Dustin L. Collier (SBN 264766) 1 V. Joshua Socks (ŠBN 303443) **ELECTRONICALLY FILED** Elizabeth R. Malay (SBN 336745) Superior Court of California COLLIER LAW FIRM, LLP County of Santa Cruz 240 Tamal Vista Blvd., Ste. 100 3 7/26/2023 4:10 PM Corte Madera, CA 94925 Clerk of the Court by Deputy. T: (510) 250-9606 4 Jessica Betancourt F: (844) 274-1850 dcollier@collierlawsf.com 5 isocks@collierlawsf.com 6 emalay@collierlawsf.com 7 Brian C. Mathias (SBN 282494) THE LAW OFFICE OF BRIAN MATHIAS 8 P.O. Box 2874 Aptos, CA 95001 T: (831) 588-1035 10 brian@brianmathiaslaw.com 11 Attorneys for Plaintiff MICHAEL BOTILL 12 SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA 13 **COUNTY OF SANTA CRUZ** 23CV01792 MICHAEL BOTILL, an individual, Case No.: 14 15 **COMPLAINT FOR DAMAGES:** Plaintiff, 16 (1) WHISTLEBLOWER RETALIATION (Cal. Lab. Code § 1102.5) vs. 17 (2) WHISTLEBLOWER RETALIATION 18 CENTRAL FIRE DISTRICT OF SANTA (Cal. Lab. Code § 6310) CRUZ COUNTY, a California public entity; (3) ASSAULT 19 DAN JORDAN, an individual; FORREST (4) BATTERY GLEITSMAN, an individual; and DOES 1-25, (5) FEHA RETALIATION 20 inclusive, (Cal. Gov't. Code § 12940 (h)) 21 (6) HARASSSMENT- HOSTILE WORK **ENVIRONMENT** Defendants. 22 (Cal. Gov't. Code 12940(j)) (7) FAILURE TO PREVENT 23 DISCRIMINATION, RETALIATION, 24 AND HARASSMENT (Cal. Gov't. Code § 12940 (k)) 25 (8) NEGLIGENT HIRING AND RETENTION 26 (9) NEGLIGENCE 27 28

I. INTRODUCTION

- 1. Plaintiff Michael Botill has been employed as a firefighter for the Central Fire District of Santa Cruz County ("Central Fire" or "Central Fire District") since 2016. During his employment with Central Fire District, Plaintiff was attacked or threatened with physical violence multiple times by a supervisor, Captain Dan Jordan. Central Fire District was fully aware of Captain Jordan's history of violence in the workplace yet failed and refused to take any meaningful action to prevent future attacks.
- 2. In October 2022, in direct response to Plaintiff's written complaints about Captain Jordan's ongoing threats of violence and retaliatory medical leave policies, Plaintiff was attacked yet again in a coordinated assault by Captain Jordan and Firefighter Forrest Gleitsman at a work event. Instead of taking meaningful action against Plaintiff's assailants, Central Fire has further retaliated against Plaintiff by blaming him for the attack and forcing Plaintiff to use protected leave should he wish to avoid working with his assailants.
- 3. Additionally, Plaintiff has been subjected to a barrage of continual and pervasive unlawful harassment by Captain Jordan and Central Fire in the form of gender and sexual orientation-based derogatory comments and taunts during his employment, all in violation of California's Fair Employment and Housing Act ("FEHA"; Gov. Code § 12900 et seq.).
- 4. Plaintiff brings this action for numerous violations of anti-retaliation laws under the Labor Code and the FEHA, as well as actions for assault and battery and violation of protected leave laws.

II. JURISDICTION AND VENUE

5. Personal jurisdiction is proper under the California Code of Civil Procedure section 410.10 because Defendants, and each of them, have maintained sufficient minimum contacts with the State to make the exercise of personal jurisdiction reasonable and just under contemporary standards. Defendants are governmental entities, residents of, and/or are doing business, and are, upon information and belief, headquartered and maintain their principal place of business in the County of Santa Cruz, State of California.

- 6. This action seeks damages in excess of \$25,000, and the action is not of otherwise limited jurisdiction. (See Code Civ. Proc. §§ 86, 88.)
- 7. Subject matter jurisdiction in this matter is conferred by the California Constitution, Article VI, sections 11-12, and the California Code of Civil Procedure section 410.50.
- 8. Jurisdiction of this Court is also invoked pursuant to the FEHA. Specifically, Gov. Code section 12965(b) provides that after receiving a right to sue letter from the Department of Fair Employment and Housing ("DFEH"), an aggrieved individual may file a civil lawsuit "against the person, employer, labor organization or employment agency named in the verified complaint within one year from the date of that notice."
- 9. Plaintiff has fulfilled all of the conditions precedent to the institution of this action under Gov. Code sections 12960, 12965.
- 10. Venue in this Court is proper pursuant to the California Code of Civil Procedure section 395 *et seq.* because at least one of the Defendants resides in Santa Cruz County and does substantial business in Santa Cruz County. Further, the unlawful acts described herein originated in Santa Cruz County.
- 11. Venue is further appropriate in Santa Cruz County in accordance with Section 12965(b) of the California Government Code because the unlawful acts alleged herein in violation of the FEHA were committed, at least in part, in the County of Santa Cruz. Plaintiff worked and continues to work in Santa Cruz County, and Plaintiff's employment records were and are maintained and administered in the County of Santa Cruz.

III. PARTIES

- 12. At all relevant times, Plaintiff Michael Botill was and is a competent adult residing in Santa Cruz and later San Luis Obispo Counties in California. Plaintiff is an employee of Defendant Central Fire District of Santa Cruz County. Plaintiff is a heterosexual male.
- 13. Plaintiff was an "employee" of Defendants within the meaning of Government Code section 12926(c), the applicable Industrial Wage Commission Order, and the California Labor and Government Codes.

- 14. Throughout his employment, Plaintiff has made formal and informal complaints, reports, and disclosures within the meaning of California Labor Code sections 1102.5, 6310, and the FEHA.
- 15. Central Fire District is, and at all times mentioned was, a California public entity district comprised of multiple fire stations and an administrative headquarters all located in Santa Cruz County. Central Fire was formerly referred to as Aptos/ La Selva Fire Protection District and/or Central Fire District.
- 16. Defendant Central Fire District is a state, political, or civil subdivision of the State or city, and regularly employed and continue to employ at least five persons during the relevant periods at issue herein. As such, Central Fire District is an "employer" within the meaning of FEHA.
- 12. Defendant Captain Dan Jordan ("Jordan") is, and at all relevant times herein, has been employed as captain of Central Fire District. Jordan has at all times relevant to this legal action been a resident of Santa Cruz County. Jordan is also referred to as "DanJo".
- 13. On information and belief, Jordan has a substance abuse problem with alcohol and this fact has been known to the Central Fire District both before and after all relevant times herein. This known substance abuse problem includes the use of violence or threats of violence after consuming alcohol.
- 14. The position held by Jordan has at all times met at least the minimum requirements of a legal supervisor for purposes of the FEHA and Government Code section 12926(t). Captains, including Jordan, direct the daily work activities of firefighters and/or act as forepersons or leads or the substantive equivalent of forepersons or leads. Captains oversee correction actions and can initiate progressive discipline. Moreover, a captain's recommendation is given significant weight in hiring, firing, or disciplinary decisions or other decisions which affect the terms and conditions of employment of firefighters. Captains are responsible for reporting illegal and discriminatory behavior and unsafe working conditions at the Central Fire District and for receiving complaints, disclosures, and reports of the same.

- 15. Defendant Forrest Gleitsman is and at all relevant times has been a Firefighter Paramedic for Central Fire. Gleitsman has at all times relevant to this legal action been a resident of Santa Cruz County.
- 16. On information and belief, Gleitsman has a substance abuse problem with alcohol and this fact has been known by the Central Fire District both before and after all relevant times herein. This known substance abuse problem includes the use of violence or threats of violence after consuming alcohol.
- 14. Plaintiff is ignorant of the true names and capacities of the Defendants sued herein as Does 1-25, inclusive, and therefore sues these Defendants by such fictitious names pursuant to Code of Civil Procedure section 474. Plaintiff will amend this Complaint to allege the true and correct names and capacities of these Doe Defendants when ascertained. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and thereon alleges, that said Defendants, and each of them, are responsible in whole or in part for Plaintiff's damages as alleged herein.
- 15. Defendants Does 1-25 are individuals and entities that, upon information and belief, reside in and/or conducted the material transactions and unlawful acts at issue herein.
- 16. Whenever reference is made to any act of Defendants such allegations shall be deemed to mean Defendant Central Fire District, Defendant Dan Jordan, Defendant Forrest Gleitsman, and/or Does 1 through 25, and/or one or more of their officers, agents, managers, representatives, employees, heirs, assignees, customers and tenants, did or authorized such acts while actively engaged in the operation, management, direction or control of the affairs of the Defendant on whose behalf they purported to act and while acting within the course and scope of their duties.

IV. AGENCY

17. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and on that basis, alleges that at times herein mentioned each of the Defendants was an agent, manager, director, servant, employee, and/or joint-venturer of each of the remaining Defendants, and were at all times acting within the course and scope of such agency, service, employment, and/or joint venture, and each of the Defendants have at times ratified, approved, and authorized the acts of each of the remaining Defendants with full

knowledge of said facts. In the alternative, Plaintiff alleges that Defendants, and each of them, exceeded the course and scope of their agency relationship with one another, rendering the agent(s) liable for their own individualized misconduct.

V. AIDING AND ABETTING/CONSPIRACY

18. Defendants, and each of them, aided and abetted, encouraged, and rendered substantial assistance to the other Defendants in breaching their obligations to Plaintiff, as alleged herein. In taking action, as alleged herein, to aid and abet and substantially assist the commission of these wrongful acts and other wrongdoing complained of, each of the Defendants acted with an awareness of its/his/her primary wrongdoing and realized that its/his/her conduct would substantially assist the accomplishment of the wrongful conduct, wrongful goals, and wrongdoing. Defendants, and each of them, also knowingly and willfully conspired to do the acts and things herein alleged pursuant to, and in furtherance of, the conspiracy.

VI. ALTER EGO

19. There is a unity of interest between one or more of the Defendants, and each acts as the alter ego of the other. Additionally, at all times relevant herein, Defendants were joint employers of the Plaintiff, by virtue of sharing authority over and control of the terms and conditions of Plaintiff's employment.

VII. EXHAUSTION OF ADMINISTRATIVE REMEDIES

- 20. Prior to filing this action, on February 9, 2023, Plaintiff filed a charge with the California Civil Rights Department, Complaint Number 202302-19648110, alleging violations of the FEHA. The same day, Plaintiff received a "Right-to-Sue" Notice and Letter from the Department. This lawsuit is timely initiated within a year of the issuance of the Right to Sue.
- 21. By obtaining and timely exercising his Right to Sue Notices from the Department in a timely manner, Plaintiff has exhausted all available and required administrative remedies of the FEHA.
- 22. Prior to filing this action, and within six-months of the incidents at issue, on February 10, 2023, Plaintiff's counsel submitted a Complaint and Notice Against a Government/

25

24

27

28

26

Public Entity pursuant to California Government Code section 910, et sec. That Complaint was mailed to Central Fire District on February 10, 2023, certified mail, return receipt requested. That Complaint described in great detail the facts, dates, and witnesses giving rise to the legal claims and the specific code sections and torts underlying those claims.

- 23. On or about March 23, 2023, Central Fire District issued a claims rejection letter to Plaintiff's counsel stating that the Complaint of February 10, 2023, had been received, but had been rejected.
- 24. Plaintiff has commenced this lawsuit prior to the six-month deadline as set forth by law and has thereby satisfied any administrative exhaustion requirements of Government Code section 910, et sec.

VIII. FACTUAL ALLEGATIONS

Plaintiff's initial hiring and the first assault by Captain Jordan

- 25. On approximately September 12, 2016, Plaintiff was hired by Central Fire District as a probationary employee. Plaintiff met at least satisfactory performance expectations during his probationary period before becoming a permanent employee on or about March 12, 2018.
- 26. Plaintiff has met at least satisfactory performance expectations for the entirety of his employment at Central Fire District.
- 27. Central Fire District hosts an annual event called "Bid Night" where firefighters and captains bid for their schedules and positions for the following year. Bid Nights are attended by all levels of Central Fire District employees, including captains and even higher-ranking battalion chiefs. Bid Nights are official or otherwise sanctioned by the Central Fire District.
- 28. At the 2020 Bid Night, which took place in or around the month of October 2020, multiple higher-ranking firefighters aside from Jordan were present at the event. Because this was a work event, Plaintiff also attended. At the event Jordan appeared drunk, impaired, and/or was otherwise under the influence of alcohol and was also observed consuming alcohol.

- 29. During the event, Jordan walked directly up to Plaintiff, abruptly slapped him across the face, and then walked away laughing. Multiple Central Fire District employees were aware of this battery immediately or very shortly thereafter, including multiple other Central Fire District captains.
- 30. In response to Jordan's well known, public assault and battery of Plaintiff, the Central Fire District did nothing to discipline, discourage, or punish Jordan, nor to prevent him from committing similar and foreseeable acts in the future. As a result of these failures by Central Fire District, Jordan learned that striking a subordinate was an acceptable practice.
- 31. By failing and refusing to take any action against Captain Jordan, Central Fire District ratified Jordan's behavior in connection with the 2020 Bid Night.

The second assault by Captain Jordan

- 32. Firefighter Botill assisted in the organization and running of the following year's Bid Night in 2021. At the 2021 Bid Night, multiple higher-ranking firefighters aside from Jordan were present, including captains and one or more battalion chiefs.
- 33. At the year 2021 Bid Night, Captain Jordan again appeared drunk, impaired, and otherwise under the influence. During the event, Jordan aggressively approached Plaintiff with his fist cocked back and ready to strike. He then verbally threatened Plaintiff and yelled, in substance or effect: "You better not say anything to my fucking people!" Multiple Central Fire District employees observed this, including higher ranking captains and battalion chiefs.
- 34. Plaintiff is informed and believed that Jordan's remarks were intended to prevent him from making workplace complaints or other legally protected reports or disclosures regarding unlawful working conditions.
- 35. In response to Jordan's second well known, public assault of Plaintiff, the Central Fire District again did nothing to discipline, discourage, or punish Jordan, nor to prevent him from committing similar and foreseeable acts in the future. Nor did Central Fire District take any action to otherwise remediate the ongoing hostile work environment Plaintiff was forced to endure. By failing to correct Jordan's unlawful behavior *again*, Jordan was once again given the impression that striking a subordinate was an acceptable way to discipline, or otherwise treat, lower ranking

firefighters In the alternative, Jordan was implementing an unwritten policy, practice or custom of the Central Fire District; to wit, that physical violence was an appropriate method of enforcing workplace discipline.

36. By failing and refusing to take any action against Captain Jordan, Central Fire District again ratified Jordan's behavior in connection with the 2021 Bid Night.

In response to complaints of unlawful conduct, Plaintiff is threatened with more violence

- 37. On or about August 30, 2022, Plaintiff reasonably and in good faith believed that Central Fire District already had implemented, or would be implementing, an illegal and retaliatory medical leave of absence policy which would effectively punish firefighters (including Plaintiff) who utilized various forms of protected leave or medical absences.
- 38. In response to Central Fire District's policy or proposed policy, Plaintiff submitted a written complaint, disclosure, or report stating that this policy was, or would be, discriminatory, retaliatory, harassing, and/or otherwise unlawful. On or about August 30, 2022, this complaint was provided to Captain Jordan and numerous other persons who had authority over Plaintiff's employment.
- 39. In direct response to Plaintiff's complaint and/or his lawful use of protected medical leave, Jordan promptly retaliated against Plaintiff by stating to dozens of Plaintiff's coworkers and superiors, that Plaintiff was "fucking [his] fellow union members because [he] want[s] to work less and get more" by utilizing protected leave and/or opposing the policy and practices that Plaintiff had reported.
- 40. In a telephone conversation with Captain Jordan shortly after Plaintiff's August 30, 2022, email, Jordan threatened further violence and retaliation against Plaintiff, stating, "You better not be in the same room as me!" and "Fuck you, Dude . . . You're such a fag."
- 41. This act of retaliation was in direct response to Plaintiff's report and disclosure from earlier that day. Plaintiff is informed and believed that Jordan's written and verbal remarks were intended to prevent him from making workplace complaints or other legally-protected reports or disclosures regarding unlawful working conditions.

42. Plaintiff is further informed and believes that Jordan's conduct in this instance, and other instances, is part of an unwritten policy, practice, or custom of the Central Fire District's to retaliate against employees who make good faith complaints about working conditions, unlawful policies and practices, or safety issues. Jordan's conduct in this instance, and others, was done in conformity with that unwritten policy, practice, or custom of the Central Fire District.

Plaintiff is assaulted yet again in response to his complaints of unlawful conduct

- 43. On August 31, 2022, Plaintiff submitted a written complaint of retaliation, discrimination and harassment to the Central Fire District pertaining to Captain Jordan's conduct, via a Central Fire Protection District Discrimination / Harassment Complaint form, where Plaintiff also reported illegal acts of assault, battery, and retaliation that had occurred in the workplace.
- 44. Although Central Fire District was aware of Jordan's violent behavior and substance abuse, Plaintiff again warned the Central Fire District of Jordan's violent history, his threats of future violence against him, and Plaintiff's ongoing and increasing workplace safety concerns.
- 45. In response, the Central Fire District ignored Plaintiff and did nothing to discipline, discourage, or punish Jordan, nor did it do anything to prevent Jordan from committing similar acts in the future. Jordan's unlawful conduct was once again ratified by the Central Fire District. By failing to correct Jordan's unlawful behavior *yet again*, Central Fire District was ratifying Jordan's illegal and harassing workplace conduct.
- 46. On October 4, 2022, Plaintiff helped organize that year's Bid Night. For the third Bid Night in a row, Captain Jordan appeared drunk, impaired, and otherwise under the influence of alcohol.
- 47. During Bid Night, Jordan approached probationary firefighters Julian Thompson and Ben Shank and physically slapped items out of their hands, including a cell phone, in a highly aggressive manner. Because he perceived this assault as another instance of workplace violence, Plaintiff immediately told Jordan to stop, then asked another captain to intervene. Multiple high-ranking firefighters observed Jordan's aggressive behavior. Because Central Fire District took no meaningful action against Jordan in response to more workplace violence, Jordan was once again

given the impression that striking a subordinate was an acceptable way to discipline, or otherwise treat, lower ranking firefighters. In the alternative, Jordan was implementing an unwritten policy, practice or custom of the Central Fire District; to wit, that physical violence was an appropriate method of enforcing workplace discipline.

- 48. By failing and refusing to take any action against Captain Jordan, Central Fire District ratified Jordan's behavior in connection with the 2022 Bid Night.
- 49. As a continuation of the Bid Night, multiple firefighters, including Plaintiff, went to the Britannia Arms Restaurant located in Capitola, California. While at the restaurant, Plaintiff received a text message from Firefighter Forrest Gleitsman, asking in substance or effect: "Where you at?" Plaintiff provided Gleitsman with his location. On information and belief, and unbeknownst to Plaintiff, Jordan and Gleitsman had by this time formed an agreement or conspiracy to attack Plaintiff and were attempting to locate him for that purpose.
- 50. A short while later, Jordan and Gleitsman entered the restaurant. Jordan sat down across from Plaintiff at the same table, staring at him and taunting him. These acts of further intimidation, harassment, and retaliation included the following statements: (1) "Why are you such a cunt?"; (2) "Why are you such a faggot?"; and (3) "Why do you hate me so much?" Because Jordan was increasingly belligerent and antagonistic, Plaintiff was afraid for his safety and left the restaurant. Jordan almost immediately pursued him.
- 51. Jordan continued to taunt Plaintiff outside and verbally reconfirmed that the basis for his retaliation against, and treatment of, Plaintiff was due in at least substantial part to Plaintiff's perceived use of protected leave and Plaintiff's complaints about unlawful working conditions. Jordan further complained about Covid-19 policies, stating that the vaccine requirements were Plaintiff's fault. Plaintiff attempted to escape Jordan for a *second time* by returning inside and sitting away from the Central Fire District's table entirely next to a stranger. Jordan again pursued Plaintiff and placed himself directly between Plaintiff and the patron, interrupting them mid conversation. Jordan continued antagonizing Plaintiff, plainly in an effort to intimidate him.

- 52. In response to Jordan's outward aggression, the bartender closed the bar for the night. Plaintiff then attempted to get away from Captain Jordan for a *third time* but was pursued by Jordan and also Gleitsman. Referring expressly to Plaintiff's protected complaint of August 31, 2022, and the District's unwritten policy, custom, or practice of allowing workplace violence, Gleitsman yelled, in substance or effect: "How dare you sue DanJo!" and "If we have problems, we settle them in the streets with our fists!" Jordan attempted to strike and shove Plaintiff at this time.
- 53. During this assault, and again in direct reference to Plaintiff's complaints and reports about workplace violence and safety, Jordan yelled, in substance or effect: "How dare you complain about me to the department!"
- 54. Plaintiff attempted to distance himself from Jordan and now Gleitsman for a *fourth time* but was attacked from behind by a strike to the jaw from Gleitsman. Gleitsman then repeatedly struck Plaintiff's face and body multiple times with his fists. Jordan joined the attack, also striking Plaintiff with his fists. Plaintiff suffered multiple physical and emotional injuries because of the unlawful attack by these agents of Central Fire District.
- 55. On information and belief, Gleitsman has committed at least one other assault and battery against a fellow District firefighter. This includes an instance where Gleitsman choked a Captain during a work event located at Palapas Restaurant in Aptos, California. The Central Fire District was made aware of this behavior, and Gleitsman's propensity for violence, but took no material and or reasonable steps to discipline or punish Gleitsman or otherwise prevent a similar violent behavior, but instead continued to negligently retain Gleitsman and thereby ratified the unlawful conduct and encourage future instances of violence. Moreover, Central Fire District's failure to address Gleichman's violence created the impression in Gleitsman that violence and/or the threat of violence was an appropriate method of resolving workplace disputes by effectively ratifying the conduct.
- 56. Upon information and belief, Captain Jordan, Gleitsman, and others who are currently unknown to Plaintiff have engaged in a pattern and practice of unlawful activity towards other firefighters, including the use of workplace violence, to implement workplace and to resolve

workplace disputes. This is part of an unwritten policy, custom, and practice at Central Fire District that deems such conduct acceptable.

The Central Fire District continues its campaign of inaction against Plaintiff's attackers and instead blames Plaintiff for the attack

- 57. Multiple upper ranking firefighters, including captains and one or more battalion chiefs as well as Fire Chief Jason Nee, were made aware of the October 4, 2022, attack on Plaintiff no later than the following day.
- 58. Plaintiff is informed and believes that the Central Fire District has taken no material steps to discipline or punish either Captain Jordan or Gleitsman, nor to prevent them from committing similar acts in the future against Plaintiff or others. Moreover, Central Fire District has ratified the actions of Captain Jordan and Gleitsman as described herein.
- 59. In contrast, Plaintiff was told by Fire Chief Nee that *he* was at fault because Plaintiff was hired by a Fire Chief who was widely disliked and since that Chief was so disliked, the people he hired (including Plaintiff) were not trusted. Nee told Plaintiff that he needed to "earn" trust for that reason. Moreover, Plaintiff was told he could try to schedule himself on different shifts than Jordan and Gleitsman, but if it was not possible to do so, he had to either work with his assailants or take leave from work.
- 60. The District's response is a further act of retaliation to Plaintiff's series of workplace complaints. Moreover, by refusing and failing to consistently schedule Jordan or Gleitsman on separate shifts than Plaintiff, the District has interfered and/or prospectively interfered with Plaintiff's ability to use protected leave for true medical or family emergencies and has engaged in unlawful conduct by failing to appropriately remediate the ongoing hostile work environment.
- 61. As a result of the aforementioned conduct, Plaintiff has in essence been frozen out from internal advancement or higher-ranking job opportunities within the Central Fire District.
- 62. For almost the entirety of Plaintiff's employment with Central Fire, Plaintiff has also been exposed to a barrage of continual and pervasive derogatory comments by Jordan, including

"faggot," "cunt," and other derogatory terms that have materially affected the terms and conditions of his employment at the Central Fire District.

IX. CAUSES OF ACTION

FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION

WHISTLEBLOWER RETALIATION

(Labor Code § 1102.5)

(Against Defendant Central Fire and Does 1-25)

- 63. Plaintiff realleges and hereby incorporates by reference all allegations set forth in the paragraphs above, to the extent they are not contradictory to the relief requested herein, as if fully set forth.
- 64. California Labor Code §1102.5(a) prohibits an employer from making, adopting or enforcing any rule or policy preventing an employee from disclosing information to a government or law enforcement agency, where the employee reasonably believes that the information discloses a violation of state or federal statute, rule or regulation.
- 65. California Labor Code § 1102.5(b) prohibits an employer, or any person acting on behalf of the employer, from discharging, retaliating or in any manner discriminating against any employee for disclosing information, or because the employer believes that the employee disclosed or may disclose information, to a government or law enforcement agency, to a person with authority over the employee or another employee who has the authority to investigate, discover, or correct the violation or noncompliance, or for providing information to, or testifying before, any public body conducting an investigation, hearing, or inquiry, if the employee has reasonable cause to believe that the information discloses a violation of state or federal statute, or a violation of or noncompliance with a local, state, or federal rule or regulation, regardless of whether disclosing the information is part of the employee's job duties.
- 66. California Labor Code §1102.5(c) prohibits an employer, or any person acting on behalf of the employer, from discharging, retaliating, or in any manner discriminating against any employee for refusing to participate in an activity that would result in a violation of state or federal statute, or a violation of or noncompliance with a local, state, or federal rule or regulation.

28

- 67. Plaintiff disclosed to Defendants what he reasonably believed to be a violations of law and his legally protected employment rights, and he opposed Defendants' inadequate response and remedial measures relating to his complaints that he had reasonable cause to believe were in violation of local, state, and or federal civil rights statutes. Those protected complaints, disclosures, reports, and activities include but are not limited to:
 - Plaintiff's written complaint and disclosure of August 30, 2022, submitted to multiple Central Fire District supervisors and managers, including Jordan, that the Central Fire's treatment and/or proposed treatment of firefighters who utilized, or would utilize, protected leave or take medical absences violated California law, and that said treatment was retaliatory, discriminatory, and harassing.
 - Plaintiff's written Discrimination/ Harassment complaint of August 31, 2022, disclosed and/or submitted to Central Fire, complaining of unlawful retaliation, discrimination, and harassment regarding Captain Jordan's past unlawful conduct and threats of future violence.
 - Plaintiff's verbal complaint of October 4, 2022, disclosed and/or submitted to a supervisor and/or manager, that Captain Jordan was engaging in violent behavior towards other firefighters.
 - Plaintiff's verbal complaint(s) of October 5, 2022, disclosed and/or submitted to supervisors and/or managers that Captain Jordan and Gleitsman had engaged in unlawful acts of violence and retaliation towards him.
 - Plaintiff's written Discrimination/ Harassment complaint of October 12, 2022, disclosed and/or submitted to Central Fire, complaining of unlawful retaliation, discrimination, and harassment regarding Captain Jordan's past unlawful conduct and threats of future violence.
 - Plaintiff's verbal complaint to Fire Chief Nee on or about October 19, 2022, that Central Fire District's conduct towards him was retaliatory, discriminatory, and harassing.
 - Other disclosures that will be identified up to and including the time of trial.

- 68. At the time Plaintiff made the disclosures, reports, and complaints regarding workplace health and safety concerns, Plaintiff reasonably believed the law had been broken, was being broken, or would be broken. Those laws include, but are not limited to:
 - California Penal Code sections 240 and 242 defining assault and battery;
 - ➤ California Labor Code sections 245-247.5 pertaining to the use of protected sick leave and medical absences;
 - California Labor Code sections 233 and 234 pertaining to the use of protected sick leave and medical absences;
 - ➤ California Government Code section 12945.2, and related provisions pertaining to the CFRA;
 - ➤ The Family Medical Leave Act (FMLA), including but not limited to 29 Code Fed. Regs. section 825.220;
 - ➤ California Government Code section 12940(a) prohibiting unlawful discrimination, harassment, and retaliation for opposing practices that violate the FEHA;
 - California Labor Code section 232.5, prohibiting employers from discrimination, disciplining, or discharging employees who disclose information about working conditions;
 - ➤ 8 Cal. Code Regs. section 3200, California's public policy to make full provision for securing safety in employment and compliance with OSHA orders to help prevent injury;
 - ➤ 8 Cal. Code Regs. section 3203, setting forth the regulations and requirements for California employers to establish, implement and maintain an effective Injury and Illness Prevention Program, that includes a system for ensuring that employees comply with safe and healthy work practices, and that includes a system for communicating with employees in a form readily understandable by all affected employees on matters relating to occupational safety and health, including provisions designed to encourage employees to inform the employer of hazards at the worksite without the fear of reprisal;

- Other laws, regulations, and/or ordinances that will be identified up to and including the time of trial.
- 69. The complaints, reports, and protected disclosures were made to persons that had had authority over Plaintiff, had the authority to make and enforce rules, regulations and policy affecting employees, and the terms and conditions of their employment, and/or to investigate, discover and/or correct the violation of non-compliance reported by Plaintiff.
- 70. Defendants took adverse employment action, by and through their agents and employees, which, individually or taken as a whole, materially and adversely affected the terms, conditions and privileges of Plaintiff's employment:
 - ➤ Committing assault and/or battery against Plaintiff;
 - Failing and/or refusing to act upon one or more of Plaintiff's disclosures or complaints of unlawful activity and/or to do so in a timely, good faith, and material way;
 - Refusing to reasonably punish or discipline Captain Jordan and/or Gleitsman;
 - Forcing Plaintiff into circumstances that would require him to work on the same shift as Captain Jordan and/or Gleitsman;
 - ➤ Prospectively interfering with Plaintiff's use of protected sick leave, CFRA, and FMLA leave by requiring him to work on the same shift as Captain Jordan and/or Gleitsman, or in the alternative, utilize protected leaves of absence;
 - Harassing Plaintiff on the basis of his actual and/or perceived sexual orientation and/or gender;
 - Failing to prevent ongoing harassment of Plaintiff on the basis of his actual and/or perceived sexual orientation and/or gender;
 - ➤ Blaming Plaintiff for the actions taken by Captain Jordan and/or Gleitsman;
 - Alienating and reprimanding Plaintiff;
 - Other adverse actions that will be identified up to and including the time of trial.
- 71. By and through the aforesaid acts and omissions of Defendants, and each of them, Plaintiff has been directly and legally caused to suffer actual damages including, but not limited to,

loss of earnings and future earning capacity, loss of benefits, attorneys' fees, costs of suit, and other pecuniary loss not presently ascertained. Accordingly, Plaintiff is entitled to a recovery for said damages in an amount according to proof at trial.

- 72. As a further direct and legal result of the acts and conduct of Defendants, and each of them, as aforesaid, Plaintiff has been caused to and did suffer, and continues to suffer significant emotional and mental distress, anguish, humiliation, embarrassment, fright, shock, pain, discomfort and anxiety. Therefore, Plaintiff is entitled to a recovery for said damages in an amount according to proof at trial.
 - 73. Defendants' conduct was a substantial factor in causing Plaintiff's harm.

SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION

WHISTLEBLOWER RETALIATION

(Labor Code § 6310) (Against Defendant Central Fire and Does 1-25)

- 74. Plaintiff realleges and hereby incorporates by reference all allegations set forth in the paragraphs above, to the extent they are not contradictory to the relief requested herein, as if fully set forth.
- 75. At all times mentioned herein, California Labor Code § 6310 ("Section 6310") was in effect, and binding on Defendant Central Fire District. Section 6310 prohibits employers from discharging, constructively discharging, retaliating or in any manner discriminating against any employee for making any oral or written health or safety complaint, or complaint regarding working conditions, to a governmental agency, or their employer.
- 76. Plaintiff made good faith health or safety complaints or complaints regarding working conditions, including but not limited to:
 - ➤ Plaintiff's written complaint and disclosure of August 30, 2022, submitted to multiple Central Fire District supervisors and managers, including Jordan, that the Central Fire's treatment and/or proposed treatment of firefighters who utilized protected leave or take medical absences, or would utilize protected leave or take medical absences, violated California law, and that said treatment was retaliatory and discriminatory;

- ➤ Plaintiff's written Discrimination/ Harassment complaint of August 31, 2022, disclosed and/or submitted to Central Fire, complaining of unlawful retaliation, discrimination, and harassment regarding Captain Jordan's past unlawful conduct and threats of future violence;
- ➤ Plaintiff's verbal complaint of October 4, 2022, disclosed and/or submitted to a supervisor and/or manager, that Captain Jordan was engaging in violent behavior towards other firefighters;
- Plaintiff's verbal complaint(s) of October 5, 2022, disclosed and/or submitted to supervisors and/or managers that Captain Jordan and Gleitsman had engaged in further violence towards him;
- ➤ Plaintiff's written Discrimination/ Harassment complaint of October 12, 2022, disclosed and/or submitted to Central Fire, complaining of unlawful retaliation, discrimination, and harassment regarding Captain Jordan's past unlawful conduct and threats of future violence.
- ➤ Plaintiff's verbal complaint to Fire Chief Nee on or about October 19, 2022, that Central Fire District's conduct towards him was retaliatory, discriminatory, and harassing.
- Other disclosures and complaints that will be identified up to and including the time of trial.
- 77. At the time Plaintiff made the complaints and disclosures regarding workplace safety violations and health and safety concerns, Plaintiff reasonably believed the law had and/or was being broken. Those workplace safety laws include, but are not limited to:
 - ➤ California Penal Code sections 240 and 242 defining assault and battery;
 - ➤ California Labor Code sections 245-247.5 pertaining to the use of protected sick leave and medical absences;
 - California Labor Code sections 233 and 234 pertaining to the use of protected sick leave and medical absences;

28

1

2

3

- ➤ California Government Code section 12945.2, and related provisions pertaining to the California Family Rights Act;
- ➤ The Family Medical Leave Act, including but not limited to 29 CFR 825.220;
- California Government Code section 12940(a) prohibiting unlawful discrimination, harassment, and retaliation for opposing practices which violate the California Fair Employment and Housing Act;
- California Labor Code section 232.5, prohibiting employers from discrimination, disciplining, or discharging employees who disclose information about working conditions;
- ➤ 8 Cal. Code Regs. section 3200, California's public policy to make full provision for securing safety in employment and compliance with OSHA orders to help prevent injury;
- ➤ 8 Cal. Code Regs. section 3203, setting forth the regulations and requirements for California employers to establish, implement and maintain an effective Injury and Illness Prevention Program, that includes a system for ensuring that employees comply with safe and healthy work practices, and that includes a system for communicating with employees in a form readily understandable by all affected employees on matters relating to occupational safety and health, including provisions designed to encourage employees to inform the employer of hazards at the worksite without the fear of reprisal;
- Other laws, regulations, and/or ordinances that will be identified up to and including the time of trial.
- 78. At the time Plaintiff made the protected complaints and disclosures, he reasonably believed the working conditions and/or practices to be unsafe.
- 79. Defendants took adverse action, by and through their agents and employees, which, individually or taken as a whole, materially and adversely affected the terms, conditions and privileges of employment for Plaintiff:

- Committing assault and/or battery against Plaintiff;
- Failing and/or refusing to act upon one or more of Plaintiff's disclosures or complaints of unlawful activity;
- Refusing to reasonably punish or discipline Captain Jordan and/or Gleitsman;
- Forcing Plaintiff into circumstances that would require him to work on the same shift as Captain Jordan and/or Gleitsman;
- ➤ Prospectively interfering with Plaintiff's use of protected sick leave, CFRA, and FMLA leave by requiring him to work on the same shift as Captain Jordan and/or Gleitsman, or in the alternative, utilize protected leaves of absence
- Harassing Plaintiff on the basis of his actual and/or perceived sexual orientation and/or gender;
- ➤ Failing to prevent ongoing harassment of Plaintiff on the basis of his actual and/or perceived sexual orientation and/or gender;
- ➤ Blaming Plaintiff for the actions taken by Captain Jordan and/or Gleitsman;
- > Alienating and reprimanding Plaintiff;
- ➤ Other adverse actions that will be identified up to and including the time of trial.
- 80. By and through the aforesaid acts and omissions of Defendants, and each of them, Plaintiff has been directly and legally caused to suffer actual damages including, but not limited to, loss of earnings and future earning capacity, loss of benefits, attorneys' fees, costs of suit, and other pecuniary loss not presently ascertained. Accordingly, Plaintiff is entitled to a recovery for said damages in an amount according to proof at trial.
- 81. As a further direct and legal result of the acts and conduct of Defendants, and each of them, as aforesaid, Plaintiff has been caused to and did suffer, and continues to suffer significant emotional and mental distress, anguish, humiliation, embarrassment, fright, shock, pain, discomfort and anxiety. Therefore, Plaintiff is entitled to a recovery for said damages in an amount according to proof at trial.
 - 82. Defendants' conduct was a substantial factor in causing Plaintiff's harm.

THIRD CAUSE OF ACTION

ASSAULT (Against All Defendants)

- 83. Plaintiff realleges and incorporates the foregoing paragraphs as though fully set forth herein, excepting those allegations that are inconsistent with this cause of action.
- 84. Captain Jordan and Gleitsman acted in a violent and threatening manner towards Plaintiff, with the intent to cause Plaintiff apprehension of immediate injury.
- 85. Plaintiff had a reasonable apprehension of immediate touching by Jordan and/or Gleitsman. This included, but was not limited to, reasonably anticipated punches, strikes, shoves and other forms of offensive touching from Captain Jordan and/or Gleitsman.
- 86. By and through the aforesaid acts and omissions of Defendants, and each of them, Plaintiff has been directly and legally caused to suffer actual damages including, but not limited to, loss of earnings and future earning capacity, loss of benefits, attorneys' fees, costs of suit, and other pecuniary loss not presently ascertained. Accordingly, Plaintiff is entitled to a recovery for said damages in an amount according to proof at trial.
- 87. As a further direct and legal result of the acts and conduct of Defendants, and each of them, as aforesaid, Plaintiff has been caused to and did suffer, and continues to suffer significant emotional and mental distress, anguish, humiliation, embarrassment, fright, shock, pain, discomfort and anxiety. Therefore, Plaintiff is entitled to a recovery for said damages in an amount according to proof at trial.
 - 88. Defendants' conduct was a substantial factor in causing Plaintiff's harm.
- 89. Defendants Gleitsman and/or Jordan were acting in the course and scope of their employment when the aforementioned assaults occurred. Moreover, the Central Fire District both authorized and ratified the assault of Plaintiff.
- 90. If, in the alternative, Defendants Jordan and Gleitsman were not acting within the scope and course of their employment, Defendants Jordan and Gleitsman committed the acts and conduct alleged herein by acting knowingly and willfully, with the wrongful and illegal deliberate intention of injuring Plaintiff, from improper motives amounting to malice, and in conscious

disregard of Plaintiff's rights. Plaintiff is thus entitled to recover nominal, actual, compensatory, punitive, and exemplary damages in amounts according to proof at time of trial, in addition to any other remedies and damages allowable by law. By reason thereof, Plaintiff is entitled to an award of punitive damages from Captain Jordan and/or Gleitsman in an amount according to proof at the time of trial.

FOURTH CAUSE OF ACTION

BATTERY (Against All Defendants)

- 91. Plaintiff realleges and incorporates the foregoing paragraphs as though fully set forth herein, excepting those allegations that are inconsistent with this cause of action.
- 92. Captain Jordan and Gleitsman touched Plaintiff with the intent to harm or offend him.
 - 93. Plaintiff did not consent to the touching.
- 94. By and through the aforesaid acts and omissions of Defendants, and each of them, Plaintiff was harmed or offended, and has been directly and legally caused to suffer actual damages including, but not limited to, loss of earnings and future earning capacity, loss of benefits, attorneys' fees, costs of suit, and other pecuniary loss not presently ascertained. Accordingly, Plaintiff is entitled to a recovery for said damages in an amount according to proof at trial.
- 95. As a further direct and legal result of the acts and conduct of Defendants, and each of them, as aforesaid, Plaintiff has been caused to and did suffer, and continues to suffer significant emotional and mental distress, anguish, humiliation, embarrassment, fright, shock, pain, discomfort and anxiety. Therefore, Plaintiff is entitled to a recovery for said damages in an amount according to proof at trial.
 - 96. Defendants' conduct was a substantial factor in causing Plaintiff's harm.
- 97. Defendants Gleitsman and/or Jordan were acting in the course and scope of their employment when the aforementioned assaults occurred. Moreover, the Central Fire District both authorized and ratified the assault of Plaintiff.

98. If, in the alternative, Defendants Jordan and Gleitsman were not acting within the scope and course of their employment, Defendants Jordan and Gleitsman committed the acts and conduct alleged herein by acting knowingly and willfully, with the wrongful and illegal deliberate intention of injuring Plaintiff, from improper motives amounting to malice, and in conscious disregard of Plaintiff's rights. Plaintiff is thus entitled to recover nominal, actual, compensatory, punitive, and exemplary damages in amounts according to proof at time of trial, in addition to any other remedies and damages allowable by law. By reason thereof, Plaintiff is entitled to an award of punitive damages from Captain Jordan and/or Gleitsman in an amount according to proof at the time of trial.

FIFTH CAUSE OF ACTION

FEHA RETALIATION (Gov't. Code §§ 12940(h))

(Against Defendant Central Fire District and Does 1-25)

- 99. Plaintiff realleges and hereby incorporates by reference all allegations set forth in the paragraphs above, to the extent they are not contradictory to the relief requested herein, as if fully set forth.
- 100. California law prohibits employers subject to FEHA from retaliating against an employee for exercising of their protected rights, engaging in protected activities under FEHA, or opposing practices forbidden by the FEHA. (Cal. Gov. Code § 12940 (h).)
- 101. Plaintiff exercised his rights and engaged in activities protected by FEHA, including (without limitation) by:
 - Submitting a written complaint and disclosure of August 30, 2022, to multiple Central Fire District supervisors and managers, including Jordan, that the Central Fire's treatment and/or proposed treatment of firefighters who utilized protected leave violated California law, and that said treatment was retaliatory, discriminatory, and harassing;
 - ➤ Plaintiff's submission on or about August 31, 2022, of his Discrimination/ Harassment Complaint to Defendant Central Fire where Plaintiff complained of retaliation from

Jordan in connection to Plaintiff's utilization of protected leave and other discriminatory practices;

- ➤ Opposing Captain Jordan's retaliatory response to Plaintiff's written complaint of August 30, 2022 by verbally speaking directly with Captain Jordan;
- ➤ Plaintiff's submission on or about October 12, 2022 of his Discrimination/ Harassment Complaint where Plaintiff complained of disability discrimination, sex discrimination, and retaliation;
- Plaintiff's verbal complaint to Fire Chief Nee on or about October 19, 2022, that Central Fire District's conduct towards him was retaliatory, discriminatory, and harassing.
- 102. Defendants responded to Plaintiff's protected acts by (among other acts and conduct):
 - ➤ Committing assault and/or battery against Plaintiff;
 - Failing and/or refusing to act upon one or more of Plaintiff's disclosures or complaints of unlawful activity, or in the alternative, not acting upon one or more of Plaintiff's disclosures in a good faith and substantive way;
 - Refusing to reasonably punish or discipline Captain Jordan and/or Gleitsman;
 - Forcing Plaintiff into circumstances that would require him to work on the same shift as Captain Jordan and/or Gleitsman;
 - ➤ Prospectively interfering with Plaintiff's use of protected sick leave, CFRA, and FMLA leave by requiring him to work on the same shift as Captain Jordan and/or Gleitsman, or in the alternative, utilize protected leaves of absence to avoid Jordan or Gleitsman;
 - ➤ Harassing Plaintiff on the basis of his actual and/or perceived sexual orientation and/or gender;
 - Failing to reasonably prevent ongoing harassment of Plaintiff on the basis of his actual and/or perceived sexual orientation and/or gender;
 - ➤ Blaming Plaintiff for the actions taken by Captain Jordan and/or Gleitsman;
 - > Alienating and reprimanding Plaintiff;

➤ Other adverse actions that will be identified up to and including the time of trial.

103. Plaintiff's participation in activities protected by FEHA was, at least in motivating part, a substantial factor in Defendants' adverse employment acts against Plaintiff.

- 104. By and through the aforesaid acts and omissions of Defendants, and each of them, Plaintiff has been directly and legally caused to suffer actual damages including, but not limited to, loss of earnings and future earning capacity, loss of benefits, attorneys' fees, costs of suit, and other pecuniary loss not presently ascertained. Accordingly, Plaintiff is entitled to a recovery for said damages in an amount according to proof at trial.
- 105. As a further direct and legal result of the acts and conduct of Defendants, and each of them, as aforesaid, Plaintiff has been caused to and did suffer, and continues to suffer significant emotional and mental distress, anguish, humiliation, embarrassment, fright, shock, pain, discomfort and anxiety. Therefore, Plaintiff is entitled to a recovery for said damages in an amount according to proof at trial.
- 106. Plaintiff has incurred and continues to incur legal expenses and attorneys' fees to which he is entitled under FEHA. Plaintiff is presently unaware of the precise amount of these expenses and fees, and prays leave of court to amend this Complaint when the amounts are more fully known.
 - 107. Defendants' conduct was a substantial factor in causing Plaintiff's harm.

SIXTH CAUSE OF ACTION

HARASSSMENT- HOSTILE WORK ENVIRONMENT (Gov't. Code §§ 12940(j))

(Against Defendant Central Fire District, Defendant Jordan, and Does 1-25)

- 108. Plaintiff realleges and incorporates the foregoing paragraphs as though fully set forth herein, excepting those allegations that are inconsistent with this cause of action.
- 109. For purposes of the FEHA, "sex" is defined to include a person's gender and "sexual orientation" is defined to include heterosexuality. Sexually harassing conduct need not be motivated by sexual desire.

- 110. For almost the entirety of Plaintiff's employment with Central Fire, Plaintiff has been exposed to a barrage of continual and pervasive derogatory comments, threats, epithets, and/or slurs directed at Plaintiff by Jordan, including "faggot," "cunt," and other gender-based and sexual-orientation based terms comments.
- 111. These derogatory remarks were unwelcome, were both subjectively and objectively offensive, and were directed at Plaintiff because of Plaintiff's actual and/or perceived sexual orientation and gender. Jordan's conduct was part of a continuing pattern of harassing conduct toward Plaintiff.
- 112. Plaintiff's gender and sexual orientation was used as a weapon to create a hostile work environment for Plaintiff.
- 113. Jordan's harassing conduct included the use of the aforementioned language in the contexts of taunts, antagonistic encounters, threatened physical assault.
- 114. Jordan's harassing conduct included repeatedly physical assaulting Plaintiff or threatening to do so. These physical assaults, or threats of physical assault were motivated, at least in part, because of Plaintiff's gender and sexual orientation.
 - 115. Jordan is a supervisor for purposes of the FEHA's harassment statute.
- 116. Jordan's treatment of Plaintiff in this regard, and Central Fire District's ratification of the same, have materially affected the terms and conditions of his employment at the Central Fire District.
- 117. Jordan's treatment of Plaintiff, and Central Fire District's ratification of the same, resulted in the loss of tangible job benefits in the form of the physical attacks, Plaintiff being forced to take a leave of absence in the aftermath of the attack, Plaintiff being forced to take leave when Jordan and/or Gleitsman are scheduled to work with Jordan, and other losses that will be identified at or before the time of trial. As a result, Plaintiff has in essence been frozen out from internal advancement within Central Fire District because of Jordan and Central Fire's conduct.
- 118. The Central Fire District was made aware of Jordan's offensive and harassing conduct toward Plaintiff and failed to take reasonable steps to prevent further harassing conduct.

119. By and through the aforesaid acts and omissions of Defendants, and each of them, Plaintiff has been directly and legally caused to suffer actual damages including, but not limited to, loss of earnings and future earning capacity, loss of benefits, attorneys' fees, costs of suit, and other pecuniary loss not presently ascertained. Accordingly, Plaintiff is entitled to a recovery for said damages in an amount according to proof at trial.

- As a further direct and legal result of the acts and conduct of Defendants, and each 120. of them, as aforesaid, Plaintiff has been caused to and did suffer, and continues to suffer significant emotional and mental distress, anguish, humiliation, embarrassment, fright, shock, pain, discomfort and anxiety. Therefore, Plaintiff is entitled to a recovery for said damages in an amount according to proof at trial.
 - 121. Defendants' conduct was a substantial factor in causing Plaintiff's harm.

SEVENTH CAUSE OF ACTION

FAILURE TO PREVENT DISCRIMINATION, RETALIATION, AND HARASSMENT (Gov't. Code § 12940(k)) (Against Defendant Central Fire District)

- 122. Plaintiff realleges and incorporates the foregoing paragraphs as though fully set forth herein, excepting those allegations that are inconsistent with this cause of action.
- 123. Employers have an affirmative duty to take reasonable steps to prevent and promptly correct discriminatory, retaliatory, and harassing conduct. (Gov. Code § 12940(k).)
- 124. Further, employers have an affirmative duty to create a workplace environment that is free from employment practices prohibited by the FEHA. In addition to distributing the Department's DFEH-185 brochure on sexual harassment, or an alternative writing that complies with Government Code section 12950, an employer must develop a harassment, discrimination, and retaliation prevention policy that:
 - a. Is in writing;
 - b. Lists all current protected categories covered under the FEHA;

- c. Indicates that the law prohibits coworkers and third parties, as well as supervisors and managers, with whom the employee comes into contact from engaging in conduct prohibited by the FEHA;
- d. Creates a complaint process to ensure that complaints receive:
 - i. an employer's designation of confidentiality, to the extent possible;
 - ii. a timely response;
 - iii. impartial and timely investigations by qualified personnel;
 - iv. documentation and tracking for reasonable progress;
 - v. appropriate options for remedial actions and resolutions; and
 - vi. timely closures.
- e. Provides a complaint mechanism that does not require an employee to complain directly to his or her immediate supervisor, including, but not limited to, the following:
 - i. direct communication, either orally or in writing, with a designated company representative, such as a human resources manager, EEO officer, or other supervisor; and/or
 - ii. a complaint hotline; and/or
 - iii. access to an ombudsperson; and/or
 - iv. identification of the Department and the U.S. Equal Employment
 Opportunity Commission (EEOC) as additional avenues for employees to lodge complaints.
- f. Instructs supervisors to report any complaints of misconduct to a designated company representative, such as a human resources manager, so the company can try to resolve the claim internally;
- g. Indicates that when an employer receives allegations of misconduct, it will conduct a fair, timely, and thorough investigation that provides all parties appropriate due process and reaches reasonable conclusions based on the evidence collected;

- h. States that confidentiality will be kept by the employer to the extent possible, but not indicate that the investigation will be completely confidential;
- i. Indicates that if at the end of the investigation misconduct is found, appropriate remedial measures shall be taken; and
- j. Makes clear that employees shall not be exposed to retaliation as a result of lodging a complaint or participating in any workplace investigation.
- 125. Dissemination of the policy must include one or more of the following methods:
 - Printing and providing a copy to all employees with an acknowledgment form for the employee to sign and return;
 - b. Sending the policy via e-mail with an acknowledgment return form;
 - c. Posting current versions of the policies on a company intranet with a tracking system ensuring all employees have read and acknowledged receipt of the policies;
 - d. Discussing policies upon hire and/or during a new hire orientation session; and/or
 - e. Any other way that ensures employees receive and understand the policies.
- 126. Any employer whose workforce at any facility or establishment contains 10 percent or more of persons who speak a language other than English as their spoken language shall translate the retaliation/discrimination policy into every language that is spoken by at least 10 percent of the workforce.
- 127. The Central Fire District knew, or should have known, that Plaintiff was experiencing unlawful discrimination and/or harassment on the basis of Plaintiff's gender and sexual orientation. The Central Fire District knew, or should have know, that Plaintiff was experiencing retaliation in response to having engaged in protected activity and/or opposing violations of the California Fair Employment and Housing Act.
- 128. In engaging in the conduct described above, the Central Fire District failed to take any reasonable steps to prevent discrimination, harassment, and/or retaliation from occurring in the workplace. These failures ultimately resulted in Plaintiff experiencing additional violence in the

workplace. Moreover, Plaintiff is informed and believes, and thereupon alleges, that the Central Fire District failed to comply with the requirements set forth above.

- 129. These failures by the Central Fire District constituted unlawful employment discrimination, and the failure to prevent that discrimination was a substantial factor in causing damage and injury to Plaintiff.
- 130. As a foreseeable, direct, and proximate result of the Central Fire District's acts and omissions Plaintiff was caused to suffer, and continues to suffer, injury, including lost wages and benefits, attorneys' fees, costs of suit and other pecuniary loss not presently ascertained, the exact amount of which will be proved at the trial.
- 131. As a further foreseeable, direct, and proximate legal result of the acts and conduct of the Central Fire District, Plaintiff has been caused to and did suffer, and continues to suffer emotional and mental distress, anguish, humiliation, embarrassment, fright, shock, pain, discomfort, and anxiety. Therefore, Plaintiff is entitled to a recovery for said damages in an amount according to proof at trial.
 - 132. Defendants' conduct was a substantial factor in causing Plaintiff's harm.

EIGHTH CAUSE OF ACTION

NEGLIGENT HIRING AND RETENTION (Against Defendant Central Fire District)

- 133. Plaintiff realleges and incorporates the foregoing paragraphs as though fully set forth herein, excepting those allegations that are inconsistent with this cause of action.
 - 134. The Central Fire District hired both Jordan and Gleitsman.
- 135. Jordan was and/or became unfit, incompetent, and/or untrustworthy to perform the firefighting work for which he had been hired and retained to do, including holding the position of Captain. This includes, but is not limited to, the reasons that Jordan had a known history, pattern, and practice of using violence and/or threats of violence towards co-workers, including Plaintiff. Upon information and belief, Jordan's reasons for unfitness of duty also include, but are not limited to, alcohol abuse.

///

- 136. Gleitsman was and/or became unfit, incompetent, and/or untrustworthy to perform the firefighting work for which he had been hired and retained to do. This includes, but is not limited to, Gleitsman's known history, pattern, and practice of using violence and/or threats of violence towards co-workers, for example Gleitsman choking-out a co-worker at a work event and his actions towards Plaintiff. Upon information and belief, Gleitman's reasons for unfitness for duty also include, but are not limited to, alcohol abuse.
- 137. The Central Fire District knew or should have known that Jordan and/or Gleitsman were or became unfit, incompetent, and/or untrustworthy.
- 138. The Central Fire District knew or should have known that Jordan and/or Gleitsman's unfitness, incompetence, and/or untrustworthiness created a heightened, particular, and unreasonable degree of risk to others, including Plaintiff. These risks, include but are not limited to, the risk and/or danger that further violence would be perpetuated by Jordan and Gleitsman in the workplace or that their alcohol abuse would cause others to be harmed.
- 139. Jordan and/or Gleitsman's unfitness, incompetence, or untrustworthiness harmed Plaintiff.
- 140. As a foreseeable, direct, and proximate result of the Central Fire District's acts and omissions Plaintiff was caused to suffer, and continues to suffer, injury, including lost wages and benefits, attorneys' fees, costs of suit and other pecuniary loss not presently ascertained, the exact amount of which will be proved at the trial.
- 141. As a further foreseeable, direct, and proximate legal result of the acts and conduct of the Central Fire District, Plaintiff has been caused to and did suffer, and continues to suffer emotional and mental distress, anguish, humiliation, embarrassment, fright, shock, pain, discomfort, and anxiety. Therefore, Plaintiff is entitled to a recovery for said damages in an amount according to proof at trial.
- 142. The Central Fire District's negligence in hiring and/or retaining Jordan and/or Gleitsman was a substantial factor in causing Plaintiff's harm.

NINTH CAUSE OF ACTION NEGLIGENCE

(Against Defendant Central Fire District)

- 143. Plaintiff realleges and incorporates the foregoing paragraphs as though fully set forth herein, excepting those allegations that are inconsistent with this cause of action.
- 144. The Central Fire District had a duty to exercise reasonable care in operating its fire stations and providing firefighter services.
- 145. The Central Fire District breached that duty of care, including, but not limited to, the reason that it had allowed, authorized, and implemented an unwritten policy, custom, and/or practice of permitting workplace discipline through violence or the threat of violence or otherwise encouraged the resolution of workplace disputes through such means.
- 146. Upon information and belief, this aforementioned policy, custom, or practice provided Jordan and Gleitsman with the reasonable impression that violence or the threat of violence was an acceptable form of workplace conduct at the Central Fire District. This included the manner and method of which they treated Plaintiff.
- 147. In the alternative, a breach of duty occurred due to the Central Fire District's failure to adequately train its employees, including but not limited to Jordan and Gleitsman, regarding any workplace non-violence policies, disciplinary policies or protocols, and/or how to appropriately resolve conflict in the workplace.
- 148. Upon information and belief, this aforementioned failure to adequately train its employees created and formed the repeated impression in Jordan and/or Gleitsman that violence or the threat of violence was an acceptable way to resolve work-related disputes, to correct perceived performance deficiencies, and/or that such violence was an acceptable way to discipline or treat coworkers and subordinates, including Plaintiff.
- 149. As a foreseeable, direct, and proximate result of the Central Fire District's acts and omissions Plaintiff was caused to suffer, and continues to suffer, injury, including lost wages and benefits, attorneys' fees, costs of suit and other pecuniary loss not presently ascertained, the exact amount of which will be proved at the trial.

27

28

150. As a further foreseeable, direct, and proximate legal result of the acts and conduct of the Central Fire District, Plaintiff has been caused to and did suffer, and continues to suffer emotional and mental distress, anguish, humiliation, embarrassment, fright, shock, pain, discomfort, and anxiety. Therefore, Plaintiff is entitled to a recovery for said damages in an amount according to proof at trial.

151. The Central Fire District's negligence was a substantial factor in causing Plaintiff's harm.

X. PRAYER FOR RELIEF

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff prays for Judgment against Defendants as follows:

- For special and economic damages, including back pay and front pay, benefits and other consequential damages, retirement service credits, in an amount according to proof at trial;
- 2. For general and non-economic damages in an amount to be determined by the fact finder;
- For exemplary and punitive damages in amounts according to proof at trial against
 Jordan and Gleitsman, as provided by law and in the event they are found to have acted
 in their individual capacities;
- 4. For costs and reasonable attorneys' fees, including a contingency fee enhancement beyond the lodestar;
- 5. For permanent injunctive relief requiring Defendant Central Fire District to adopt policies, and implement training, to ensure that employees are provided work environments free of unlawful discrimination, harassment, retaliation, and/or any other form of training the Court deems appropriate;
- 6. For declaratory relief, as may be appropriate under the law and circumstances;
- 7. For an award of interest, including prejudgment interest, at the legal rate;