JS 44U/SUNY TO THE TREV. 1/2008

The JS-44 civil cover sheet and the information contained herein neithed replace for supperheat hereining and proper pleadings or other papers as required by law, except as provided by local bies of clurt. The form all roved by fine Juribial Conference of the United States in September 1974, is required for use of the Clerk of Court for the purpose of initial the civil docket sheet.

		nay, individually and o situated	on behalf of	DEFENDANTS Robert Half International, Inc., Dewey & Leboeuf LLP, and John Does #1-10					
ATTOR	NEYS (FIRM NAM	ME, ADDRESS, AND TEL	EPHONE NUMBER)	ATTO	RNEYS (IF KNOW	/N)			
Samuel (212) 56		t 32nd Street, Suite 1110 /	New York, NY 10001						
	(DO		under which you are fit statutes unless diver		D WRITE A BRIEF S	TATEMENT OF CAUSE)			
Has this	or a similar case	been previously filed in S	DNY at any time? No?	Yes?	Judge Previo	usly Assigned			
lf yes, w	as this case Vol.	☐ Invol. ☐ Dismissed.	. No Yes If yes,	give da	te	& Case No.			
(PLACE	AN [x] IN ONE B	OX ONLY)	NATURE	OF S	UIT				
		TORTS			AC	CTIONS UNDER STATUTES			
CONTRAC	т	PERSONAL INJURY	PERSONAL INJURY	FORFEI	TURE/PENALTY	BANKRUPTCY	OTHER STATUTES		
[]110 []120 []130 []140 []150 []150 []151 []152 []153 []160 []196 []196 FR REAL PRO []210 []220 []230 []245 []290		[]310 AIRPLANE []315 AIRPLANE PRODUCT LIABILITY []320 ASSAULT, LIBEL & SLANDER []330 FEDERAL EMPLOYERS' LIABILITY []340 MARINE []345 MARINE PRODUCT LIABILITY []350 MOTOR VEHICLE PRODUCT LIABILITY []360 OTHER PERSONAL INJURY ACTIONS UNDER STATUTES CIVIL RIGHTS []441 VOTING []442 EMPLOYMENT []443 HOUSING/ ACCOMMODATIONS []444 WELFARE []345 AMERICANS WITH DISABILITIES - EMPLOYMENT []446 AMERICANS WITH DISABILITIES - OTHER CIVIL RIGHTS		[]630 []640 []650 []660 []690 LABOR X 710 []720 []730 []740 []791 IMMIGRA [] 462 [] 463	FAIR LABOR STANDARDS ACT LABOR/MGMT RELATIONS LABOR/MGMT REPORTING & DISCLOSURE ACT RAILWAY LABOR ACT OTHER LABOR LITIGATION EMPL RET INC SECURITY ACT	[] 422 APPEAL	[] 400 STATE REAPPORTIONMENT [] 410 ANTITRUST [] 430 BANKS & BANKING [] 450 COMMERCE [] 460 DEPORTATION [] 470 RACKETEER INFLU- ENCED & CORRUPT ORGANIZATION ACT (RICO) [] 480 CONSUMER CREDIT [] 480 CABLE/SATELLITE TV [] 810 SELECTIVE SERVICE [] 850 SECURITIES/ EXCHANGE [] 875 CUSTOMER CHALLENGE 12 USC 3410 [] 880 OTHER STATUTORY ACTIONS [] 891 AGRICULTURAL ACTS [] 892 ECONOMIC STABILIZATION ACT [] 893 ENVIRONMENTAL MATTERS [] 894 ENERGY ALLOCATION ACT [] 895 FREEDOM OF INFORMATION ACT [] 990 APPEAL OF FEE DETERMINATION UNDER EQUIAL ACCESS TO JUSTICE [] 950 CONSTITUTIONALITY OF STATE STATUTES		
					9332	997			
_	heck if demanded						DENDING IN C. D. V. V. C.		
CHECK IF THIS IS A CLASS ACTION UNDER F.R.C.P. 23		DO YOU CLAIM IF SO, STATE:	THIS CASE IS RELATED TO A CIVIL CASE NOW PENDING IN S.D.N.Y.?						
DEMAND \$		OTHER	JUDGE	DOCKET NUMBER					
Check \	YES only if deman DEMAND: ☑ Y	nded in complaint ES □ NO	NOTE: Please	submit	at the time of filing	an explanation of why cas	ses are deemed related.		

(PLA	CE AN x IN OI	NE BOX ONL	Y)			01	RIGIN					
□ 1	Proceeding	2b.Remo	Court oved from Court AND ast one is pro se.		Remanded from Appellate Court	4 Rei	instated or opened		Transferred from (Specify District)	6 Multidistric	et 🔲 7	Appeal to District Judge from Magistrate Judge Judgment
	CE AN X IN ON					SIS OF J				IF D	IVERSITY	, INDICATE
П.	U.S. PLAINTIF	F ∐2 U.S	B. DEFENE	DANT	☑ 3 FEDEI (U.S. 1	RAL QUES NOT A PAI		∐4 DI\	VERSITY		IZENSHIP USC 1322	
CITIZENSHIP OF PRINCIPAL PARTIES (FOR DIVERSITY CASES ONLY)												
	(Place an [X] i									,		
CITIZE	EN OF THIS STATI	PTF E []1	DEF []1		EN OR SUBJEC EIGN COUNTR'			PTF DEF []3 []3		RATED <u>and</u> PRINCI		PTF DEF []5 []5
CITIZE	EN OF ANOTHER	STATE []2	[]2		RPORATED <u>or</u> F USINESS IN TH		PLACE	[]4 []4	FOREIGN	NATION		[]6 []6
PLAI	NTIFF(S) ADD	RESS(ES)	AND COL	JNTY(I	IES)							
DEFE	ENDANT(S) AI	DDRESS(ES	S) AND C	OUNT	Y(IES)							
RE	ENDANT(S) AI EPRESENTATIO DENCE ADDRE	ON IS HEREB	Y MADE	THAT, A	AT THIS TIME DEFENDANTS	E, I HAVE E	BEEN UN	ABLE, WIT	ΓΗ REASONA	BLE DILIGENCE	, TO ASCEI	RTAIN THE
Check					SSIGNED T	_	WH	ITE PL	AINS	✓ MANHA	TTAN	
DATE	5 5	SIGNATURE	OF ATTO	RNEY	OFRECORD			[]	NO	RACTICE IN THIS DMITTED Mo. <u>s</u> #DS-2119		
Magi	strate Judge	is to be des	signated	by the	e Clerk of the	ne Court	FR	EEI	MAN			
	strate Judge									is so Designa	ted.	
	chael McMah									_		

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK

SAMUEL & STEIN

David Stein (DS 2119)
Michael Samuel (MS 7997)
38 West 32nd Street
Suite 1110
New York, New York 10001
(212) 563-9884



Attorneys for Plaintiff, Individually and on behalf of all others similarly situated

Charlemagne Dumay, on behalf of himself and all other persons similarly situated,

Plaintiff,

- vs. -

Robert Half International, Inc., Dewey & Leboeuf LLP, and John Does #1-10,

Defendants.

Plaintiff Charlemagne Dumay, by and through his undersigned attorneys, for his complaint against defendants Robert Half International, Inc., Dewey & Leboeuf LLP, and John Does #1-10, alleges as follows, on behalf of himself and on behalf of all other persons similarly situated:

NATURE OF THE ACTION

1. Plaintiff Charlemagne Dumay alleges on behalf of himself and on behalf of other similarly situated current

and former employees of defendants Robert Half International, Inc., Dewey & Leboeuf LLP, and John Does #1-10, who elect to opt into this action pursuant to the Fair Labor Standards Act ("FLSA"), 29 U.S.C. § 216(b), that they are entitled to: (i) unpaid wages from defendants for overtime work for which they did not receive overtime premium pay as required by law, and (ii) liquidated damages pursuant to the FLSA, 29 U.S.C. §§ 201 et seq., because defendants' violations were willful.

2. Mr. Dumay further complains that he is entitled to back wages and liquidated damages from defendants for overtime work for which defendants willfully failed to pay overtime premium pay as required by the New York Labor Law SS 650 et seq. and the supporting New York State Department of Labor regulations, liquidated damages for unreasonably delayed payment of wages, and actual and liquidated damages as compensation for defendants' violation of the "spread of hours" regulations pursuant to New York Labor Law and the supporting regulations.

THE PARTIES

- 3. Plaintiff Mr. Dumay is an adult individual residing in Brooklyn, New York.
- 4. Plaintiff Mr. Dumay consents in writing to be a party to this action pursuant to 29 U.S.C. § 216(b); Mr.

Dumay's written consent is attached hereto and incorporated by reference.

- 5. Upon information and belief, defendant Robert Half International Inc. ("Robert Half") is a Delaware corporation registered to do business as a foreign corporation in New York with offices located at 245 Park Avenue, New York, New York.
- 6. Upon information and belief, defendant Dewey & Leboeuf LLP is a New York limited liability partnership with a principal place of business at 1301 Avenue of the Americas, New York, New York.
- 7. At all relevant times, defendants Robert Half and Dewey & Leboeuf have been, and continue to be, employers engaged in interstate commerce and/or the production of goods for commerce within the meaning of the FLSA, 29 U.S.C. §§ 206(a) and 207(a).
- 8. Upon information and belief, at all relevant times, defendant Robert Half has had gross revenues in excess of \$500,000.00.
- 9. Upon information and belief, at all relevant times, defendant Robert Half has used goods produced in interstate commerce.

- 10. Upon information and belief, at all relevant times, defendant Dewey & Leboeuf has had gross revenues in excess of \$500,000.00.
- 11. Upon information and belief, at all relevant times, defendant Dewey & Leboeuf has used goods produced in interstate commerce.
- 12. Upon information and belief, at all relevant times, defendants Robert Half and Dewey & Leboeuf constituted "enterprises" as defined in the FLSA.
- 13. Upon information and belief, at relevant times, defendants Robert Half and Dewey & Leboeuf constituted "joint employers" within the meaning of the FLSA.
- 14. Upon information and belief, defendants John Does 1-10 represent the owners, officers, directors, and/or managing agents of Robert Half and Dewey & Leboeuf, whose identities are unknown at this time, who participated in the day-to-day operations of defendants, who have the power to hire and fire employees, set wages and schedules, and retain their records, and who constitute "employers" pursuant to the FLSA, New York Labor Law, and federal and state implementing regulations.

JURISDICTION AND VENUE

15. This Court has subject matter jurisdiction over this matter pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §§ 1331 and 1337 and

supplemental jurisdiction over Mr. Dumay's state law claims pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1367. In addition, the Court has jurisdiction over Mr. Dumay's claims under the FLSA pursuant to 29 U.S.C. § 216(b).

16. Venue is proper in this district pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1391 because defendants' businesses are located in this district.

COLLECTIVE ACTION ALLEGATIONS

- 17. Pursuant to 29 U.S.C. § 207, Mr. Dumay seeks to prosecute his FLSA claims as a collective action on behalf of all persons who are or were formerly employed by defendants in the United States at any time since March 18, 2008, to the entry of judgment in this case (the "Collective Action Period"), who were non-exempt employees within the meaning of the FLSA, and who were not paid overtime compensation at rates not less than one-and-one-half times the regular rate of pay for hours worked in excess of forty hours per workweek (the "Collective Action Members").
- 18. The Collective Action Members are similarly situated to Mr. Dumay in that they were employed by Robert Half and assigned to work for Dewey & Leboeuf (as described further in detail below) as non-exempt employees of

defendants, and were denied premium overtime pay for hours worked beyond forty hours in a week.

- 19. They are further similarly situated in that defendants had a policy and practice of knowingly and willfully refusing to pay them overtime.
- 20. The exact number of such individuals is presently unknown, but is known by defendants and can be ascertained through appropriate discovery.

FACTS

- 21. At all relevant times herein, defendant Robert Half, a nationwide staffing firm, operated Robert Half Technology, a division of the company focusing on technology staffing, with offices in New York.
- 22. At all relevant times herein, defendant Dewey & Leboeuf operated a nationwide law firm with headquarters in New York.
- 23. Mr. Dumay has been employed by Robert Half at its Robert Half Technology division since approximately 2005, and for most of that time has been assigned by Robert Half to work for Dewey & Leboeuf as a network operations specialist.
- 24. Mr. Dumay was hired by Robert Half, placed by Robert Half at his position (as well as at other positions from time to time), and was paid by Robert Half.

- 25. However, on a day-to-day basis, Mr. Dumay was assigned to work at Dewey & Leboeuf, alongside both Dewey & Leboeuf employees and other staffing agency employees. He was supervised by Dewey & Leboeuf employees, who set his work schedule, gave him his daily work assignments, signed off on his time sheets, and evaluated his performance.
- 26. Further, upon information and belief, Mr. Dumay's pay rate while working on this assignment was set pursuant to an agreement between Robert Half and Dewey & Leboeuf.
- 27. Mr. Dumay's duties included monitoring the network, providing customer support, and rebooting the servers when necessary.
- 28. Mr. Dumay's work was performed in the normal course of defendants' business and was integrated into the business of defendants, and did not involve executive or administrative responsibilities.
- 29. At all relevant times herein, Mr. Dumay was an employee engaged in commerce and/or in the production of goods for commerce, as defined in the FLSA and its implementing regulations.
- 30. Until approximately the end of 2008, Mr. Dumay regularly worked approximately 40 hours a week, and was properly paid for overtime on the occasions when he did work in excess of 40 hours.

- 31. Starting in approximately 2009, when Dewey & Leboeuf opened a new network operations center (the "Center"), Mr. Dumay's schedule changed.
- 32. He was scheduled to regularly work a 48 hour week.
- 33. In addition, Mr. Dumay often covered additional shifts when other employees were absent, or when the network operations center was understaffed.
- 34. As a result, Mr. Dumay frequently worked as much as 56 hours in a week.
- 35. Mr. Dumay was paid at an hourly rate of \$22 per hour.
- 36. At the end of his first pay period at the Center, Mr. Dumay submitted a time sheet to his supervisor at Dewey & Leboeuf, Thomas Lord, with more than 40 hours on it.
- 37. Mr. Lord, who was required to sign off on all time sheets before submitting them to Robert Half, instructed Mr. Dumay not to do so again, but instead to only submit time sheets with 40 hours or less on them.
- 38. Mr. Dumay was instructed by Mr. Lord to "carry over" the additional, overtime hours until he had a pay period in which he worked less than forty hours, at which point he could claim credit for the overtime hours worked in prior pay periods.

- 39. As a result, Mr. Dumay would routinely have to wait weeks or months before he was paid for his overtime hours.
- 40. Moreover, he was only paid for these overtime hours at his regular rate of pay, with no overtime premium.
- 41. When Mr. Dumay complained about this arrangement, via email, to Bob Cadet, the director of Robert Half's Long Island office and Mr. Dumay's supervisor, he was told, "[Thomas Lord] is not violating the law" and that he would just have to wait until Robert Half could find another placement for him.
- 42. Defendants willfully failed to pay Mr. Dumay the overtime "bonus" for hours worked beyond 40 hours in a workweek, in violation of the FLSA, the New York Labor Law, and the supporting New York State Department of Labor regulations.
- 43. Mr. Dumay was frequently required to work in excess of ten hours per day, yet defendants willfully failed to pay him one additional hour's pay at the minimum wage for each day he worked more than ten hours in violation of the New York Labor Law and the supporting New York State Department of Labor regulations.
- 44. Upon information and belief, throughout the period of Mr. Dumay's employment, both before that time

(throughout the Collective Action Period) and continuing until today, defendant Robert Half has likewise employed other individuals like Mr. Dumay and has assigned them to work for Deewy & Lebouef (the Collective Action Members) in non-exempt positions that required no capital investment, and with duties and responsibilities that did not include any managerial responsibilities or the exercise of independent judgment.

- 45. Upon information and belief, these other individuals also worked in excess of forty hours per week, yet defendants likewise failed to pay them overtime compensation of one-and-one-half times their regular hourly rate in violation of the FLSA and the New York Labor Law, or to pay them an additional hour's pay at the minimum wage for each day they worked more than ten hours, in violation of New York Labor Law.
- 46. Upon information and belief, while defendants employed Mr. Dumay, and throughout all relevant time periods, defendants failed to maintain accurate and sufficient time records and failed to post or keep posted a notice explaining the minimum wage and overtime pay rights provided by the FLSA.

COUNT I

(Fair Labor Standards Act - Overtime)

- 47. Mr. Dumay, on behalf of himself and all Collective Action Members, repeats, realleges, and incorporates by reference the foregoing allegations as if set forth fully and again herein.
- 48. At all relevant times, defendants employed Mr. Dumay and each of the Collective Action Members within the meaning of the FLSA.
- 49. At all relevant times, defendants had a policy and practice of refusing to pay overtime compensation to their employees for hours they worked in excess of forty hours per workweek, by "shifting" those hours to weeks in which the employees worked less than forty hours.
- 50. As a result of defendants' willful failure to compensate their employees, including Mr. Dumay and the Collective Action Members, at a rate not less than one-and-one-half times the regular rate of pay for work performed in excess of forty hours per workweek, defendants have violated, and continue to violate, the FLSA, 29 U.S.C. §§ 201 et seq., including 29 U.S.C. §§ 207(a)(1) and 215(a).
- 51. The foregoing conduct, as alleged, constitutes a willful violation of the FLSA within the meaning of 29 U.S.C. \S 255(a).

52. Due to defendants' FLSA violations, Mr. Dumay and the Collective Action Members are entitled to recover from defendants their unpaid overtime compensation, an additional equal amount as liquidated damages, interest, reasonable attorneys' fees, and costs and disbursements of this action, pursuant to 29 U.S.C. § 216(b).

COUNT II

(New York Labor Law - Overtime)

- 53. Mr. Dumay repeats, realleges, and incorporates by reference the foregoing allegations as if set forth fully and again herein.
- 54. At all relevant times, Mr. Dumay was employed by defendants within the meaning of the New York Labor Law, §§ 2 and 651.
- 55. Defendants willfully violated Mr. Dumay's rights by failing to pay him overtime compensation at rates not less than one-and-one-half times the regular rate of pay for each hour worked in excess of forty hours per workweek in violation of the New York Labor Law §§ 650 et seq. and its supporting regulations in 12 N.Y.C.R.R § 142.
- 56. Defendants' failure to pay overtime was willful within the meaning of New York Labor Law § 663 and supporting regulations.

57. Due to defendants' New York Labor Law violations, Mr. Dumay is entitled to recover from defendants his unpaid overtime compensation, liquidated damages, interest, reasonable attorneys' fees, and costs and disbursements of the action, pursuant to New York Labor Law § 663(1).

COUNT III

(New York Labor Law - Spread of Hours)

- 58. Mr. Dumay repeats, realleges, and incorporates by reference the foregoing allegations as if set forth fully and again herein.
- 59. At all relevant times, Mr. Dumay was employed by defendants within the meaning of the New York Labor Law, $\S\S$
- 60. Defendants willfully violated Mr. Dumay's rights by failing to pay him an additional hour's pay at the minimum wage for each day he worked more than ten hours, in violation of the New York Labor Law §§ 650 et seg. and its regulations in 12 N.Y.C.R.R § 142-2.4.
- 61. Defendants' failure to pay the "spread of hours" premium was willful within the meaning of New York Labor Law § 663 and supporting regulations.
- 62. Due to defendants' New York Labor Law violations, Mr. Dumay is entitled to recover from defendants his unpaid compensation, liquidated damages, interest, reasonable

attorneys' fees, and costs and disbursements of the action, pursuant to New York Labor Law § 663(1).

COUNT IV

(New York Labor Law - Failure to Pay Wages)

- 63. Mr. Dumay repeats, realleges, and incorporates by reference the foregoing allegations as if set forth fully and again herein.
- 64. At all relevant times, Mr. Dumay was employed by defendants within the meaning of the New York Labor Law, §§ 2 and 651.
- 65. Defendants willfully violated Mr. Dumay's rights by failing to pay him all wages owed in a timely manner, in violation of New York Labor Law § 191 and its implementing regulations.
- 66. Defendants' failure to pay wages was willful within the meaning of New York Labor Law § 198 and supporting regulations.
- 67. Due to defendants' New York Labor Law violations, Mr. Dumay is entitled to recover from defendants liquidated damages for unreasonably delayed wages, interest, reasonable attorneys' fees, and costs and disbursements of the action, pursuant to New York Labor Law § 198.

PRAYER FOR RELIEF

WHEREFORE, Mr. Dumay respectfully requests that this Court grant the following relief:

- a. Designation of this action as a collective action on behalf of the Collective Action Members and prompt issuance of notice pursuant to 29 U.S.C. § 216(b) to all similarly situated members of an FLSA Opt-In Class, 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 appointing plaintiff and his counsel to represent the Collective Action members;
- b. A declaratory judgment that the practices complained of herein are unlawful under the FLSA and the New York Labor Law;
- c. An injunction against defendants and their officers, agents, successors, employees, representatives, and any and all persons acting in concert with them, as provided by law, from engaging in each of the unlawful practices, policies, and patterns set forth herein;

- d. A compensatory award of unpaid compensation, at the statutory overtime rate, due under the FLSA and the New York Labor Law;
- e. An award of liquidated damages as a result of defendants' willful failure to pay overtime compensation pursuant to 29 U.S.C. § 216 and New York Labor Law;
- f. Compensatory and liquidated damages for failure to pay the "spread of hours" premium;
- g. Liquidated damages for failure to pay for all hours worked in a timely manner;
- h. Back pay;
- i. Punitive damages;
- j. An award of prejudgment and postjudgment interest;
- k. An award of costs and expenses of this action together with reasonable attorneys' and expert fees; and
- Such other, further, and different relief as this Court deems just and proper.

Dated: March 17, 2011

David Stein (DS 2119)
Michael Samuel (MS 7997)
SAMUEL & STEIN

38 West 32nd Street

Suite 1110

New York, New York 10001

(212) 563-9884

Attorneys for Plaintiff

DEMAND FOR TRIAL BY JURY

Pursuant to Fed.R.Civ.P. 38 (b), plaintiff Mr. Dumay demands a trial by jury on all questions of fact raised by this complaint.

Dated: March 17, 2011

David Stein (DS 2119)
Michael Samuel (MS 7997)
SAMUEL & STEIN
38 West 32nd Street
Suite 1110
New York, New York 10001
(212) 563-9884

Attorneys for Plaintiff

EXHIBIT A

CONSENT TO SUE

By my signature below, I hereby authorize the filing and prosecution of claims in my name and on my behalf to contest the failure of Robert Half, Dewey & LeBoeuf, and their affiliates to pay me, *inter alia*, overtime wages as required under state and/or federal law and also authorize the filing of this consent in the action(s) challenging such conduct, and consent to being named as the representative plaintiff in this action to make decisions on behalf of all other plaintiffs concerning this action. I have been provided with a copy of a retainer agreement with the law firms of Samuel & Stein and Berger Attorney P.C., and I agree to be bound by its terms.

Date: July 27, 2010