

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

SETH HARRIS, *Acting Secretary of Labor,
United States Department of Labor,*

Petitioner,

- v -

Civ. No. 1:12-MC-82
(DNH/RFT)

SUBCONTRACTING CONCEPTS, LLC

Respondent.

APPEARANCES:

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF LABOR
OFFICER OF THE SOLICITOR

Attorneys for the Petitioner
201 Varick Street, Room 983
New York, New York 10014

JASINSKI, P.C.

Attorneys for the Respondent
60 Park Place, 8th Floor
Newark, New Jersey 07102

RANDOLPH F. TREECE
United States Magistrate Judge

OF COUNSEL:

ANDREW M. KATZ, ESQ.

DAVID F. JASINSKI, ESQ.

MEMORANDUM-DECISION and ORDER

This matter was submitted to this Court by the United States Department of Labor's Wage and Hour Division (hereinafter "DOL") seeking to compel Subcontracting Concepts, LLC (hereinafter "SCI LLC") to comply with its Subpoena *Ad Testificandum* (hereinafter "Subpoena"). Dkt. No. 1, Pet'r Mot. to Compel. On February 11, 2013, this Court issued a Memorandum-Decision and Order (hereinafter

“MDO”) granting in part DOL’s Motion. Dkt. No. 12. For the most part, SCI LLC was directed to testify at a deposition and to produce requested documents, albeit with specific limitations. Some of the production is subject to representative sampling, while disclosure of SCI LLC’s client list was contingent upon “the understanding that DOL is not to publish, disclose, nor reveal this list to any third party outside the context of any prospective litigation.” *Id.* at p. 20. Lastly, the applicable statute of limitations was tolled for a definite duration. *Id.* at pp. 21-22.

On February 25, 2013, SCI LLC filed a Motion for Reconsideration of the MDO on the ground of newly discovered evidence. Dkt. No. 13. Additionally, SCI LLC seeks clarification of the MDO as well as a more formal and extensive protective order. *Id.* Pursuant to the Court’s Amended Text Notice, the Motion for Reconsideration was placed on an expedited schedule requiring DOL to file its Response in Opposition to the Motion on an abbreviated time table, Dkt. No. 14, DOL’s Opp’n, dated Mar. 5, 2013, and eliminating the need for replies and sur-replies.

MOTION FOR RECONSIDERATION STANDARD

Normally, prior decisions made within the same case must be followed under the law of the case doctrine. *Cantanzano by Catanzano v. Wing*, 103 F.3d 223, 231 n. 5 (2d Cir. 1996); *Shomo v. City of New York*, 579 F.3d 176, 186 (2d Cir. 2009);

United States v. Millett, 208 F.3d 204 (2d Cir. 2000) (noting that court should “not depart from this sound policy absent cogent or compelling reasons”). Generally, reconsideration of a court’s prior decision is warranted only where the moving party demonstrates (1) an intervening change of controlling law; (2) the availability of new evidence; and/or (3) the need to correct a clear error or prevent manifest injustice.

Crucible Materials Corp. v. Certain Underwriters at Lloyd’s London & London Market Companies, 681 F. Supp. 2d 216, 225 (N.D.N.Y. 2010); *Caidor v. Harrington*, 2009 WL 799954, at *1 (N.D.N.Y. Mar. 24, 2009) (Suddaby, J.) (quoting *United States v. Sanchez*, 35 F.3d 673, 677 (2d Cir.), *cert. denied*, 514 U.S. 1038 (1995); *see also Pescatore v. Pan American World Airways, Inc.*, 97 F.3d 1, 8 (2d Cir. 1996) (one ground for reconsideration includes an intervening change of controlling law); *Delaney v. Selsky*, 899 F. Supp. 923, 925 (N.D.N.Y. 1995) (citing *Doe v. New York City Dep’t of Soc. Servs.*, 709 F.2d 782, 789 (2d Cir.), *cert. denied*, 464 U.S. 864 (1983)). Thus, the moving party must “point to controlling decisions or data that the court overlooked – matters, in other words, that might reasonably be expected to alter the conclusion reached by the court.” *Shrader v. CSX Transp., Inc.*, 70 F.3d 255, 257 (2d Cir. 1995) (citations omitted).

“[A] motion to reconsider should not be granted where the moving party seeks solely to relitigate an issue already decided.” *Id.* at 257. “[A]ny litigant considering

bringing a motion for reconsideration must evaluate whether what may seem to be a clear error of law is in fact simply a point of disagreement between the Court and the litigant.” *Gaston v. Coughlin*, 102 F. Supp. 2d 81, 83 (N.D.N.Y. 2000) (citation omitted). Of significance here, “[a] motion for reconsideration is not an opportunity for a losing party to advance new arguments to supplant those that failed in the prior briefing of the issue.” *Fredericks v. Chemipal, Ltd.*, 2007 WL 1975441, at *1 (S.D.N.Y. July 6, 2007). In other words, it is not an opportunity to take a “second bite at the apple.” *Analytical Surveys, Inc. v. Tonga Partners, L.P.*, 684 F.3d 36, 52 (2d Cir. 2012) (quoting *Sequa Corp v. GBJ Corp.*, 156 F.3d 136, 144 (2d Cir. 1998)); see also *In re Health Mgmt. Sys., Inc. Sec. Litig.*, 113 F. Supp. 2d 613, 614 (S.D.N.Y. 2000) (“[R]econsideration of a previous order is an extraordinary remedy to be employed sparingly in the interests of finality and conservation of scarce judicial resources.”) (quotation marks and citations omitted); *In re Bird*, 222 B.R. 229, 235 (Bankr. S.D.N.Y. 1998) (“A motion for reconsideration is not a forum for new theories or for plugging the gaps of a lost motion with additional matters.”) (internal quotation marks and citation omitted).

NEWLY DISCOVERED EVIDENCE

SCI LLC seeks reconsideration of the MDO based upon newly discovered evidence. The Court is told that this new revelation became apparent to SCI LLC during the latter stage of the Motion to Compel discourse when DOL filed its reply

and included an especially curious exhibit. That curious exhibit was a redacted check issued by Subcontracting Concepts, Inc (hereinafter “SCI”).¹ *See* Dkt. No. 8-1, Lisa Schneider Supp. Decl. & Supp. Ex. A. Relying upon Investigator Schneider’s averment that she had “obtained copies of checks issued by “SCI’ to one of the individuals termed an independent contractor” in order to show that there may be a business relationship between SCI LLC and SCI, this Court accepted it for what it portrayed - a blank check. *See id.* at ¶ 3 (attaching a copy of “a partially redacted [check] to protect the identity of the payee”). However, still inexplicable to this Court, SCI LLC was able to discern that this Exhibit was a check issued to Milton Greene, who had previously challenged his independent contractor status with the New York State Division of Human Rights and the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission. Dkt. Nos. 13-1, Resp’t Mem. of Law at p. 1, 13-3, Peter Fidopiastis, Esq., Decl., dated Feb. 25, 2013, at ¶¶ 3 & 7-12. Prior to this revelation, SCI LLC “had no idea why DOL was investigating its global operation,” Fidopiastis Decl. at ¶ 4, and now posits that “DOL’s investigation and “unrestrained demands for information were prompted by a single complaint filed by Milton Greene,” Resp’t Mem. of Law at p. 1. Purportedly contributing to SCI LLC’s suspicion that Mr.

¹ Subcontracting Concepts Inc. is a separate entity that may have a business connection to SCI LLC. That connection or relationship is to be explored during the ordered deposition of SCI LLC.

Greene is the sole impetus for this investigation is DOL's letter to SCI LLC reminding it not to retaliate against Mr. Greene for the disclosure of his name in this case. Dkt. No. 13-4, Pet'r Lt., dated Feb. 11, 2013.²

Based upon this newly unearthed revelation and DOL's Letter, SCI LLC extrapolates that Greene's complaint is the sole impetus for DOL's investigation, which would not justify the magnitude of DOL's investigation and the unreasonable production of documents demanded by DOL. SCI LLC exclaims that DOL intentionally kept it and the Court "in the dark as to the real basis for its investigation" and the Court was "deprived of this vital piece of evidence" which would have critically impacted the ultimate decision rendered in the MDO. Resp't Mem. of Law at pp. 5-6. With this in mind, SCI LLC argues that DOL's investigation is unreasonable and its investigative powers have been stretched "well beyond justifiable end[s]," the ordered production is disproportionate to the "real" scope of the investigation, and that DOL has no evidence that SCI LLC committed any violations of the Fair Labor Standard Act (hereinafter "FLSA"). *See generally* Resp't Mem. of Law. Lastly, SCI LLC seeks clarification of the MDO by asking that a more formal

² Apparently, the impetus for DOL's Letter was SCI LLC's General Counsel's Supplemental Declaration identifying Mr. Greene. Dkt. No. 10-1, Peter Fidopiastis Supp. Decl., dated Feb. 7, 2013, at ¶¶ 3-9. Because Mr. Greene was identified in this manner and concerned about its overarching implications, DOL felt compelled to remind SCI LLC that it would be unlawful to retaliate against "any employee." Dkt. No. 13-4, Ex. B at p. 1.

protective order be issued under these circumstances. *Id.*

In opposing the Motion for Reconsideration, DOL chides the entire premise of SCI LLC's Application, especially the propositions that this constitutes newly discovered evidence and that its investigation is constrained solely to Mr. Greene or even to a single complaint. *See* Dkt. No. 14, Pet'r Opp'n Mem. of Law, dated Mar. 5, 2013. DOL contends that the wholly redacted check, which contains no personal identify information, "say[s] nothing about the origin of the Secretary's investigation" and, the proposition that this investigation should be limited to only those transactions involving Mr. Greene would "lead to an absurd result - the Secretary [of Labor] would be impeded from investigating widespread and pervasive employment violations where the trigger for the investigation was a single complaint." *Id.* at pp. 3 & 4. For the Petitioner, this Motion for Reconsideration constitutes nothing short of a ruse to supplement SCI LLC's previously ineffectual opposition to its Motion to Compel and poses as a veiled opportunity to re-argue relevancy, reasonableness, burden, and confidentiality, which were firmly rejected by the Court. *See generally* Pet'r Mem. of Law. Thus, DOL seeks a denial of this Motion for Reconsideration.

ANALYSIS

Even if the Court was to deem Mr. Greene's identity and his role in this investigation as newly discovered evidence, it could only serve as an abstract or

obtuse fact having no purposeful bearing on this Court's MDO. This Court does not adopt SCI LLC's myopic view that a single complaint legally impedes DOL from conducting a much more broader investigation. To do so would require a tremendous leap in logic. It is well established that an agency cannot conjure up an investigation and its demands to produce are subject to the limitations of reasonableness, *United States v. Constr. Prod. Research, Inc.*, 73 F.3d 464, 471 (2d Cir. 1996), but as long as the investigation is conducted pursuant to a legitimate purpose, the information is not already within the agency's possession, and all required administrative steps have been followed, a court's role in enforcing an administrative subpoena is "extremely limited," *E.E.O.C. v. United Parcel Serv., Inc.*, 587 F.3d 136, 139 (2d Cir. 2009). Under the statute, DOL may investigate and gather information relative to wages, hours and conditions of employment in order to determine if there has been a violation. *See* 29 U.S.C. §§ 209 & 211(a) & Mem.-Dec. & Order at pp. 3-4.

Even though DOL has not fully disclosed the genesis of its investigation, nor does it have to, SCI LLC knows full well, or should know, that this investigation does not rest solely on Mr. Greene's complaint alone. To argue otherwise is pure obfuscation. A better indicator as to why DOL's investigation has encompassed SCI LLC is DOL's ongoing investigation regarding Zion Delivery Services Inc., a client of SCI LLC. Dkt. No. 8, Attach. A, Peter Fidopiastis Decl., dated Dec. 31, 2012, &

B, Cent. Dist. of California Case No. 12-09956, Order, dated Jan. 15, 2013. SCI LLC is keenly aware that DOL brought a petition to enforce an administrative subpoena to obtain drivers' 1099s completed by SCI LC, which was ultimately upheld by that district court. Dkt. No. 8, Ex. B, Order, dated Jan. 15, 2013. The California investigation was not narrowly confined to a particular driver, and obviously neither is this investigation. Setting all of that aside, this Court already found that the purpose of this investigation is to determine whether the independent owner operators are misclassified as independent contractors rather than employees and whether SCI LLC and the logistic couriers may be joint employers of these drivers. Mem.-Dec. & Order at p. 9.

Newly discovered evidence must have some significance to conceivably change the outcome of the previous ruling, but none can be found in this presentation. *In re Bernard L. Madoff Inv. Sec., LLC*, 489 F. App'x 519, 520 (2d Cir. 2012) (citing *United States v. Int' Bhd. of Teamsters*, 247 F.3d 370, 392 (2d Cir. 2001)). Mr. Greene's complaint and its impact as to the reasonableness of its scope is of minute importance. Hence this Court does not find that this is relevant newly discovered evidence nor would it require a modification to the MDO, and accordingly there is no legitimate basis for this Motion.

Continuing, because it deserves mentioning, this Court agrees with DOL that

2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65
66
67
68
69
70
71
72
73
74
75
76
77
78
79
80
81
82
83
84
85
86
87
88
89
90
91
92
93
94
95
96
97
98
99
100
101
102
103
104
105
106
107
108
109
110
111
112
113
114
115
116
117
118
119
120
121
122
123
124
125
126
127
128
129
130
131
132
133
134
135
136
137
138
139
140
141
142
143
144
145
146
147
148
149
150
151
152
153
154
155
156
157
158
159
160
161
162
163
164
165
166
167
168
169
170
171
172
173
174
175
176
177
178
179
180
181
182
183
184
185
186
187
188
189
190
191
192
193
194
195
196
197
198
199
200
201
202
203
204
205
206
207
208
209
210
211
212
213
214
215
216
217
218
219
220
221
222
223
224
225
226
227
228
229
230
231
232
233
234
235
236
237
238
239
240
241
242
243
244
245
246
247
248
249
250
251
252
253
254
255
256
257
258
259
260
261
262
263
264
265
266
267
268
269
270
271
272
273
274
275
276
277
278
279
280
281
282
283
284
285
286
287
288
289
290
291
292
293
294
295
296
297
298
299
300
301
302
303
304
305
306
307
308
309
310
311
312
313
314
315
316
317
318
319
320
321
322
323
324
325
326
327
328
329
330
331
332
333
334
335
336
337
338
339
340
341
342
343
344
345
346
347
348
349
350
351
352
353
354
355
356
357
358
359
360
361
362
363
364
365
366
367
368
369
370
371
372
373
374
375
376
377
378
379
380
381
382
383
384
385
386
387
388
389
390
391
392
393
394
395
396
397
398
399
400
401
402
403
404
405
406
407
408
409
410
411
412
413
414
415
416
417
418
419
420
421
422
423
424
425
426
427
428
429
430
431
432
433
434
435
436
437
438
439
440
441
442
443
444
445
446
447
448
449
450
451
452
453
454
455
456
457
458
459
460
461
462
463
464
465
466
467
468
469
470
471
472
473
474
475
476
477
478
479
480
481
482
483
484
485
486
487
488
489
490
491
492
493
494
495
496
497
498
499
500
501
502
503
504
505
506
507
508
509
510
511
512
513
514
515
516
517
518
519
520
521
522
523
524
525
526
527
528
529
530
531
532
533
534
535
536
537
538
539
540
541
542
543
544
545
546
547
548
549
550
551
552
553
554
555
556
557
558
559
560
561
562
563
564
565
566
567
568
569
570
571
572
573
574
575
576
577
578
579
580
581
582
583
584
585
586
587
588
589
590
591
592
593
594
595
596
597
598
599
600
601
602
603
604
605
606
607
608
609
610
611
612
613
614
615
616
617
618
619
620
621
622
623
624
625
626
627
628
629
630
631
632
633
634
635
636
637
638
639
640
641
642
643
644
645
646
647
648
649
650
651
652
653
654
655
656
657
658
659
660
661
662
663
664
665
666
667
668
669
670
671
672
673
674
675
676
677
678
679
680
681
682
683
684
685
686
687
688
689
690
691
692
693
694
695
696
697
698
699
700
701
702
703
704
705
706
707
708
709
710
711
712
713
714
715
716
717
718
719
720
721
722
723
724
725
726
727
728
729
730
731
732
733
734
735
736
737
738
739
740
741
742
743
744
745
746
747
748
749
750
751
752
753
754
755
756
757
758
759
760
761
762
763
764
765
766
767
768
769
770
771
772
773
774
775
776
777
778
779
780
781
782
783
784
785
786
787
788
789
790
791
792
793
794
795
796
797
798
799
800
801
802
803
804
805
806
807
808
809
810
811
812
813
814
815
816
817
818
819
820
821
822
823
824
825
826
827
828
829
830
831
832
833
834
835
836
837
838
839
840
841
842
843
844
845
846
847
848
849
850
851
852
853
854
855
856
857
858
859
860
861
862
863
864
865
866
867
868
869
870
871
872
873
874
875
876
877
878
879
880
881
882
883
884
885
886
887
888
889
890
891
892
893
894
895
896
897
898
899
900
901
902
903
904
905
906
907
908
909
910
911
912
913
914
915
916
917
918
919
920
921
922
923
924
925
926
927
928
929
930
931
932
933
934
935
936
937
938
939
940
941
942
943
944
945
946
947
948
949
950
951
952
953
954
955
956
957
958
959
960
961
962
963
964
965
966
967
968
969
970
971
972
973
974
975
976
977
978
979
980
981
982
983
984
985
986
987
988
989
990
991
992
993
994
995
996
997
998
999
1000

this Motion is uniquely disguised as “a second bite of the apple” as SCI LLC reargues all of the issues that should have been fully addressed during the Motion to Compel. This is nothing more than a veiled attempt to overcome previous deficiencies and to plug in information SCI LLC failed to reveal earlier. For example, when the Court addressed the matter of disclosing SCI LLC’s client list, I noted that “[o]ther than conclusory statements that its client list is ‘carefully guarded,’ SCI LLC has not outlined in any detail how it protects or guards its customer lists[.]” Mem.-Dec. & Order at p. 19. Now, SCI LLC presents Affidavits, especially one from Ryan Wise, the Vice President of Information Technology, extolling in graphic detail all of the steps SCI LLC takes to maintain the confidentiality of its “proprietary” information. *See* Dkt. No. 13-5, Ryan Wise Decl., dated Feb. 25, 2013. Additionally, SCI LLC’s Memorandum of Law is merely a recapitulation of those same central themes it argued in opposing the Motion to Compel - relevance, reasonableness, burdensome, trade secrets, and confidentiality.

These are belated submissions to overcome previous deficiencies. This Court will not allow SCI LLC another opportunity to pitch its position, and the MDO and all of its directions stand.

Nonetheless, this Court takes a moment to address SCI LLC’s complaint that if it has to adhere to the MDO, it will have to produce nearly 45,000 pages of

documents. Initially, the Court realized the DOL was seeking an enormous amount of documents and, in that respect, I reduced the scope of the Subpoena and also imposed representative sampling in order to make the demand for documents more reasonable. *See* generally Mem.-Dec. & Order. By directing that SCI LLC give a deposition within sixty days, it is conceivable that the size of disclosure may be decreased. But this Court finds Ryan Wise’s Declaration very telling in terms of SCI LLC’s ability to produce these documents without unfairly intruding upon its twenty-two (22) employees. Both the client list and 1099 tax records are in both “physical form” and “in electronic form in [its] computer and server systems.” Wise Decl. at ¶¶ 2-3. Although this Court may not share the technological sophistication of Mr. Wise, I certainly know that the amount of time, cost, and effort expended to produce these records from the computer is significantly less than by hand. With the advent of software, predictive coding, spreadsheets, and similar advances, the time and cost to produce large reams of documents can be dramatically reduced. Further, suggesting to DOL to accept the production of these documents in either native format, or through a zip file, or some other electronic transaction should minimize SCI LLC’s anxiety. Hence, the Court is more convinced than ever that SCI LLC is not subject to an overwhelming and incomprehensible burden. *See e.g., E.E.O.C. v. Sterling Jewelers, Inc.*, 2011 WL 5282622, at *5 (W.D.N.Y. Nov. 2, 2011) (noting

that reviewing 54,000 personnel files was not burdensome nor would it disrupt the business). Quite frankly, no manifest injustice has been demonstrated.

Finally, SCI LLC's request for a more formal protective order to ensure that all necessary measures are taken by DOL to protect the names and addresses of its clients is as baseless as it is superfluous. Throughout its argument against the Motion to Compel, SCI LLC raised the alarm that DOL will reveal its proprietary information and that its profitability would be impaired. To remind SCI LLC, the Court found its "fear that DOL intends to share all of this information with SCI LLC's universe of competitors [] utterly without basis." Mem.-Dec. & Order at p. 16. Nonetheless, the Court directed DOL "not to publish, disclose nor reveal this list to any third party outside the context of any prospective litigation." *Id.* at p. 20. To suggest that this broadly stated protective order is toothless because a penalty or consequence was not definitely and explicitly meted out should this federal agency not abide by the Court's order is meritless. Parties to litigation are expected to fully comprehend the magnitude of an order and the consequences to bear for failing to abide by such an order. And to surmise that a party will breach such an order is presumptuous and unfounded. SCI LLC has conveniently forgotten that this Court maintains jurisdiction over this application for the enforcement of a subpoena and clearly has the power of

contempt when a party has failed to comply with such a clearly stated directive.³ Thus a more formal protective order is not necessary.

Based upon the foregoing, it is hereby Ordered that SCI LLC's Motion for Reconsideration, Dkt. No. 13, **is denied**. To reiterate further, the entire MDO remains in effect.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

March 11, 2013
Albany, New York


Randolph F. Treece
U.S. Magistrate Judge

³ The Court may turn to those inherent powers, which are innate to its creation, to impose respect for its lawful mandates. *United States v. Seltzer*, 227 F.3d 36, 39-42 (2d Cir. 2000); *DLC Mgmt. Corp. v. Town of Hyde Park*, 163 F.3d 124, 136 (2d Cir. 1998). Federal courts have always had the inherent power to manage their own proceedings and to control the conduct of those who may appear before them, and when a party acts "in bad faith, vexatiously, wantonly, or for oppressive reasons," the courts may exercise their discretion in fashioning a remedy. *Chambers v. Nasco, Inc.*, 501 U.S. 32, 45-46 (1991). Additionally, the Court may rely upon the authority granted in the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure. FED. R. CIV. P. 37(b)(2)(A)(vii) & 45(e).