

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK**

-----x  
ALONIA WHITE,

Civil Action No. 21-cv-10490

PLAINTIFF,

**COMPLAINT**

v.

Plaintiff Demands  
a Trial by Jury

IRIS NOVA LTD,  
DIRTY LEMON BEVERAGES, LLC, and,  
ZAK NORMANDIN, individually,

DEFENDANTS.  
-----x

Plaintiff ALONIA WHITE (“White” or “Plaintiff”), by her attorneys, LEVINE & BLIT, PLLC, complaining of defendants IRIS NOVA LTD (“Iris” or “defendant”), DIRTY LEMON BEVERAGES, LLC (“Dirty Lemon” or “defendant”), and ZAK NORMANDIN, individually (“Normandin” or “defendant”) (all collectively “defendants”), respectfully alleges upon information and belief:

**NATURE OF THE ACTION**

1. This action is brought to remedy unpaid minimum wages, regular wages, and overtime wages in violation of the Fair Labor Standards Act (“FLSA”) and New York Labor Law (“Labor Law”), as well as violations of the law with respect to frequency of payments and failure to provide wage notices and wage statements, in violation of the Labor Law.
2. Defendants' actions were unlawful and Plaintiff seeks injunctive and declaratory relief, monetary, compensatory and punitive damages, liquidated damages, interest, attorneys’ fees, costs, and other appropriate legal and equitable relief pursuant to the FLSA and Labor Law, and such other further relief as this Court deems necessary and proper.

### **JURISDICTION AND VENUE**

3. Jurisdiction of this Court is proper under 28 U.S.C. §1331, because the matter in controversy is a civil action arising under the Constitution, laws or treaties of the United States.

4. Supplemental jurisdiction over Plaintiff's state law claims is proper under 28 U.S.C. §1367.

5. Venue of this action in the Southern District of New York under 28 U.S.C. §1391 is appropriate as Defendants have a principle place of business within the district, and that the Southern District is the judicial district where a substantial part of the events or omissions giving rise to the claim occurred.

### **PARTIES**

6. Plaintiff is an individual who resides in Bronx County, New York.

7. Upon information and belief, defendant Normandin is a New York resident, and is the founder, owner, Chief Executive Officer and control person of defendants Iris and Dirty Lemon.

8. Defendant Iris is a Delaware business corporation registered to do business in New York State, with a principle place of business in New York County.

9. Defendant Dirty Lemon is a Delaware business corporation registered to do business in New York State, with a principle place of business in New York County.

10. Defendant Normandin owns and controls defendants Iris and Dirty Lemon insofar as Normandin actively managed both companies, and sets the terms and conditions of employment for both companies' employees.

11. At all times relevant to this action, defendants were "employers" of Plaintiff within the meaning of the Labor Law §§ 190(3) and 651(6) and FLSA § 203(d).

12. At all times relevant to this action, defendants jointly employed plaintiff insofar as Iris and Dirty Lemon have common ownership, common control, common management, and common

employees, and insofar as plaintiff performed work for both Iris and Dirty Lemon, was jointly supervised by all defendants, and had the terms and conditions of her employment jointly set by all defendants.

13. Upon information and belief, at all times relevant to this action, defendants have, individually and jointly, been enterprises engaged in interstate commerce within the meaning of the FLSA, 29 U.S.C § 207(a) insofar that they: (1) have had employees engaged in commerce or in the production of goods for commerce, and handles, sells or otherwise works on goods or materials that have been moved in or produced for commerce by any person; and (2) have had annual gross volume of sales not less than \$500,000.

14. At all times relevant to this action, plaintiff performed work for defendants which was interstate in nature, insofar as plaintiff regularly dealt with customers, vendors, suppliers and accounts who were located outside of New York State, via interstate communications networks and equipment.

15. At all times relevant to this action, plaintiff was an “employee” of defendants within the meaning of the Labor Law and FLSA, and entitled to protection. At all times relevant to this action, Plaintiff performed services as employee for defendants in Bronx and Manhattan, New York.

16. At all times relevant to this action, Plaintiff had the skills, experience and qualifications necessary to work in her employment position for the defendants.

### **FACTUAL ALLEGATIONS**

17. Plaintiff began her employment tenure with Defendants in or about September, 2020, as a customer experience associate, and remained in that job title at all times relevant to this action.

18. Plaintiff’s duties as a customer experience associate were to provide customer service to defendants’ customers by answering phones and emails, and tracking customer feedback, among

other things.

19. Plaintiff was initially hired on a part-time schedule of approximately 20-25 hours per week. Plaintiff maintained a part-time schedule up to approximately April, 2021, then became full-time.

20. Plaintiff was initially hired at a rate of pay of \$16/hour, which increased to \$30/hour as per defendants' management in the beginning of October, 2021, then \$20/hour at the beginning of November, 2021.

21. At all times relevant to this complaint, plaintiff's regular payday, as designated in advance by defendants, was to be two Fridays after each Monday through Friday workweek ended. For example, as per defendants, for the workweek Monday 9/7/2020 through Friday 9/11/2020, plaintiff was to be paid on Friday 9/25/2020.

22. From the beginning of her employment to present, defendants did not pay plaintiff on her regularly designated payday and, during the weeks for which plaintiff was paid by defendants, her wages were received well after her regular payday.

23. Therefore, from the beginning of plaintiff's employment to present, defendants were in violation of Labor Law § 191 insofar as defendants failed to pay plaintiff on her regularly scheduled payday.

24. Accordingly, for each such workweek in which plaintiff was not paid on her regularly designated payday, plaintiff is owed liquidated damages by defendants, due to defendants' intentional violation of Labor Law § 191.

25. In or around the beginning of April, 2021, plaintiff began full-time work for defendants.

26. In or around that time through present, though defendants required plaintiff to work significantly more hours, defendants failed to pay plaintiff any wages for just about all workweeks for the remainder of her employment, but for a few sporadic workweeks.

27. For example, for the workweek beginning May 17, 2021, plaintiff worked forty (40) hours for defendants, and was owed \$640 by defendants at her regular rate of \$16/hour, but was paid \$0 by defendants.

28. As an additional example, for the workweek beginning October 4, 2021, plaintiff worked forty (40) hours for defendants, and was owed \$1200 by defendants at her agreed upon increased regular rate of \$30/hour, but was paid \$0 by defendants.

29. Accordingly, plaintiff is owed by defendants minimum wages, regular wages, and all other available statutory damages for all workweeks in which she worked but was not paid.

30. Additionally, during many workweeks plaintiff worked over forty (40) hours in the workweek but was not compensated by defendants any overtime wages for such overtime work.

31. For example, during the workweek beginning April 5, 2021, plaintiff worked no less than 4.77 overtime hours, above her regular forty hour workweek. Defendants paid plaintiff no overtime wages for such work.

32. As another example, during the workweek beginning October 11, 2021, plaintiff worked no less than 5.2 overtime hours, above her regular forty hour workweek. Defendants paid plaintiff no overtime wages for such work.

33. Accordingly, plaintiff is owed by defendants overtime wages, and all other available statutory damages, for all workweeks in which she worked overtime but was not paid.

34. Finally, for many workweeks during her employment tenure defendants failed to provide plaintiff wage statements in compliance with Labor Law 195(3) on her regularly designated payday.

35. Defendants' blatant disregard of the FLSA and Labor Law, as outlined above, was willful and intentional as, despite plaintiff's vast reserve of patience and dedication to remain working for

# 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.