Maria 2010-3000

MICHAEL K JEANES, JRK

By A. Francis COPY

Rebecca Winterscheidt (#009359)
Manuel H. Cairo (#024339)
SNELL & WILMER LLP.
One Arizona Center
400 E. Van Buren
Phoenix, AZ 85004-2202
Telephone: (602) 382-6000
Attorneys for Danny's Subway, Inc.



MAR 0 9 2010

IN THE SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF ARIZONA IN AND FOR THE COUNTY OF MARICOPA

THE STATE OF ARIZONA ex rel. ANDREW P. THOMAS,

Plaintiff,

No. CV2010-005886

CONSENT DECREE

Assigned to:

٧.

DANNY'S SUBWAY, INC., an Arizona corporation,

Defendant.

Plaintiff, the State of Arizona, through Maricopa County Attorney Andrew P. Thomas and the Maricopa County Attorney's Office (collectively hereafter "the State"), filed this action against Defendant Danny's Subway, Inc. (hereafter the "Company"), an Arizona corporation, alleging that the Company knowingly hired an unauthorized worker, Fidel Vargas-Salgado, in violation of the Legal Arizona Workers Act, A.R.S. § 23-212 et seq. ("LAWA").

THE LITIGATION

2. According to the State in this litigation, Immigration and Customs Enforcement ("ICE") determined and informed the Company that Mr. Vargas-Salgado was unauthorized to work in the United States. The State further alleges that, at the time ICE informed the Company of its determination, Mr. Vargas-Salgado was an employee employed by the Company at its store located at 1950 West Indian School Road #3, Phoenix, Arizona 85015 (hereafter "Company's Indian School Location"). The Company

One Artison Competer 100 Process Conce Artison Concess 1000 Process 10

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

then acted upon the information received from ICE by terminating Mr. Vargas-Salgado's employment on or about July 15, 2008.

- According to the State, Daniel Rose, an officer, director, and/or shareholder 3. of the Company, and Martin Gomez, a manager and supervisor at the Company's Indian School Location, re-hired Mr. Vargas-Salgado to work at the Company's Indian School Location on or about September 9, 2008. The State alleges that the hiring occurred after Mr. Rose instructed Mr. Salgado to obtain new employment documents. According to the State's allegations in this litigation, Mr. Rose and Mr. Gomez then allowed Mr. Vargas-Salgado, using the false name and identity of "Marco Anthony Gomez", to complete a Form I-9 Employment Eligibility Verification, an Employee's Arizona Withholding Percentage Election, Employee's Withholding Allowance Certificate, and an Automatic Deposit Authorization Agreement.
- The State alleged that the Company's actions described above constituted a knowing or intentional violation of the LAWA pursuant to A.R.S. §§ 23-212 or 23-212.01, respectively and therefore sought to suspend the following licenses issued to the Company: (1) Articles of Incorporation, issued by the Arizona Corporation Commission, 1300 West Washington Street, Phoenix, AZ 85007; (2) Transaction Privilege Sales Tax License, issued by the City of Phoenix Privilege License Tax Section, 251 West Washington Street, 9th Floor, Phoenix, AZ 85003; and (3) Transaction Privilege Sales Tax License and a Notice of Employer Withholding Identification Number, issued by the Arizona Department of Revenue License and Registration Section, 1600 West Monroe, Phoenix, Arizona 85007 (collectively "Business Licenses").
- The State did not allege that any location other than the Company's Indian 5. School Location violated the LAWA; that the Company hired or employed any other alleged unauthorized workers, irrespective of location; or that the Company had, or has, a pattern or practice of hiring or employing unauthorized workers. At all times relevant, the Company completed Form I-9 Employment Eligibility Verification for all its employees and used E-Verify in accordance with the Memorandum of Understanding.

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

6. The Company and the State desire to resolve the issues raised by the Complaint without the time, expense, and uncertainty of further contested litigation. The parties expressly acknowledge that this Consent Decree (hereafter "Decree") is the compromise of disputed claims, that the Company denies any and all liability alleged by the Complaint, and that there has been no adjudication of any claim. Without admitting any liability for the claims made in the Complaint filed in this matter, the parties agree to be bound by this Decree and not to contest that it was validly entered into in any subsequent proceeding to implement or enforce its terms. The parties therefore have consented to the entry of this Decree, waiving trial, findings of fact, and conclusions of law. This Decree fully and finally resolves any and all issues and claims arising out of the Complaint filed by the State in this action.

FINDINGS

Having carefully examined the terms and provisions of this Decree the Court finds the following:

- This Court has jurisdiction over the subject matter of this action and over 7. the parties, and venue in Maricopa County is proper.
- The terms of this Decree are adequate, fair, reasonable, equitable, and just. 8. The rights of the State, the Company, and the public interest area adequately protected by this Decree.
- This Decree conforms with the Arizona Rules of Civil Procedure and the 9 LAWA and is not in derogation of the rights or privileges of any person. The entry of this Decree will further the objectives of the LAWA, and will be in the best interest of the parties and public.

NOW, THEREFORE, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED, ADJUDGED AND DECREED as follows:

This Decree resolves all issues and claims 10. Resolution of the Complaint. set forth in the State's Complaint filed in this case, and all issues and claims, whether known or unknown, that were required to be raised, or that could have been raised, under

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

the LAWA with respect to the State's complaint alleging the Company knowingly or intentionally violated the LAWA by re-employing Mr. Vargas-Salgado, an individual allegedly unauthorized to work in the United States.

- Terminate Employment of Unauthorized Workers. The Company shall 11. terminate the employment of all known unauthorized aliens, if any, working at the Company's Indian School Location.
- 12. Three-Year Probation. The Company shall be subject to a three-year During this probationary period only for the Company's Indian School Location. probationary period, the Company shall file with the State quarterly reports of each new employee hired by the Company's Indian School Location in the form provided in A.R.S. § 23-722.01. The Company shall file with the State the quarterly reports no later than twenty (20) calendar days following the close of the calendar quarter. The form quarterly report, attached as Exhibit 1, may be used by the Company in fulfilling its obligations under this paragraph.
- The Company shall file a signed sworn affidavit with the State 13. Affidavit. within three (3) business days after this Decree is executed by this Court. The affidavit shall state that the Company has terminated the employment of all known unauthorized aliens, if any, working at the Company's Indian School Location and that the Company will not intentionally or knowingly employ an unauthorized alien. The form affidavit, attached as Exhibit 2, may be used by the Company in fulfilling its obligations under this paragraph.
- Failure to Provide Affidavit. The appropriate agencies shall suspend 14. the Company's Business Licenses if the Company fails to file a signed sworn affidavit with the State within three (3) business days after the Court executes this Decree. If the Company's Business Licenses are suspended pursuant to this paragraph, those licenses shall remain suspended until the Company files a signed sworn affidavit, as set forth in Paragraph 13 above, with the State. Upon filing of the affidavit, the suspended Business Licenses shall be reinstated immediately by the appropriate agency. The State shall

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

maintain a copy of this Decree pursuant to A.R.S. §§ 23-212(F)(c) and 23-212(G).

- 15. Closure of Danny's Subway. The Company's Indian School Location shall be closed for one (2) business days—April 4, 2010, and November 25, 2010. During these two days, the Company shall not conduct any business out of the Company's Indian School Location. Nothing in this paragraph or Decree shall cause the suspension of any Business License held by the Company or the Company's Indian School Location. The conditions set forth in this paragraph shall be deemed completely satisfied three (3) business days after each respective closure, unless, within those three days, the State contests the Company's completion of its obligations under this paragraph in writing.
- 16. Second Violation. If an Arizona court of competent jurisdiction issues a final order or judgment finding that the Company's Indian School Location violated the LAWA a second time during the three-year probationary period, the Company's Indian School Location's Transaction Privilege Sales Tax License shall be permanently revoked.

DISPUTE RESOLUTION

In the event any party to this Decree believes that the other party has failed 17. to comply with any provision(s) of the Decree, the complaining party shall notify the other party of the alleged non-compliance and shall afford the alleged non-complying party fifteen (15) business days to remedy the non-compliance or to satisfy the complaining party that the alleged non-complying party has complied. If the alleged noncomplying party has not remedied the alleged non-compliance or satisfied the complaining party that it has complied within fifteen (15) business days, the complaining party may apply to the Court for appropriate relief.

DURATION OF THE DECREE AND RETENTION OF JURISDICTION

18. All provisions of this Decree shall be in effect (and the Court will retain jurisdiction of this matter to enforce this Decree) for a period of three (3) years immediately following the date this Decree is entered by the Court, provided, however, that if, at the end of the 3-year period, any disputes under Paragraph 16, above, remain unresolved, the term of the Decree shall be automatically extended (and the Court will

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

retain jurisdiction of this matter to enforce the Decree) with respect to only those issue(s) then in dispute until such time as all such disputes have been resolved. This Decree shall expire by its own terms at the three-year anniversary following entry of the Decree by the Court, without further action by the parties.

MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS

- 19. This Consent Judgment shall be governed in all Governing Law. respects whether as to validity, construction, capacity, performance or otherwise by the laws of the State of Arizona.
- Defendants' obligations under this Consent Judgment 20. Binding Effect. shall be binding upon Defendant's assigns, successors, successors-in-interest, receivers, trustees in bankruptcy, personal representatives, and agents.
- 21. When this Decree requires the submission of documents to the Notice. State under Paragraphs 12, 13, and 14, which include but are not limited to the affidavit, quarterly reports, or other materials, they shall be mailed to: Peter S. Spaw, Deputy County Attorney, Maricopa County Attorney's Office, 301 West Jefferson Suite 800, Phoenix, Arizona 85003, or his successor(s). Notices to the Company shall be mailed to: Manuel H. Cairo, Snell & Wilmer LLP, 400 East Van Buren Street, Phoenix, Arizona 85004.
- There shall be no modification of this Decree without 22. Modification. the written consent of the Company and the State and the further order of this Court. In the event of a material change of circumstances, the parties agree to make a good faith effort to resolve this matter. If the parties are unable to reach agreement, either party may ask the Court to make such modifications as are appropriate.
- Effectuating Decree. The parties agree to the entry of this Decree upon 23. final approval by the Court. The effective date of this Decree shall be the date that it is entered by the Court.

ENTERED AND ORDERED this 9 day of _____ Sam J. Myers Maricopa County Superior Court Snell & Wilner
Live OFFICES
One Aritems Center, 400 E. Van Bure
Placenta, Arienna \$1500+2191

, 2010.

Snell & Wilmer LAW OFFICES One Arithms Center, 400 E. Van Beren 100 Housell, Arithms 5500-1302

CONSENT TO JUDGMENT

- On behalf of Defendant Danny's Subway, Inc. (the "Company"), I acknowledge that I have read the foregoing Consent Decree, and that Danny's Subway, Inc. is aware of its right to a trial in this matter and has waived that right.
- Danny's Subway, Inc. agrees to the jurisdiction of the Court, and consents to entry of this Consent Decree.
- 3. Danny's Subway, Inc. states that no promise of any kind or nature whatsoever (other than the terms of this Consent Decree) was made to induce it to enter into this Consent Decree, that it has entered into this Consent Decree voluntarily, and that this Consent Decree constitutes the entire agreement between the Company and the State.
- 4. I am the <u>President</u> of Danny's Subway, Inc., and, as such, have been authorized by Danny's Subway, Inc. to enter into this Consent Decree for and on behalf of Danny's Subway, Inc.

DATED this /** day of March, 2010.

DANNY'S SUBWAY, INC. an Arizona corporation

By

State of Arizona
County of Maricopa
SS.

<u>Oacqueline</u> Stevens Notary Public

My Commission Expires:

6/9/10



	- 1	
Shell & Wilmer LAW Carlot. 400 E. Van Buren Phopman, Alizana \$5004-2102 (602) 182-6000	1	APPROVED AS TO FORM AND SUBSTANCE
	2	ANDREW P. THOMAS
	3	Maricopa County Attorney
	4	
	5	Mary 9, 2010 By Wer.
	6	Date Peter S. Spaw Deputy Maricopa County Attorney
	7	301 West Jefferson Street, Suite 800 Phoenix, AZ 85003
	8	Attorneys for Plaintiff
	9	
	10	SNELL & WILMER LLP
	11	$\sim \sim$
	12	3/3/10 By Hampland
	13	Date Repecca Winterscheidt Manuel H. Cairo
	14	One Arizona Center
	15	400 E. Van Buren Phoenix, Arizona 85004-2202
	16	Attorneys for Defendant
	17	11155079.2
	18	
	19	
	20	
	21	
	22	
	23	
	24	
	25	
	26	