday: 6:00 a.m. until 3:00 p.m.

Thus, Plaintiff worked a total of fifty-seven and one-half hours during this week. For his work

that week, Defendants paid him a flat weekly wage of \$795.00, or \$19.88 for his first forty hours

worked, and nothing for any hours that Plaintiff worked that week in excess of forty.

28. Defendants paid Plaintiff on a weekly basis, partly by check and partly in cash.

29. On each occasion when they paid Plaintiff, Defendants did not provide Plaintiff

with wage statements that accurately reflected the amount of hours that he worked per week, his

total weekly compensation, his regular rate of pay, or his overtime rate of pay for each hour that

he worked in excess of forty in a given workweek.

30. Defendants acted in the manner described herein so as to maximize their profits

while minimizing their labor costs.

7

- 31. Defendants treated all FLSA Plaintiffs in the manner described above.
- 32. Every hour that Plaintiff and FLSA Plaintiffs worked was for Defendants' benefit.
- 33. Prior to August 19, 2016, Plaintiff had previously complained to Defendant Duke Sofield about his lack of proper compensation on four separate occasions. Each time Plaintiff raised the issue of not being properly paid overtime, Defendant Duke Sofield would dismiss Plaintiff's complaints and respond by stating that Plaintiff was well paid and that Defendants would not pay him any more money.
- Defendant Duke Sofield again to complain about the lack of overtime compensation. Specifically, Plaintiff told Duke Sofield that he wanted to be paid overtime and that he could not continue to work without being paid proper compensation. In response, Defendant Duke Sofield became enraged, and told Plaintiff that if Plaintiff were to sue him or otherwise take action about his pay that Defendants would make it their personal mission to ensure that Plaintiff could not find a job elsewhere and that nobody would hire someone who complained. Plaintiff persisted, telling Duke Sofield that he could not continue to work without being properly paid, and Duke Sofield then threatened to fire Plaintiff unless he quit. After finishing the rest of his shift, Plaintiff acquiesced to Duke Sofield's coercion and left his employment, refusing to continue working for pay that violated United States and New York law.

FIRST CLAIM FOR RELIEF AGAINST DEFENDANTS

Unpaid Overtime Under the FLSA

35. Plaintiff and FLSA Plaintiffs repeat, reiterate, and re-allege each and every allegation set forth above with the same force and effect as if more fully set forth herein.

- 36. 29 U.S.C. § 207(a) requires employers to compensate their employees at a rate not less than one and one-half times their regular rates of pay for any hours worked exceeding forty in a workweek.
- 37. As described above, Defendants are employers within the meaning of the FLSA, while Plaintiff and FLSA Plaintiffs are employees within the meaning of the FLSA.
- 38. As also described above, Plaintiff and FLSA Plaintiffs worked in excess of forty hours in a workweek, yet Defendants failed to compensate Plaintiff and FLSA Plaintiffs in accordance with the FLSA's overtime provisions.
 - 39. Defendants willfully violated the FLSA.
- 40. Plaintiff and FLSA Plaintiffs are entitled to overtime pay for all hours worked per week in excess of forty at the rate of one and one-half times their respective regular rates of pay.
- 41. Plaintiff and FLSA Plaintiffs are also entitled to liquidated damages and attorneys' fees for Defendants' violations of the FLSA's overtime provisions.

SECOND CLAIM FOR RELIEF AGAINST DEFENDANTS

Unpaid Overtime Under the NYLL and the NYCCRR

- 42. Plaintiff and any FLSA Plaintiff who opts-in to this action repeat, reiterate, and re-allege each and every allegation set forth above with the same force and effect as if more fully set forth herein.
- 43. NYLL § 160 and 12 NYCCRR § 142-2.2 require employers to compensate their employees at a rate not less than one and one-half times their regular rates of pay for any hours worked exceeding forty in a workweek.
- 44. As described above, Defendants are employers within the meaning of the NYLL and the NYCCRR, while Plaintiff and any FLSA Plaintiff who opts-in to this action are employees within the meaning of the NYLL and the NYCCRR.

- 45. As also described above, Plaintiff and any FLSA Plaintiff who opts-in to this action worked in excess of forty hours in a workweek, yet Defendants failed to compensate them in accordance with the NYLL's and the NYCCRR's overtime provisions.
- 46. Plaintiff and any FLSA Plaintiff who opts-in to this action are entitled to their overtime pay for all hours worked per week in excess of forty at the rate of one and one-half times their respective regular rates of pay.
- 47. Plaintiff and any FLSA Plaintiff who opts-in to this action are also entitled to liquidated damages, interest, and attorneys' fees for Defendants' violations of the NYLL's and NYCCRR's overtime provisions.

THIRD CLAIM FOR RELIEF AGAINST DEFENDANTS

Failure to Furnish Proper Wage Statements in Violation of the NYLL

- 48. Plaintiff and any FLSA Plaintiff who opts-in to this action repeat, reiterate, and re-allege each and every allegation set forth above with the same force and effect as if more fully set forth herein.
- 49. NYLL § 195(3) requires that employers furnish employees with wage statements containing accurate, specifically enumerated criteria on each occasion when the employer pays wages to the employee.
- 50. As described above, Defendants failed to furnish Plaintiff and any FLSA Plaintiff who opts-in to this action with any wage statements on each payday, let alone those containing the accurate criteria that the NYLL requires.
- 51. Prior to February 27, 2015, pursuant to NYLL § 198(1-d), Defendants are liable to Plaintiff and any FLSA Plaintiff who opts-in to this action in the amount of \$100 for each workweek after the violation occurred, up to the statutory cap of \$2,500.

52. On or after February 27, 2015, pursuant to NYLL § 198(1-d), Defendants are liable to Plaintiff and any FLSA Plaintiff who opts-in to this action in the amount of \$250 for each workday after the violation occurred, up to a statutory cap of \$5,000.

FOURTH CLAIM FOR RELIEF AGAINST DEFENDANTS

Retaliation in Violation of the FLSA, 29 U.S.C. § 215(3)

- 53. Plaintiff repeats, reiterates, and re-alleges each and every allegation set forth above with the same force and effect as if more fully set forth herein.
- 54. Under FLSA § 215(a)(3), it is unlawful "to discharge or in any other manner discriminate against any employee because such employee has filed any complaint . . . under . . . this chapter, or has testified or is about to testify in any such proceeding."
- 55. As described above, after Plaintiff lodged a good faith complaint with Defendants about their failure to pay him proper overtime, Defendants retaliated by constructively terminating Plaintiff's employment and threatening him that Defendants would interfere to prevent him from being hired elsewhere.
- 56. As a direct and proximate result of Defendants' unlawful retaliatory conduct in violation of the FLSA, Plaintiff has suffered, and continues to suffer, economic harm for which he is entitled to an award of monetary damages and other relief.
- 57. As a direct and proximate result of Defendants' unlawful retaliatory conduct in violation of the FLSA, Plaintiff has suffered, and continues to suffer, severe mental anguish and emotional distress, including, but not limited to, depression, humiliation, embarrassment, stress and anxiety, loss of self-esteem and self-confidence, and emotional pain and suffering, for which he is entitled to an award of monetary damages and other relief.
- 58. Additionally, Plaintiff is entitled to liquidated damages, as well as punitive damages for Defendants' malicious, willful, and wanton violations of the FLSA's anti-retaliation

provision, and all other appropriate forms of relief, including reasonable attorneys' fees and costs.

FIFTH CLAIM FOR RELIEF AGAINST DEFENDANTS Retaliation in Violation of NYLL § 215(1)

- 59. Plaintiff repeats, reiterates, and re-alleges each and every allegation set forth above with the same force and effect as if more fully set forth herein.
- 60. Under NYLL § 215(1)(a), "[n]o employer or his or her agent, or the officer or agent of any corporation . . . shall discharge, threaten, penalize, or in any other manner discriminate or retaliate against any employee (i) because such employee has made a complaint to his or her employer . . . that the employer has engaged in conduct that the employee, reasonably and in good faith, believes violates any provision of this chapter."
- 61. As described above, after Plaintiff lodged a good faith complaint with Defendants about their failure to pay him proper overtime, Defendants retaliated by constructively terminating Plaintiff's employment and threatening him that Defendants would interfere to prevent him from being hired elsewhere.
- 62. As a direct and proximate result of Defendants' unlawful retaliatory conduct in violation of the NYLL, Plaintiff has suffered, and continues to suffer, economic harm for which he is entitled to an award of monetary damages and other relief.
- 63. As a direct and proximate result of Defendants' unlawful retaliatory conduct in violation of the NYLL, Plaintiff has suffered, and continues to suffer, severe mental anguish and emotional distress, including, but not limited to, depression, humiliation, embarrassment, stress and anxiety, loss of self-esteem and self-confidence, and emotional pain and suffering, for which he is entitled to an award of monetary damages and other relief.

- 64. Additionally, Plaintiff is entitled to liquidated damages, as well as punitive damages for Defendants' malicious, willful, and wanton violations of the NYLL's anti-retaliation provision, and all other appropriate forms of relief, including reasonable attorneys' fees, interest, and costs.
- 65. Pursuant to NYLL § 215(2)(b), contemporaneous with the filing of this Complaint, Plaintiff is filing a Notice of Claim with the Office of the New York State Attorney General, thereby advising the aforementioned of his claim for retaliation under Section 215 of the NYLL.

DEMAND FOR A JURY TRIAL

66. Pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 38(b), Plaintiff and FLSA Plaintiffs demand a trial by jury in this action.

PRAYER FOR RELIEF

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff and FLSA Plaintiffs demand judgment against Defendants as follows:

- a. A judgment declaring that the practices complained of herein are unlawful and in willful violation of the aforementioned United States and New York State laws;
- b. Preliminary and permanent injunctions against Defendants and their officers, owners, agents, successors, employees, representatives, and any and all persons acting in concert with them, from engaging in each of the unlawful practices, policies, customs, and usages set forth herein;
- c. An order restraining Defendants from any retaliation against any individual for participating in this lawsuit in any form;

- d. Designation of this action as a FLSA collective action on behalf of Plaintiff and FLSA Plaintiffs and prompt issuance of notice pursuant to 29 U.S.C. § 216(b) to the FLSA Plaintiffs, apprising them of the pendency of this action, permitting them to assert timely FLSA claims in this action by filing individual Consents to Sue pursuant to 29 U.S.C. § 216(b), and tolling of the statute of limitations;
- e. All damages that Plaintiff and FLSA Plaintiffs have sustained as a result of Defendants' conduct, including all unpaid wages and any shortfall between wages paid and those due under the law that Plaintiff and FLSA Plaintiffs would have received but for Defendants' unlawful payment practices;
- f. Liquidated damages and any other statutory penalties as recoverable under the FLSA and NYLL;
- g. All compensatory damages that Plaintiff has individually sustained as a result of the Defendants' unlawful retaliatory conduct, including back pay, front pay, damages to compensate Plaintiff for harm to his professional and personal reputation and loss of career fulfillment, emotional distress damages, general and special damages for lost compensation and employee benefits that he would have received but for the Defendants' conduct, and any other out-of-pocket losses that Plaintiff has incurred or will incur;
- h. Punitive damages, as provided by law, in connection with Plaintiff's individual retaliation claims;
- i. Awarding Plaintiff and FLSA Plaintiffs their costs and disbursements incurred in connection with this action, including reasonable attorneys' fees, expert witness fees and other costs, and an award of a service payment to Plaintiff;

- j. Designation of Plaintiff and his counsel as collective action representatives under the FLSA;
 - k. Pre-judgment and post-judgment interest, as provided by law; and
- l. Granting Plaintiff and FLSA Plaintiffs other and further relief as this Court finds necessary and proper.

Dated: May 2, 2017

Great Neck, New York

Respectfully submitted,

BORRELLI & ASSOCIATES, P.L.L.C. Attorneys for Plaintiff
1010 Northern Boulevard, Suite 328
Great Neck, New York 11021
Tel. (516) 248-5550
Fax. (516) 248-6027

CAITLIN DUFFY, ESQ. (¢D 81\$0)

ALEXANDER T. COLEMAN, ESQ (AC 8151) MICHAEL J. BORRELLI, ESQ (MB 8533) JS 44 (Rev. 07/16)

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	3		-	
JOSE URQUILLA			Joseph Sofield City-Scape, Inc., and City-Scape Landscaping, Inc.,					
				and Christopher "[Duke" Sofi	ield, and Vince	ent Sofield	aping, mc.
(b) County of Residence	of First Listed Plaintiff	Queens		County of Residence	e of First List	ted Defendant		
(E	XCEPT IN U.S. PLAINTIFF C	ASES)				PLAINTIFF CASES	ONLY)	
				NOTE: IN LAND CO	ONDEMNATI I OF LAND II	ION CASES, USE T	THE LOCATION O	F
(-)								
(c) Attorneys (Firm Name,				Attorneys (If Known)	l			
Borrelli & Associates, P.I. Great Neck, New York 1	L.L.C., 1010 Northern	Boulvard, Suite 328	,					
Gleat Neck, New York 1	1021							
II. BASIS OF JURISD	ICTION (Place an "X" in (One Box Only)	III. CI	TIZENSHIP OF P	RINCIPA	AL PARTIES	(Place on "X" in O	ne Roy for Pla
□ 1 U.S. Government	3 3 Federal Question	·	1	(For Diversity Cases Only)	TF DEF		and One Box for	Defendant)
Plaintiff	(U.S. Government	Not a Party)	Citize		11 11 1	Incorporated or P		PTF DEF
						of Business In		
☐ 2 U.S. Government Defendant	☐ 4 Diversity	hin of Bouties in It on III)	Citizo	en of Another State	3 2 7 2			□ 5 □ 5
Detendant	(maicate Chizens)	hip of Parties in Item III)				of Business In	Another State	
				en or Subject of a Treign Country	3 17 3	Foreign Nation		П 6 П 6
IV. NATURE OF SUI	Γ (Place an "X" in One Box O	nly)						
CONTRACT	1	ORTS		RFEITURE/PENALTY		KRUPTCY	OTHER S	
☐ 110 Insurance ☐ 120 Marine	PERSONAL INJURY 310 Airplane	PERSONAL INJURY 365 Personal Injury -	i' [7] 62:	5 Drug Related Seizure of Property 21 USC 881	☐ 422 Appo	eal 28 USC 158	☐ 375 False Cla☐ 376 Qui Tam	
☐ 130 Miller Act ☐ 140 Negotiable Instrument	315 Airplane Product Liability	Product Liability	□ 69	0 Other		JSC 157	3729(a))	
☐ 150 Recovery of Overpayment	☐ 320 Assault, Libel &	☐ 367 Health Care/ Pharmaccutical			PROPE	RTY RIGHTS	☐ 400 State Rea ☐ 410 Antitrust	
& Enforcement of Judgment 151 Medicare Act	Slander 330 Federal Employers*	Personal Injury Product Liability			☐ 820 Copy ☐ 830 Pater		130 Banks and 450 Commerce	d Banking
☐ 152 Recovery of Defaulted	Liability	☐ 368 Asbestos Personal	ŀ		☐ 840 Trade		460 Deportation	
Student Loans (Excludes Veterans)	☐ 340 Marine ☐ 345 Marine Product	Injury Product Liability		LABOR	SOCIAL	SECURITY	170 Racketeer	r Influenced and Organizations
☐ 153 Recovery of Overpayment of Veteran's Benefits	Liability 350 Motor Vehicle	PERSONAL PROPER 370 Other Fraud	TY 2 710	Fair Labor Standards Act	☐ 861 HIA	(1395በ)	☐ 480 Consumer	r Credit
160 Stockholders' Suits	☐ 355 Motor Vehicle	371 Truth in Lending	D 720) Labor/Management	☐ 863 DIW	k Lung (923) C/DIWW (405(g))	☐ 490 Cable/Sat ☐ 850 Securities	
☐ 190 Other Contract ☐ 195 Contract Product Liability	Product Liability 360 Other Personal	☐ 380 Other Personal Property Damage	D 740	Relations Railway Labor Act	☐ 864 SSID ☐ 865 RSI (Exchange 890 Other Star	
☐ 196 Franchise	Injury ☐ 362 Personal Injury -	☐ 385 Property Damage Product Liability		Family and Medical Leave Act			☐ 891 Agricultur	ral Acts
	Medical Malpractice			Other Labor Litigation			☐ 893 Environm ☐ 895 Freedom o	
REAL PROPERTY ☐ 210 Land Condemnation	CIVIL RIGITS ☐ 440 Other Civil Rights	PRISONER PETITION Habeas Corpus:	S □ 791	Employee Retirement Income Security Act		L TAX SUITS s (U.S. Plaintiff	Act 896 Arbitratio	
220 Foreclosure 230 Rent Lease & Ejectment	☐ 441 Voting	☐ 463 Alien Detainee	- 1	The state of the s	or Do	efendant)	☐ 899 Administr	rative Procedure
240 Torts to Land	☐ 442 Employment ☐ 443 Housing/	☐ 510 Motions to Vacate Sentence	1		Ø 871 IRS— 26 U	-Third Party SC 7609	Act Revie Agency D	w or Appeal of legision
☐ 245 Tort Product Liability ☐ 290 All Other Real Property	Accommodations ☐ 445 Amer, w/Disabilities -	☐ 530 General ☐ 535 Death Penalty	<u> </u>	IMMIGRATION			☐ 950 Constitution	onality of
and the state of t	Employment	Other:	O 462	Naturalization Application	1		State State	ites
	☐ 446 Amer. w/Disabilities - Other	☐ 540 Mandamus & Other ☐ 550 Civil Rights	r 🗇 465	Other Immigration Actions				
	☐ 448 Education	☐ 555 Prison Condition ☐ 560 Civil Detainee -	1					
		Conditions of						
V ODICIN as	0.5.611	Confinement			<u> </u>		L	
V. ORIGIN (Place an "X" in X 1 Original □ 2 Rea		Remanded from	4 Reins	totador 🗆 5 m . c	1.0	☐ 6 Multidistr		en latet at a ctor
	te Court	Appellate Court	Reope	ened Another (specify)	r District	Litigation Transfer	- Li	fultidistrict itigation - irect File
	Cite the U.S. Civil Sta Fair Labor Standa	itute under which you are ards Act - 29 U.S.C.	filing (Da Section	not cite jurisdictional state 207(a)	utes unless div	versity);		
VI. CAUSE OF ACTIO	Brief description of ca	use:						
VII. REQUESTED IN		e to pay overtime wa		MAND S	C	UECV VEG	.6.1	
COMPLAINT:	UNDER RULE 2		DE	MANDS		HECK YES only: J RY DEMAND:		ompiaint: (7 No
VIII. RELATED CASE	Z(S)							
IF ANY	(See instructions):	JUDGE			DOCKE	T NUMBER		
DATE 5/2/17		SIGNATURE OF ATTO	DRNEY OF	RECORD				
FOR OFFICE USE ONLY		COLT L	1	<i>YW</i>				
RECEIPT # AM	IOUNT	APPLYING IFP		JUDGE		MAG. JUD	OGE	

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 certification	ve of inter ition to th	est and costs, are eligible for compulsory arbitration. The amount of damages is presumed to be below the threshold amount unless a e contrary is filed.
I, Caitlin	Duffy	, counsel for Jose Urquilla , do hereby certify that the above captioned civil action is
ineligi	ble for o	, counsel for open description of the following reason(s):
	X	monetary damages sought are in excess of \$150,000, exclusive of interest and costs,
		the complaint seeks injunctive relief,
		the matter is otherwise ineligible for the following reason
		DISCLOSURE STATEMENT - FEDERAL RULES CIVIL PROCEDURE 7.1
		Identify any parent corporation and any publicly held corporation that owns 10% or more or its stocks:
		RELATED CASE STATEMENT (Section VIII on the Front of this Form)
provides because same jud case: (A	s that "A of the cases dge and mail) involves	es 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) civil case is "related" to another civil case for purposes of this guideline when, because of the similarity of facts and legal issues or arise from the same transactions or events, a substantial saving of judicial resources is likely to result from assigning both cases to the nagistrate judge." Rule 50.3.1 (b) provides that "A civil case shall not be deemed "related" to another civil case merely because the civil sidentical legal issues, or (B) involves the same parties." Rule 50.3.1 (c) further provides that "Presumptively, and subject to the power runine otherwise pursuant to paragraph (d), civil cases shall not be deemed to be "related" unless both cases are still pending before the
		NY-E DIVISION OF BUSINESS RULE 50.1(d)(2)
1.)	Is the c County	ivil action being filed in the Eastern District removed from a New York State Court located in Nassau or Suffolk
2.)		answered "no" above: the events or omissions giving rise to the claim or claims, or a substantial part thereof, occur in Nassau or Suffolk ? Yes
	b) Did District	the events or omissions giving rise to the claim or claims, or a substantial part thereof, occur in the Eastern
Suffolk	County, olk Coun	
	(1)	lote: A corporation shall be considered a resident of the County in which it has the most significant contacts).
		BAR ADMISSION
I am cui	rrently ac	dmitted in the Eastern District of New York and currently a member in good standing of the bar of this court. No
Are you	currentl	y 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: (m) 1 m/lim

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

for the

Eastern District of New York

Eastern Dis	Strict of INEW TOTK	
JOSE URQUILLA, on behalf of himself, individually, and on behalf of all others similarly-situated,)))	
Plaintiff(s))	
V.	Civil Action No.	
JOSEPH SOFIELD CITY-SCAPE, INC., and CITY-SCAPE LANDSCAPING, INC., and CHRISTOPHER "DUKE" SOFIELD, an individual, and VINCENT SOFIELD, an individual.)))	
Defendant(s))	
SUMMONS	IN A CIVIL ACTION	
To: (Defendant's name and address) Joseph Sofield City-Scap	pe, Inc., 5 Willis Avenue, Floral Park, New York, 11001	
City-Scape Landscaping	, Inc., 5 Willis Avenue, Floral Park, New York, 11001	
Christopher "Duke" Sofield, 5 Willis Avenue, Floral Park, New York 11001		
Vincent Sofield, 5 Willis	Avenue, Floral Park, New York, 11001	
A lawsuit has been filed against you.		
are the United States or a United States agency, or an of P. 12 (a)(2) or (3) — you must serve on the plaintiff an	L.L.C. d, Suite 328	
If you fail to respond, judgment by default will You also must file your answer or motion with the court	be entered against you for the relief demanded in the complaint. t.	
	DOUGLAS C. PALMER CLERK OF COURT	
Date:		
	Signature of Clerk or Deputy Clerk	

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

Civil Action No.

PROOF OF SERVICE

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

		ne of individual and title, if ar	ny)	
was rec	ceived by me on (date)		·	
	☐ I personally served	the summons on the ind	lividual at (place)	
			on (date)	; or
	☐ I left the summons		ence or usual place of abode with (name)	
			, a person of suitable age and discretion who res	ides there,
	on (date)	, and mailed a	copy to the individual's last known address; or	
		ons on (name of individual)		, who is
	designated by law to	accept service of process	s on behalf of (name of organization)	
			on (date)	; or
	☐ I returned the summ	nons unexecuted because	e	; or
	☐ Other (<i>specify</i>):			
	My fees are \$	for travel and S	for services, for a total of \$	0.00
	I declare under penalty	y of perjury that this info	ormation is true.	
Date:		_		
			Server's signature	
		_	Printed name and title	
		_	Server's address	

Additional information regarding attempted service, etc:

Complete and Mail To: BORRELLI & ASSOCIATES, P.L.L.C.

Attn: JOSE W URQUILLA, et al. v. JOSEPH SOFIELD CITY-SCAPE, INC., et al. 1010 Northern Boulevard, Suite 328

> Great Neck, New York 11021 Tel: (516) 248-5550

Fax: (516) 248-6027

CONSENT TO JOIN COLLECTIVE ACTION

I hereby consent to join the lawsuit, entitled JOSE W URQUILLA, on behalf of himse	elf
and all those similarly situated, v. JOSEPH SOFIELD CITY-SCAPE, et al, Docket No	o.:
brought pursuant to the Fair Labor Standards Act, the New York Sta	 ate
Labor Law, and the New York Code of Rules and Regulations.	

By signing below, I state that I am currently or was formerly employed by the defendants at some point during the previous six years. I was required to work for the defendants in excess of forty (40) hours per week without being properly compensated for all hours worked or for overtime or spread of hours compensation in accordance with state and federal law.

I hereby designate Borrelli & Associates, PLLC ("Plaintiffs' Counsel") to represent me for all purposes of this action.

I also designate JOSE W URQUILLA, the class representative who brought the abovereferenced lawsuit, as my agent to make decisions on my behalf concerning the litigation and the method and manner of conducting the litigation. I also state that I have entered into my own retainer agreement with Plaintiffs' Counsel or consent to the retainer agreement entered into by Mr. URQUILLA, concerning attorneys' fees and costs, and all other matters pertaining to this lawsuit.

12/21/2016

Signature

Sose W Ur quillo

Full Legal Name (Print)

Completar y Enviar a: BORRELLI & ASSOCIATES, P.L.L.C.

Attn: JOSE W URQUILLA, et al. v. JOSEPH SOFIELD CITY-SCAPE, INC., et al. 1010 Northern Boulevard, Suite 328
Great Neck, New York 11021

Tel: (516) 248-5550 Fax: (516) 248-6027

CONSENTIMIENTO PARA UNI	IRSE A UNA ACCIÓN COLECTIVA		
nombre de todos aquellos similarmente misma INC. et al., Docket No.: in	la demanda titulada, <u>JOSE W URQUILLA</u> , <u>y en no situado</u> , <u>v. JOSEPH SOFIELD CITY-SCAPE</u> , terpuestos en virtud del Fair Labor Standards Act, rk, y el Código de Nueva York de las Reglas y		
Mediante mi firma abajo, yo declaró que estoy empleado(a) or que estuve empleado(a) con los Demandados en una punto durante los ultimos seis (6) años. Yo fui/soy requierido(a) a trabajar mas de cuarenta (40) para los demandados sin ser compensado(a) apropiadomente o por la propagación de horas enconformidad con la ley Federal y estatal.			
Por la presente designo a Borrelli Demandantes") que me represente a todos los e	i & Associates, P.L.L.C. ("Abogados de los efectos de esta acción.		
Tambien designo a el JOSE W URQUILLA el representante de la clase quien trajo esta demanda, como mi agente para hacer las decisiones en mi nombre sobre la demanda y el método y la forma de llevar acabo esta demanda. Yo tambien decalro que he entrado en mi propio acuerdo de retención con los Abogados de los Demandantes o doy mi consentimento de los acuerdos de retención suscritos por el Señor URQUILLA relativa a los honorarios de abogados y costos, y todas mas cuestiones relativas a esta demanda.			
12/21/2016	J Will		
Fecha	Firma 50 Se W Ur 9 UIII a Nombre Completo		

ClassAction.org

This complaint is part of ClassAction.org's searchable class action lawsuit database and can be found in this post: <u>Lawsuit: Landscaper's Unpaid OT Dispute Ends in Retaliation</u>