

**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, 8<sup>th</sup> 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”).<sup>1</sup> 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.

---

<sup>1</sup> 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.<sup>2</sup>

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

---

<sup>2</sup> 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.<sup>3</sup> 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

---

<sup>3</sup> 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).