

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF
MASSACHUSETTS

Douglas Goncalves Santos and Jaderson Goncalves Da Silva v.
Capital Power and Lighting, LLC, and Kevin Isabelle

Santos v. Capital Power and Lighting · No. 1:25-cv-11674-ADB · Decided January 16, 2026

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the District of Massachusetts addresses Plaintiffs’ amended motion for default judgment on claims under the Fair Labor Standards Act, Massachusetts Wage Act, and Massachusetts Fair Minimum Wage Law. The court finds Defendants liable by default for unpaid wages and overtime but reduces the requested attorney’s fees and prejudgment interest based on deficiencies in the motion and calculations. Judgment is entered for Plaintiffs in the amount of \$49,948.98, with interest as provided by law.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the District of Massachusetts
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Allison D. Burroughs
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the District of Massachusetts
DECIDED	January 16, 2026
DOCKET	1:25-cv-11674-ADB
DISPOSITION	other
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	Plaintiffs moved for default judgment under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 55(b)(2) on claims under the Fair Labor Standards Act, the Massachusetts Wage Act, and the Massachusetts Fair Minimum Wage Law.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	For default judgment, well-pleaded factual allegations are taken as conceded for liability, but entry of default does not establish the amount of damages. The court may determine damages from the pleadings and supporting affidavits without a hearing when those materials adequately establish the amount owed.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	unknown
PARTIES	Douglas Goncalves Santos, Jaderson Goncalves Da Silva v. Capital Power and Lighting, LLC, Kevin Isabelle

TOPICS

default judgment flsa wage and hour attorney fees prejudgment interest

PRACTICE AREAS

employment law wage and hour civil procedure remedies

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether the well-pleaded allegations established liability under the FLSA for unpaid minimum wages and overtime.
2. Whether the allegations established liability under the Massachusetts Wage Act for nonpayment of wages.
3. Whether the allegations established liability under the Massachusetts Fair Minimum Wage Law for unpaid wages and overtime.
4. Whether the plaintiffs' supporting affidavits and documentation adequately established damages, attorney's fees, costs, and prejudgment interest for purposes of default judgment.
5. What amount of damages, attorney's fees, costs, and prejudgment interest should be awarded.

HOLDINGS

1. The well-pleaded allegations established that defendants employed plaintiffs, that the work involved interstate activity, and that plaintiffs were undercompensated, including by receiving no wages for at least six weeks and no overtime premium for hours worked beyond 40 per week. Plaintiffs were therefore entitled to default judgment on their FLSA claims.
2. Plaintiffs were entitled to default judgment on their Massachusetts Wage Act claim because they were employees, their compensation constituted wages, and defendants failed to pay the wages within the statutory period.
3. Plaintiffs were entitled to default judgment on their claims under the Massachusetts Fair Minimum Wage Law for unpaid wages and unpaid overtime.
4. A damages hearing was unnecessary because the plaintiffs' declarations, work-hour records, and counsel's billing and cost documentation adequately established the recoverable amounts.
5. The court entered judgment for \$49,948.98, consisting of \$39,186.00 in damages, \$8,966.50 in attorney's fees, \$837.43 in costs, and \$949.05 in prejudgment interest, with interest as provided by law.

KEY QUOTATIONS

“By defaulting, Defendants are “taken to have conceded the truth of the factual allegations in the complaint as establishing the grounds for liability.”” (at 2)

“An entry of default establishes liability, but “it does not establish the amount of damages owed to the plaintiff for purposes of a default judgment.”” (at 5)

“Pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 55(b)(2), the Court enters judgment in Plaintiffs’ favor against Defendants in the amount of \$49,948.98, with interest as provided by law.” (at 7)

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Defendants employed the plaintiffs as electricians in Massachusetts from December 2024 through March 2025. Plaintiffs earned approximately \$28 per hour and routinely worked 50 to 60 hours per week. Defendants allegedly failed to pay overtime at one and one-half times the regular rate and failed to pay any compensation for at least the final six weeks of employment. Defendants’ business involved interstate activity, and Capital Power and Lighting was based in New Hampshire.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Plaintiffs filed suit on June 9, 2025, and served both defendants. Neither defendant answered, appeared, pleaded, or defended. Defaults were entered against Kevin Isabelle on July 15, 2025, and Capital Power and Lighting, LLC on August 15, 2025. After the court denied or deferred the initial default-judgment motion because damages were not ascertainable from the papers, plaintiffs filed an amended motion. The court granted the amended motion in part and denied it in part, entering judgment for \$49,948.98.

DISPOSITION

other

CASES CITED

- Sec. & Exch. Comm’n v. Tropikgadget FZE., 146 F. Supp. 3d 270, 275 (D. Mass. 2015)
- In re The Home Restaurants, Inc., 285 F.3d 111, 114-15 (1st Cir. 2002)
- Manning v. Bos. Med. Ctr. Corp., 725 F.3d 34, 43 (1st Cir. 2013)
- Austin v. Ken’s Foods, Inc., 772 F. Supp. 3d 163, 175 (D. Mass. 2025)
- Groden v. Epstein, No. 24-cv-10303, 2024 WL 4519724, at *3 (D. Mass. Oct. 17, 2024)
- Carroca v. All Star Enters. & Collision Ctr., Inc., No. 12-cv-11202, 2013 WL 3496537, at *4 (D. Mass. July 10, 2013)
- Tobin v. Liberty Mut. Ins. Co., 553 F.3d 121, 147 (1st Cir. 2009)
- George v. Nat’l Water Main Cleaning Co., 77 N.E.3d 858, 864-66 (Mass. 2017)