IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLORADO

Action	

CALVIN BROWN; JESUS GARCIA,

Plaintiffs,

v.

CITY OF AURORA,

Defendant.

COMPLAINT AND JURY DEMAND

Plaintiffs Calvin Brown and Jesus Garcia, by and through their counsel, David A. Lane and Danielle C. Jefferis of Killmer, Lane & Newman, LLP, respectfully allege for their Complaint and Jury Demand as follows:

I. INTRODUCTION

- 1. Plaintiffs Calvin Brown and Jesus Garcia are tenured, experienced firefighters. They boast long, successful careers with departments across the country. When they received offers to work for the Aurora Fire Department ("AFD"), they relocated to Colorado and looked forward to the chance to demonstrate their skills and success with a new department.
- 2. Their chances to do so were cut short, however, when AFD discriminated against them on account of their race and retaliated against them for their participation in an internal investigation involving one of Mr. Brown's and Mr. Garcia's fellow lateral recruits and a superior officer.

3. This is an action against AFD for discrimination and retaliation in violation of Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964. Defendant's illegal conduct has caused Mr. Brown and Mr. Garcia to suffer significant damages and losses.

II. JURISDICTION AND VENUE

- 4. Jurisdiction of this Court is invoked pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §§ 1331 and 1343. This action is authorized and instituted pursuant to Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 ("Title VII"), as amended, 42 U.S.C. § 2000e, *et seq.* Jurisdiction supporting Plaintiff's claims for attorney's fees and costs is conferred by 42 U.S.C. § 2000e-5(k).
- 5. Venue is proper pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1391 because Defendant is subject to personal jurisdiction in the District of Colorado and the employment practices alleged herein to be unlawful were committed in the District of Colorado.

III. ADMINISTRATIVE PREREQUISITES

6. Plaintiffs timely filed Charges of Discrimination with the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission and have received their Notices of Right to Sue. Thus, all administrative prerequisites have been met.

IV. PARTIES

- 7. Plaintiff Calvin Brown is a resident of, and domiciled in, the State of Colorado.

 At all times relevant to this Complaint he was employed by Defendant.
- 8. Plaintiff Jesus Garcia is a resident of, and domiciled in, the State of Colorado. At all times relevant to this Complaint he was employed by Defendant.
- 9. Defendant City of Aurora ("Aurora") is a political subdivision of the State of Colorado and is responsible for the supervision, training, official policies, customs, and actual

practices of its agents, the Aurora Fire Department and its firefighters. Aurora has continuously been an "employer" within the meaning of Title VII at all times relevant to this Complaint.

V. FACTUAL ALLEGATIONS

- 10. Calvin Brown (African American) and Jesus Garcia (Hispanic) were hired by AFD and entered the Rocky Mountain Fire Academy in January 2012. They were experienced lateral hires. Mr. Brown spent several years as a firefighter in Garden City, Kansas. Mr. Garcia came to AFD with six years' firefighting and emergency medical services experience from Hialeah, Florida.
- 11. Both men were highly successful in their previous positions. Mr. Brown, for example, was 2007's Firefighter of the Year for Lafayette Fire and Rescue and Firefighter of the Month in 2010 in Garden City. They were thrilled with the opportunity to work for AFD.
- 12. Predictably, based on their track records and experience, Mr. Brown and Mr. Garcia excelled in the Academy.
- 13. AFD's one-year probationary program requires new hires to pass practical skills tests at their three-, six-, nine-, and twelve-month anniversaries. Both men received excellent reviews, and neither failed an exam or skills test, on their three-month anniversary.
- 14. Mr. Brown and Mr. Garcia graduated from the Academy in April 2012 and were then placed in specific fire stations with AFD.
- 15. They performed well in their respective stations and received no disciplinary actions or negative reviews.

- 16. Their success was halted, however, beginning in June 2012, by the discriminatory and retaliatory conduct of their team of AFD instructors superiors separate and apart from Mr. Brown's and Mr. Garcia's superiors at their respective stations.
- 17. For each of their periodic test sessions, Mr. Brown and Mr. Garcia were evaluated, at least in part, by the same core team of instructors: Captain James Moon, Chief Kris Anderson, Lieutenant James Eitel, and Lieutenant Mitchell Harr (replaced by Lieutenant Kenneth Kahler).
- 18. During their six-month anniversary testing, Mr. Brown and Mr. Garcia, and one of their fellow recruits Ryan Goosley (Caucasian), witnessed one of their instructors, Lieutenant Harr, target and berate another recruit, Nathanial Lewis (African American), for failing his practical skills test.
- 19. Mr. Lewis initiated a complaint of race discrimination against Lieutenant Harr with his superior that day. AFD launched an internal investigation of the incident.
- 20. As part of the investigation, AFD required Mr. Brown and Mr. Garcia to submit to an interview and to provide a statement to the investigator.
- 21. Neither man was comfortable doing so; in fact, Mr. Garcia told the investigator that he did not want to participate because of the hostility that he and his fellow lateral, racial minority recruits had already sensed and experienced by their team of instructors, including Lieutenant Harr. Mr. Garcia feared that hostility would only increase in retaliation for his cooperation in the investigation of Lieutenant Harr.

- 22. Seemingly to alleviate his concerns, however, and to elicit his participation, the investigative team assured Mr. Garcia that if he faced any sort of retaliation for his participation in the investigation, they would address it.
- 23. On that reassurance, both Mr. Brown and Mr. Garcia submitted to interviews and provided their statements.
- 24. The investigation concluded that Lieutenant Harr had violated several internal policies, but did not find that he discriminated against Mr. Lewis. AFD suspended Lieutenant Harr for a short period of time.
- 25. Thereafter, Mr. Brown and Mr. Garcia went back to working their shifts at their assigned stations, where they resumed their previous success and encountered no performance or disciplinary issues with their superiors.
- 26. But when it came time for their nine-month periodic test session, when they faced their team of instructors again for the first time since the investigation the same instructors who had worked closely with Lieutenant Harr and were acutely aware of the investigation into his allegedly discriminatory conduct and Mr. Brown's and Mr. Garcia's participation in that investigation Mr. Brown's and Mr. Garcia's performance was suddenly and inexplicably deficient.
- 27. Specifically, it was deficient on the practical skills portion of the testing, which is dependent largely on the instructor's subjective evaluation of the subject's performance.
- 28. Now at the whim of the subjective evaluation of that same core of AFD instructors, just weeks after their participation in the investigation and upon their first encounter

with those instructors following the investigation, Mr. Garcia and Mr. Brown failed their ninemonth practical tests.

- 29. Based upon their experience and the nuances of the particular practical skills on which they were tested, their failures were unjustified.
- 30. AFD gave Mr. Brown and Mr. Garcia an opportunity to retest, but their retest was again administered in part by Lieutenant Kahler. Lieutenant Kahler and the instructor team failed Mr. Brown and Mr. Garcia on their retests, after providing them with the wrong tools to complete the test and/or then citing only minor mistakes as the bases for the fails.
 - 31. Just days after their second retest, AFD abruptly terminated Mr. Brown.
- 32. When Mr. Garcia voiced concerns (again) that the AFD instructors were discriminating and retaliating against Mr. Brown and him, AFD allowed Mr. Garcia to retest a second time.
 - 33. AFD fired Mr. Garcia nearly immediately after the second retest.
- 34. Of the four individuals who witnessed the incident involving Lieutenant Harr and participated in the investigation into his conduct, only one remained employed with AFD Ryan Goosley the only white individual involved in the investigation.
- 35. AFD fired the other three firefighters Mr. Brown, Mr. Garcia, and Mr. Lewis just weeks after their participation in the investigation of discrimination and harassment. All three are members of protected classes.
- 36. AFD's conduct has caused Mr. Brown and Mr. Garcia significant injuries, damages, and losses.

VI. STATEMENT OF CLAIMS FOR RELIEF

FIRST CLAIM FOR RELIEF Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, as amended, 42 U.S.C. § 2000e, et seq. Discrimination

- 37. Plaintiffs hereby incorporate all paragraphs of this Complaint as though fully set forth herein.
- 38. As an African American man, Mr. Brown is a member of a protected class under Title VII. As a Hispanic man, Mr. Garcia is a member of a protected class under Title VII.
- 39. Defendant treated Mr. Brown and Mr. Garcia less favorably than their similarly situated white counterpart by failing them on their practical skills exams and firing them in retaliation for their participation in the investigation of Lieutenant Harr's conduct.
- 40. Mr. Brown and Mr. Garcia were subjected to adverse treatment in the terms and conditions of their employment because of their race, including but not limited to, Defendant's terminations of their employment.
- 41. At all pertinent times, Mr. Brown and Mr. Garcia performed the functions of their job competently and were qualified for their positions.
- 42. Despite their qualifications, Defendant fired Mr. Brown and Mr. Garcia, in whole or in part, because of their race.
- 43. Defendant's asserted reasons for firing Mr. Brown and Mr. Garcia were mere pretext for illegal discrimination.
- 44. Defendant is liable for the acts and/or omissions of its agents and employees.

 Defendant, either directly or by and through its agents, discriminated against Mr. Brown and Mr.

Garcia on the basis of their race, and directly and proximately caused them injuries, damages, and losses.

45. Defendant's acts and conduct were committed with malice or with reckless indifference to Mr. Brown's and Mr. Garcia's federally protected rights within the meaning of Title VII.

SECOND CLAIM FOR RELIEF Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, as amended, 42 U.S.C. § 2000e, et seq. Retaliation

- 46. Plaintiffs hereby incorporate all of the paragraphs of this Complaint as though fully set forth herein.
- 47. Mr. Brown and Mr. Garcia opposed activities prohibited by Title VII by participating in the investigation of Lieutenant Harr's allegedly discriminatory conduct toward Mr. Lewis.
- 48. As a direct result of Mr. Brown's and Mr. Garcia's opposition to activities prohibited by Title VII, Defendant subjected Mr. Brown and Mr. Garcia to adverse treatment, including but not limited to, firing them.
- 49. Defendant is liable for the acts and omissions of its agents and employees.

 Defendant, either directly or by and through its agents, retaliated against Mr. Brown and Mr.

 Garcia and directly and proximately caused them severe injuries, damages, and losses.
- 50. Defendant's acts and conduct were committed with malice or with reckless indifference to the federally protected rights of Mr. Brown and Mr. Garcia within the meaning of Title VII.

WHEREFORE, Plaintiffs respectfully request that this Court enter judgment in their favor and against Defendant, and award them all relief as allowed by law, including, but not limited to the following:

- a. Declaratory relief and injunctive relief, as appropriate;
- b. Actual economic damages as established at trial;
- c. Compensatory damages, including, but not limited to those for future pecuniary and non-pecuniary losses, emotional pain, suffering, inconvenience, mental anguish, loss of enjoyment of life, and other non-pecuniary losses;
- d. Pre-judgment and post-judgment interest at the highest lawful rate;
- e. Attorney's fees and costs; and
- f. Such further relief as justice requires.

PLAINTIFF DEMANDS A JURY TRIAL ON ALL ISSUES SO TRIABLE.

Dated this 13th day of April, 2015.

KILLMER, LANE & NEWMAN, LLP

s/ David Lane

David Lane
Danielle C. Jefferis
1543 Champa Street, Suite 400
Denver, Colorado 80202
(303) 571-1000

Attorneys for Plaintiff

Case 1:15-cv-00767 Document 1-1 Filed 04/13/15 USDC Colorado Page 1 of 2 CIVIL COVER SHEET

JS 44 (Rev. 12/11) District of Colorado Form

The JS 44 civil cover sheet and the information contained herein neither replace nor supplement the filing and service of pleadings or other papers as required by law, except as

	ourt. This form, approved by the Judicial Conference sheet. (SEE INSTRUCTIONS ON NEXT PAGE OF	nce of the United States in September 1974, is required for the use of the Clerk of Court for the purpose <i>PFTHIS FORM</i> .)	
I. (a) PLAINTIFFS Calvin Brown, et. a		DEFENDANTS City of Aurora	
(b) County of Residence of First Listed Plaintiff		County of Residence of First Listed Defendant (IN U.S. PLAINTIFF CASES ONLY) NOTE: IN LAND CONDEMNATION CASES, USE THE LOCATION OF THE TRACT OF LAND INVOLVED. Attorneys (If Known)	
Daivd Lane, Killmer			
II. BASIS OF JURIS	SDICTION (Place an "X" in One Box Only)	III. CITIZENSHIP OF PRINCIPAL PARTIES (Place an "X" in One Box for Plaintig	
1 U.S. Government Plaintiff	X 3 Federal Question (U.S. Government Not a Party)	(For Diversity Cases Only) PTF DEF Citizen of This State 1 Incorporated or Principal Place 4 4 4	
2 U.S. Government Defendant	4 Diversity (Indicate Citizenship of Parties in Item III)	Citizen of Another State 2 2 Incorporated and Principal Place 5 5 5 of Business In Another State	
		Citizen or Subject of a 3 5 Foreign Nation 6 6 6 Foreign Country	
CONTRACT	JIT (Place an "X" in One Box Only) TORTS	FORFEITURE/PENALTY BANKRUPTCY OTHER STATUTES	
110 Insurance 120 Marine 130 Miller Act 140 Negotiable Instrument 150 Recovery of Overpaym & Enforcement of Judgme 151 Medicare Act 152 Recovery of Defaulted Student Loans (Excl. Veter 153 Recovery of Overpaym of Veteran's Benefits 160 Stockholders' Suits 190 Other Contract 195 Contract Product Liabil 196 Franchise REAL PROPERTY 210 Land Condemnation 220 Foreclosure 230 Rent Lease & Ejectmen 240 Torts to Land 245 Tort Product Liability 290 All Other Real Propert	ant Sandaria Personal Injury Product Liability 340 Marine Injury Product Liability 350 Motor Vehicle 355 Motor Vehicle Product Liability 360 Other Personal Injury Property Dar 361 Product Liability 362 Personal Injury Property Dar 362 Personal Injury Property Dar Med. Malpractice CIVIL RIGHTS PRISONER PETIT Habeas Corpus: 441 Voting 463 Alien Detair 443 Housing Accommodations 465 Amer well-ignerity 1535 Persth Penalty 1545 Amer well-ignerity 1545 Amer well-igner well-igner well-igner well-igner well-igner	of Property 21 USC 881 of Property 21 USC 157 of Property Rights of 440 Naturalization of Acketeer Influenced and Corrupt Organizations of Property 21 USC 881 of Property 21 USC 157 of Property Rights of Act 0 Deportation of 440 Deportation of 440 Deportation of 440 Cable/Sat TV of Park 1410 Antitrust of 440 Deportation of 440 Deportation of 440 Deportation of 440 Cable/Sat TV of Racketeer Influenced and Corrupt Organizations of 440 Cable/Sat TV of Asocheter Influenced and Corrupt Organizations of 440 Cable/Sat TV of 885 RSI (405(g)) of 88	
	an "X" in One Box Only) Removed from State Court Cite the U.S. Civil Statute under which ye	4 Reinstated or Reopened 5 Transferred from another district (specify) 6 Multidistrict Litigation 7 Judge from Magistrate Judgmer (ou are filing (Do not cite jurisdictional statutes unless diversity):	
VI. CAUSE OF AC	PION 42 USC 2000 Brief description of cause:	AP Docket Act of 1964, Discrimination and Retaliation	
VII. REQUESTED COMPLAINT:	IN CHECK IF THIS IS A CLASS ACTI UNDER F.R.C.P. 23	CHECK IF THIS IS A CLASS ACTION UNDER F.R.C.P. 23 CHECK YES only if demanded in complaint: JURY DEMAND: X Yes No	
DATE	SIGNATURE OF A	ATTORNEY OF RECORD	
April 13, 2015	s/ David Lane		
FOR OFFICE USE ONLY			
RECEIPT #	AMOUNT APPLYING IF	FP JUDGE MAG. JUDGE	

Case 1:15-cv-00767 Document 1-1 Filed 04/13/15 USDC Colorado Page 2 of 2

JS 44 Reverse (Rev. 12/11) District of Colorado Form

INSTRUCTIONS FOR ATTORNEYS COMPLETING CIVIL COVER SHEET FORM JS 44

Authority For Civil Cover Sheet

The JS 44 civil cover sheet and the information contained herein neither replaces nor supplements the filings and service of pleading or other papers as required by law, except as provided by local rules of court. This form, approved by the Judicial Conference of the United States in September 1974, is required for the use of the Clerk of Court for the purpose of initiating the civil docket sheet. Consequently, a civil cover sheet is submitted to the Clerk of Court for each civil complaint filed. The attorney filing a case should complete the form as follows.

- **I.** (a) **Plaintiffs-Defendants.** Enter names (last, first, middle initial) of plaintiff and defendant. If the plaintiff or defendant is a government agency, use only the full name or standard abbreviations. If the plaintiff or defendant is an official within a government agency, identify first the agency and then the official, giving both name and title.
- **(b) County of Residence.** For each civil case filed, except U.S. plaintiff cases, enter the name of the county where the first listed plaintiff resides at the time of filing. In U.S. plaintiff cases, enter the name of the county in which the first listed defendant resides at the time of filing. (NOTE: In land condemnation cases, the county of residence of the "defendant" is the location of the tract of land involved.)
- (c) Attorneys. Enter the firm name, address, telephone number, and attorney of record. If there are several attorneys, list them on an attachment noting, noting in this section "(see attachment)".
- **II. Jurisdiction**. The basis of jurisdiction is set forth under Rule 8(a), F.R.C.P., which requires that jurisdictions be shown in pleadings. Place an "X" in one of the boxes. If there is more than one basis of jurisdiction, precedence is given in the order shown below.

United States plaintiff. (1) Jurisdiction based on 28 U.S.C. 1345 and 1348. Suits by agencies and officers of the United States are included here.

United States defendant. (2) When the plaintiff is suing the United States, its officers or agencies, place an "X" in this box

Federal question. (3) This refers to suits under 28 U.S.C. 1331, where jurisdiction arises under the Constitution of the United States, an amendment to the Constitution, an act of Congress or a treaty of the United States. In cases where the U.S. is a party, the U.S. plaintiff or defendant code takes precedence, and box 1 or 2 should be marked.

Diversity of citizenship. (4) This refers to suits under 28 U.S.C. 1332, where parties are citizens of different states. When Box 4 is checked, the citizenship of the different parties must be checked. (See Section III below; federal question actions take precedence over diversity cases.)

- III. Residence (citizenship) of Principal Parties. This section of the JS 44 is to be completed if diversity of citizenship was indicated above. Mark this section for each principal party.
- **IV. Nature of Suit**. Place an "X" in the appropriate box. If the nature of suit cannot be determined, be sure the cause of action, in Section VI below, is sufficient to enable the deputy clerk or the statistical clerks in the Administrative Office to determine the nature of suit. If the cause fits more than one nature of suit, select the most definitive.
- V. Origin. Place an "X" in one of the seven boxes.

Original Proceedings. (1) Cases which originate in the United States district courts.

Removed from State Court. (2) Proceedings initiated in state courts may be removed to the district courts under Title 28 U.S.C., Section 1441. When the petition for removal is granted, check this box.

Remanded from Appellate Court. (3) Check this box for cases remanded to the district court for further action. Use the date of remand as the filing date.

Reinstated or Reopened. (4) Check this box for cases reinstated or reopened in the district court. Use the reopening date as the filing date.

Transferred from Another District. (5) For cases transferred under Title 28 U.S.C. Section 1404(a). Do not use this for within district transfers or multidistrict litigation transfers.

Multidistrict Litigation. (6) Check this box when a multidistrict case is transferred into the district under authority of Title 28 U.S.C. Section 1407. When this box is checked, do not check (5) above.

Appeal to District Judge from Magistrate Judgment. (7) Check this box for an appeal from a magistrate judge's decision.

VI. Cause of Action. Report the civil statute directly related to the cause of action and give a brief description of the cause. Do not cite jurisdictional

statutes unless diversity. Example: U.S. Civil Statute: 47 USC 553

Brief Description: Unauthorized reception of cable service

Or: "AP Docket"

VII. Requested in Complaint. Class Action. Place an "X" in this box if you are filing a class action under Rule 23, F.R.Cv.P.

Demand. In this space enter the dollar amount (in thousands of dollars) being demanded or indicate other demand such as a preliminary injunction.

Jury Demand. Check the appropriate box to indicate whether or not a jury is being demanded.

Date and Attorney Signature. Date and sign the civil cover sheet.