

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF
MASSACHUSETTS

**Claudio Sosa, Luis Aguilar, and Cristian Lamarque v. 28Freight LLC
d/b/a Truck Courier and Richard Marks**

Sosa · No. 4:24-cv-40064-MRG · Decided March 23, 2026

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the District of Massachusetts grants Plaintiffs’ motion for reconsideration, vacates portions of its prior order, and denies Defendants’ motion to dismiss. The Court holds that federal Truth-in-Leasing regulations do not preempt Plaintiffs’ Massachusetts Wage Act and Massachusetts minimum wage claims because the regulations govern disclosure and do not require allegedly unlawful wage deductions. The Court reinstates the challenged claims for further proceedings.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the District of Massachusetts
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Margaret R. Guzman
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the District of Massachusetts
DECIDED	March 23, 2026
DOCKET	4:24-cv-40064-MRG
DISPOSITION	vacated
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	Plaintiffs moved for reconsideration of an interlocutory order that had granted in part and denied in part defendants' motion to dismiss. The court granted reconsideration, vacated the prior dismissal of portions of Counts II and III, and denied defendants' motion to dismiss.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	Interlocutory orders may be reconsidered under the court's inherent authority before final judgment. Reconsideration is granted sparingly and requires newly discovered evidence, an intervening change in controlling law, or a manifest error of law or clearly unjust prior order. At the motion-to-dismiss stage, preemption generally presents a pure question of law and disputed factual assumptions are not material to the preemption analysis.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	unpublished district court order

PARTIES

Claudio Sosa, Luis Aguilar, Cristian Lamarque v. 28Freight LLC d/b/a Truck Courier, Richard Marks

TOPICS

motion for reconsideration

motions to dismiss

wage and hour

federalism

civil procedure

PRACTICE AREAS

civil procedure

employment law

wage and hour

federal preemption

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether the court should reconsider its interlocutory order dismissing portions of plaintiffs' Massachusetts wage claims as preempted.
2. Whether the federal Truth-in-Leasing regulations conflict with or frustrate the objectives of the Massachusetts Wage Act and Massachusetts Minimum Wage Law.
3. Whether compliance with the Massachusetts wage laws and the Truth-in-Leasing regulations is impossible.
4. Whether the prior order's factual assumptions warranted reconsideration.

HOLDINGS

1. The court may reconsider its nonfinal order under its inherent authority, and reconsideration was warranted because the prior determination that the Truth-in-Leasing regulations preempted the Massachusetts wage claims was a clear error of law.
2. The Truth-in-Leasing regulations do not conflict with or frustrate the objectives of the Massachusetts Wage Act because the federal regulations protect drivers through lease-term disclosure while the Massachusetts law regulates the payment of earned wages; the two legal regimes operate in distinct spheres.
3. Compliance with the Massachusetts Wage Act and the Truth-in-Leasing regulations is possible; therefore, impossibility preemption does not apply.

KEY QUOTATIONS

"Here, as explained below, the Court concludes that the TIL regulations do not preempt Plaintiffs' MWA (Count II) and MMWL (Count III) claims." (Introduction)

"A carrier may therefore comply with both by refraining from unlawful deductions as to employees and disclosing any such deductions in leases with independent contractors." (III.2)

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Plaintiffs are former and current truck drivers for 28Freight LLC who allege that defendants made improper deductions from their wages. They assert a Massachusetts Wage Act claim based on unlawful deductions and a

Massachusetts Minimum Wage Law claim alleging that, after the deductions, they were paid less than the minimum wage. Defendants argued that the claims were conflict-preempted by federal Truth-in-Leasing regulations governing leases between motor carriers and drivers.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Plaintiffs brought a proposed class action alleging violations of Massachusetts wage laws and federal Truth-in-Leasing regulations arising from deductions from truck drivers' wages. The court's prior order dismissed Count II, to the extent based on unlawful deductions, and Count III as preempted by the federal regulations. On reconsideration, the court concluded that the regulations did not preempt the state-law claims and vacated those dismissals while leaving other portions of the prior order intact.

DISPOSITION

vacated

CASES CITED

- Thomson Reuters Enter. Ctr. GMBH v. Ross Intel. Inc., 765 F. Supp. 3d 382, 390 (D. Del. 2025)
- Mazza v. City of Bos., 780 F. Supp. 3d 325, 329–30 (D. Mass. 2025)
- Barrows v. Resol. Tr. Corp., 1994 WL 643309, at *3 (1st Cir. 1994)
- Fernandez-Vargas v. Pfizer, 522 F.3d 55, 61 n.2 (1st Cir. 2008)
- United States ex rel. Nargol v. Depuy Orthopaedics, Inc., 69 F.4th 1, 11 (1st Cir. 2023)
- United States v. Allen, 573 F.3d 42, 53 (1st Cir. 2009)
- Ass'n to Pres. & Protect Loc. Livelihoods v. Sidman, 147 F.4th 40, 49 (1st Cir. 2025)
- Arizona v. United States, 567 U.S. 387, 399 (2012)
- Fid. Fed. Sav. & Loan Ass'n v. de la Cuesta, 458 U.S. 141, 153 (1982)
- Grant's Dairy–Me., LLC v. Comm'r of Maine Dep't of Agric., Food & Rural Res., 232 F.3d 8, 14–15 (1st Cir. 2000)
- Rice v. Santa Fe Elevator Corp., 331 U.S. 218, 230 (1947)
- Asociación de Detallistas de Gasolina de P.R., Inc. v. Puerto Rico, 138 F.4th 686, 693 (1st Cir. 2025)
- Gade v. Nat'l Solid Wastes Mgmt. Ass'n, 505 U.S. 88, 98 (1992)
- Triumph Foods, LLC v. Campbell, 742 F. Supp. 3d 63, 72 (D. Mass. 2024), aff'd, 156 F.4th 29 (1st Cir. 2025)
- Medicaid & Medicare Advantage Prod. Ass'n of P.R., Inc. v. Emanuelli Hernandez, 58 F.4th 5, 11 (1st Cir. 2023)
- Fox v. Transam Leasing, Inc., 839 F.3d 1209, 1211 (10th Cir. 2016)
- Goyal v. CSX Intermodal Terminals, Inc., 2018 WL 4649829, at *3, *6 (N.D. Cal. Sept. 25, 2018)
- Valadez v. CSX Intermodal Terminals, Inc., 2017 WL 1416883 (N.D. Cal. Apr. 10, 2017)
- B&O Logistics, Inc. v. Cho, 2019 WL 2879876, at *5 (C.D. Cal. Apr. 15, 2019)
- Turner v. Miller Transporters, Inc., 852 So. 2d 478, 485 (La. Ct. App. 2003)
- Johnson v. Logistics, 2018 WL 1519157, at *6 (N.D. Ill. Mar. 28, 2018)

- *Cumpata v. Blue Cross Blue Shield of Mass., Inc.*, 113 F. Supp. 2d 164, 168 (D. Mass. 2000)
- *Parker v. EnerNOC, Inc.*, 484 Mass. 128, 132 (2020)
- *Camara v. Athy Gen.*, 941 N.E.2d 1118, 1121 (Mass. 2011)
- *Sebago v. Bos. Cab Dispatch, Inc.*, 28 N.E.3d 1139, 1146 (Mass. 2015)
- *Remington v. J.B. Hunt Transport, Inc.*, 2016 WL 4975194, at *4–6 (D. Mass. Sept. 19, 2016)
- *United States v. Rhode Island Insurers' Insolvency Fund*, 80 F.3d 616, 619 (1st Cir. 1996)

Retrieved from lawtools.ai · <https://lawtools.ai/cases/federal/united-states-district-court-for-the-district-of-massachuset/2026/claudio-sosa-luis-aguilar-and-cristian-lamarque-v-28freight-py9f2ob1>