

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE
EASTERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK**

DERRICK PALMER, KENDIA MESIDOR,
BENITA ROUSE, ALEXANDER ROUSE,
BARBARA CHANDLER, LUIS PELLOT-
CHANDLER, and DEASAHNI BERNARD,

Plaintiffs

v.

AMAZON.COM, INC. and AMAZON.COM
SERVICES, LLC,

Defendants.

No. 1:20-cv-02468-BMC

**PLAINTIFFS' MEMORANDUM OF LAW IN OPPOSITION TO
DEFENDANTS' MOTION TO DISMISS**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION	1
ARGUMENT	1
A. The Court should not defer to OSHA under the primary jurisdiction doctrine	1
1. Plaintiffs’ claims are not within the special competence of OSHA	1
2. OSHA has no jurisdiction over public health and safety issues governed by state law	3
3. Amazon’s arguments as to the Court’s competence to decide this matter would apply to a wide swath of common law claims	4
B. Plaintiffs state a NYLL § 200 claim	6
1. Plaintiffs’ § 200 claim is not preempted by the OSH Act	6
2. Plaintiffs need not establish causation of an existing injury in order to seek injunctive relief under § 200.....	9
C. Plaintiffs state a claim for public nuisance	11
1. Plaintiffs have sufficiently alleged interference with a public right.....	11
2. Plaintiffs have sufficiently alleged special injury.....	12
3. Plaintiffs have sufficiently alleged actual and proximate causation of the increased risk of exposure	14
D. Plaintiffs have standing to seek injunctive relief.....	15
1. Plaintiffs challenge Amazon’s post-July 13 practices because workers continue to be unaware of the modified productivity requirements	15

2.	Plaintiffs retain standing to challenge Amazon’s pre-July 13 practices because it is not “absolutely clear” that they will not recur	16
3.	Plaintiffs have standing to ensure that newly hired workers are notified about the modified productivity requirements.....	17
E.	Workers’ compensation exclusivity does not bar employee-plaintiffs’ claims	18
F.	Plaintiffs state a claim for failure to pay wages under NYLL § 191	19
1.	Leave Law payments are wages subject to the provisions of New York Labor Law § 191	19
2.	Amazon’s \$2 hazard pay was a raise and workers were entitled to receive that raise in their Leave Law payments.....	21
3.	Plaintiffs have standing to seek injunctive relief on behalf of a class.....	22
4.	Section 191 of the New York Labor Law provides a cause of action for breach of statutory rights.....	23
	CONCLUSION.....	24

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

	Page
FEDERAL CASES	
<i>Ackerman v. Coca-Cola Co.</i> , No. 09 Civ. 0395, 2010 WL 2925955 (E.D.N.Y. July 21, 2010)	5
<i>Businesses for a Better New York v. Angello</i> , 341 F. App'x 701 (2d Cir. 2009)	7
<i>Cavalotti v. Daddy's BBQ, Inc.</i> , No. 15 Civ. 6469, 2018 WL 5456654 (E.D.N.Y. Sept. 8, 2018).....	24
<i>City of Los Angeles v. Lyons</i> , 461 U.S. 95 (1983).....	16, 17
<i>City of New York v. Beretta U.S.A. Corp.</i> , 315 F. Supp. 2d 256 (E.D.N.Y. 2004)	14
<i>City of New York v. Beretta U.S.A. Corp.</i> , 524 F.3d 384 (2d Cir. 2008).....	18
<i>Clapper v. Amnesty Int'l USA</i> , 568 U.S. 398 (2013).....	23
<i>Crawford v. Coram Fire Dist</i> , No. CV 12-3850, 2015 WL 10044273 (E.D.N.Y. May 4, 2015)	20
<i>Desiano v. Warner-Lambert & Co.</i> , 467 F.3d 85 (2d Cir. 2006).....	4
<i>Does v. Scalia</i> , No. 3:20-cv-01260, ECF No. 1 (M.D. Pa. July 22, 2020)	2, 5
<i>DoubleLine Capital LP v. Odebrecht Fin., Ltd.</i> , 323 F. Supp. 3d 393 (S.D.N.Y. 2018).....	15
<i>Eastside, Inc. v. Waste Mgmt. of New York, L.L.C.</i> , 405 F. Supp. 3d 408 (W.D.N.Y. 2019).....	13
<i>Ellis v. Tribune Television Co.</i> , 443 F.3d 71 (2d Cir. 2006).....	2, 3
<i>Floyd v. City of New York</i> , 283 F.R.D. 153 (S.D.N.Y. 2012)	23

Friends of the Earth, Inc. v. Laidlaw Envtl. Servs. (TOC), Inc.,
528 U.S. 167 (2000).....16

Gade v. Nat’l Solid Wastes Mgmt. Ass’n,
505 U.S. 88 (1992).....6, 7, 8

Goya Foods, Inc. v. Tropicana Prods., Inc.,
846 F.2d 848 (2d Cir. 1988).....2

Hill v. City of New York,
136 F Supp 3d 304 (E.D.N.Y. 2015)22

In re Am. Fed’n of Labor,
No. 20-1158, 2020 WL 3125324 (D.C. Cir. June 11, 2020)9

Jacobsen v. New York City Health & Hosps. Corp.,
No. 12 Civ. 7460, 2013 WL 4565037 (S.D.N.Y. Aug. 28, 2013)9

Lindsey v. Caterpillar, Inc.,
480 F.3d 202 (3d Cir. 2007).....5

Myers v. Hertz Corp.,
624 F.3d 537 (2d Cir 2010).....24

Montauk Oil Transp. Corp. v. Tug El Zorro Grande,
54 F.3d 111 (2d Cir. 1995).....18

NAACP v. AcuSport, Inc.,
271 F.Supp.2d 435 (E.D.N.Y. 2003)12, 14

Nat’l Commc’ns Ass’n v. Am. Tel. and Tel. Co.,
46 F.3d 220 (2d Cir. 1995).....2, 3

Pedraza v. Shell Oil Co.,
942 F.2d 48 (1st Cir. 1991).....5

Sakellaridis v. Polar Air Cargo, Inc.,
104 F. Supp. 2d 160 (E.D.N.Y. 2000)4, 7

Segedie v. Hain Celestial Grp., Inc.,
No. 14 Civ. 5029, 2015 WL 2168374 (S.D.N.Y. May 7, 2015).....5

Sosnowy v. A. Perri Farms, Inc.,
764 F. Supp. 2d 457 (E.D.N.Y. 2011)20

Explore Litigation Insights

Docket Alarm provides insights to develop a more informed litigation strategy and the peace of mind of knowing you're on top of things.

Real-Time Litigation Alerts



Keep your litigation team up-to-date with **real-time alerts** and advanced team management tools built for the enterprise, all while greatly reducing PACER spend.

Our comprehensive service means we can handle Federal, State, and Administrative courts across the country.

Advanced Docket Research



With over 230 million records, Docket Alarm's cloud-native docket research platform finds what other services can't. Coverage includes Federal, State, plus PTAB, TTAB, ITC and NLRB decisions, all in one place.

Identify arguments that have been successful in the past with full text, pinpoint searching. Link to case law cited within any court document via Fastcase.

Analytics At Your Fingertips



Learn what happened the last time a particular judge, opposing counsel or company faced cases similar to yours.

Advanced out-of-the-box PTAB and TTAB analytics are always at your fingertips.

API

Docket Alarm offers a powerful API (application programming interface) to developers that want to integrate case filings into their apps.

LAW FIRMS

Build custom dashboards for your attorneys and clients with live data direct from the court.

Automate many repetitive legal tasks like conflict checks, document management, and marketing.

FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS

Litigation and bankruptcy checks for companies and debtors.

E-DISCOVERY AND LEGAL VENDORS

Sync your system to PACER to automate legal marketing.