

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
EASTERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK

-----X  
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Plaintiff,

-against-

THOMAS MAMMOLITO, THOMAS  
AUTOMOTIVE, LLC, THOMAS DODGE  
CORP. OF NEW YORK,

Defendants.  
-----X

REPORT AND  
RECOMMENDATION

CV 09-3564 (JS) (ETB)

TO THE HONORABLE JOANNA SEYBERT, United States District Judge:

The plaintiff, the United States of America, brings this action against the defendants, Thomas Mammolito (“Mammolito”), Thomas Automotive, LLC (“Thomas Automotive”) and Thomas Dodge Corp. of New York (“Thomas Dodge”) (collectively referred to as “defendants”), for moneys owed in connection with the advancement of certain funds by plaintiff to defendants for the purpose of financing a business venture. A motion for default judgment was filed by the plaintiff on May 24, 2011 and the matter was referred to the undersigned for a recommendation with respect to whether the motion should be granted, as well as any accompanying damages.

For the following reasons, I recommend that plaintiff’s motion for a default judgment be granted and that plaintiff be awarded damages in the amount of \$1,274,167.94.

FACTS

On February 5, 2008, the United States, through an entity known as the Long Island Development Corporation (“LIDC”), a development corporation certified by the Small Business

Administration (“SBA”) to administer business loans, entered into a loan agreement, secured by a promissory note (the “Note”), with 1800 Route 112 Realty, LLC. (“112 Realty”). (Hogan Decl. ¶ 2 and Ex. 1, annexed thereto.) Defendant Mammolito entered into the loan agreement on behalf of 112 Realty. (*Id.*; Tr. 6-7.) The loan was collateralized by individual guarantees (the “Guarantees”) executed by the individual defendant, Mammolito, and Thomas Automotive LLC and Thomas Dodge Corp. of New York, as well as a second mortgage (the “Mortgage”) on the real estate that 112 Realty occupied. (Tr. 6; Kapur Decl. ¶ 5.) That same day, LIDC assigned its interest in the Note, the Mortgage and the Guarantees to the SBA. (Hogan Decl. ¶ 5.)

The loan was disbursed to 112 Realty on March 12, 2008. (Hogan Decl. ¶ 7.) Pursuant to the loan agreement, the SBA, acting through LIDC, advanced 112 Realty \$1,091,000 in capital. (Hogan Decl., Ex. 1.) On March 18, 2008, LIDC sent 112 Realty a letter outlining the terms of the loan, which provided for a twenty-year repayment schedule based on a fixed interest rate of 5.56677 percent. (Tr. 11; Hogan Decl. Ex. 6.) 112 Realty selected a monthly payment option. (Tr. 11.) Pursuant to this agreement, an outside provider would debit monthly payments in the amount of \$8,549.73 from an account designated by 112 Realty. (Hogan Decl. Ex. 6A.)

112 Realty made the required payments on the loan during the months of April and May 2008. (Tr. 14; Hogan Decl., Ex.8.) In May 2008, 112 Realty sought a temporary cessation of future loan payments, citing corporate cash flow problems as the reason for its inability to comply with its obligations under the loan. (Tr. 20; Hogan Decl., Ex. 10.) 112 Realty was granted a payment suspension for the months of June, July, and August 2008. (Tr. 20; Hogan Decl., Ex. 11.) 112 Realty’s requirement to make its regularly scheduled payments resumed in September 2008. (Tr. 21.) However, the payment amount increased to \$9,023.58 to reflect the

suspended payments. (Tr. 21; Hogan Decl., Ex. 11.) In September 2008, 112 Realty made its first post-deferral payment. (Tr.2; Hogan Decl., Ex. 8.) However, 112 Realty again found itself unable to commit to making future payments and the SBA granted it a second three-month suspension of its loan obligations for the months of October, November and December 2008. (Tr. 23-24; Hogan Decl., Ex. 14-15.)

112 Realty failed to make its January 2009 payment, at which time the SBA declared it to be in default under the terms of the loan agreement. (Tr. 26.) On March 20, 2009, LIDC sent the guarantors, Mammolito, Thomas Automotive, and Thomas Dodge, a letter declaring the loan in default, and accelerating the loan so that any of the defendants could cure the defect by paying the entire amount of the loan. (Tr. 27; Pl. Ex. 5) None of the defendants paid the loan obligations. (Tr. 27.) On August 18, 2009, the United States commenced this action to recover the monies owed under the loan agreement.

An inquest was held before the undersigned on September 21, 2011. Defendants did not appear at the inquest. In support of its motion, the United States called two witnesses, John Hogan, the Assistant Vice President for the New York Business Development Corporation,<sup>1</sup> and Celeste Kapur, District Counsel for the SBA.

#### DISCUSSION

##### I. Default Judgment

When a party fails to appear or defend an action by an adverse party, a default may be

---

<sup>1</sup> In February 2009, LIDC voluntarily transferred its certificate as a development company back to the SBA, at which time the SBA appointed the New York Business Development Corporation to take over LIDC's portfolio. (Tr. 7.)

entered against the non-moving party. See Fed. R. Civ. P. 55. “A default constitutes an admission of all well-pleaded factual allegations in the complaint and the allegations as they pertain to liability are deemed true.” Heartland Payment Services, Inc. v. Island Pride Homes, Inc., No. 10 Civ. 1739, 2011 WL 4458988, at \*2 (E.D.N.Y. Aug. 31, 2011) (citing Joe Hand Promotions, Inc. v. El Norteno Restaurant Corp., No. 06 Civ. 1878, 2007 WL 2891016, at \*2 (E.D.N.Y. Sept. 28, 2007)); see also Greyhound Exhibitgroup, Inc. v. E.L. U.L. Realty Corp., 973 F.2d 155, 158 (2d. Cir. 1992). Damages, however, must be proven, usually “at an evidentiary proceeding at which the defendant is afforded the opportunity to contest the amount claimed.” Time Warner Cable of N.Y. v. Rivera, No. 99-2339, 1995 WL 362429, at \*2 (E.D.N.Y. June 8, 1995) (citing Greyhound Exhibitgroup, 973 F.2d at 158). Plaintiff “is entitled to all reasonable inferences from the evidence it offers.” Cablevision Sys. New York City Corp. v. Lokshin, 980 F. Supp. 107, 112 (E.D.N.Y. 1997) (citing Au Bon Pain Corp. v. Artect, Inc., 653 F.2d 61, 65 (2d Cir. 1981)).

Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 55(b)(2) provides that, upon entering a default judgment, the court may “(A) conduct an accounting; (B) determine the amount of damages; (C) establish the truth of any allegation by evidence; or (D) investigate any other matter.” Fed. R. Civ. P. 55(b)(2). Upon hearing an application for entry of a default judgment, “a district court judge is required to exercise his ‘sound judicial discretion’ in determining whether the judgment should be entered.” Wong v. East River Chinese Restaurant, 884 F. Supp. 663, 669 (E.D.N.Y. 1995).

Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 54(c) “limits the damages recoverable by a plaintiff following a default judgment to the type and quantity of damages demanded in the complaint

...” Ames v. Stat Fire Suppression, Inc., 227 F.R.D. 361, 362 (E.D.N.Y.); see also Fed. R. Civ. P. 54(c) (“A default judgment must not differ in kind from, or exceed in amount, what is demanded in the pleadings.”). Accordingly, plaintiff is limited to the actual damages pleaded in its Complaint of \$1,084,083.97. (Compl.¶ 9.) However, plaintiffs’ request for interest may be awarded in an amount determined by the court. See Ames, 227 F.R.D. at 362 (finding that Rule 54(c) “does not require plaintiff to have demanded a sum certain” with respect to damages that accrue during the pendency of a proceeding and are “explicitly requested in the complaint, and sufficiently established by the affidavits submitted by plaintiff[ ]”).

Here, plaintiff filed its Complaint on August 17, 2009. Defendants answered the Complaint on October 26, 2009. However, by Stipulation dated May 19, 2011, defendants withdrew their Answer and agreed not to file a new one or to file a motion to dismiss. (Stipulation and Order dated May 19, 2011.) The Court so ordered the parties’ stipulation on May 23, 2011. (Order of Seybert J., dated May 23, 2011.) Thereafter, on May 24, 2011, plaintiff moved for the entry of a default judgment against defendants. The Clerk the Court certified the defendants’ default on May 25, 2011. (Certificate of Default dated May 25, 2011.) As stated above, defendants did not appear at the inquest held before the undersigned on September 21, 2011.

Accordingly, I recommend that plaintiff’s motion for a default judgment be granted.

## II. Damages Pursuant to the Agreement

The total amount of money borrowed by 112 Realty was \$1,091,000. (Hogan Decl., Ex.

1.) 112 Realty made three loan payments for the months of April, May and September 2008,

# 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.