

NAME ADDRESS AND TELEPHON SCOTT D. Myer MYER LAW FIRM 1800 Century Park	NE NUMBER OF ATTORNEY OR PARTY WITHOUT ATTORNEY:	STATE BAR NUMBER	Reserved for Clerk's File Stamp
Los Angeles, CA 90 Phone (310) 277-30	ONICINAL IL 2D ORICINAL IL 2D OPECIAL DURT OF CALIFORNIA COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES		
	ntiff, NORMA E. GUZMAN-MORALES, a		COGNALA ON FOR YING REFE
COURTHOUSE ADDRESS:	OF CALIFORNIA, COUNTY OF LOS	ANGELES	APR 05 2013
111 North Hill Str	eet, Los Angeles, CA 90012		
PLAINTIFF: TORMA E. GUZMAN-MO DEFENDANT:	Gloricus Routinson.		
MACROLIFE NATURALS	, INC.; et al.		
	AMENDMENT TO COMPLAINT (Fictitious /Incorrect Name)		CASE NUMBER: BC489103Dept.48-Hon.White
designated the defe	(No order required) e complaint, the plaintiff, being ignorant of ndant in the complaint by the fictitious nam		defendant and having
DOE 1			
and having discover TRUE NAME JOHN GROGAN & A	red the true name of the defendant to be:		
amends the complai	nt by substituting the true name for the ficti	tious name wherever	
April 4, 2013	Scott D. Myer (SBN 126048)	100	Me a
		All to the late of the	
The plaintiff, having	E (Order required) designated a defendant in the complaint b	y the incorrect name	of:
and having discover	ed the true name of the defendant to be:		
amends the complai	nt by substituting the true name for the inco	orrect name whereve	
THE COURT ORDERS to	ORDEI	₹.	
Dated			Judicial Officer

LACIV 105 (Rev. 01/07) LASC Approved 03-04 AMENDMENT TO COMPLAINT (Fictitious / Incorrect Name)

Gode Civ. Proc., §§ 471.5, 472, 473, 474

ATTORNEY'S CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE BY MAIL

[Code Civ. Proc. § 1013a(2)]

I, SCOTT D. MYER, certify:

I am, and at all times mentioned herein was, an active member of the State Bar of California and not a party to the above-entitled cause. My business address is Myer Law Firm, 1800 Century Park East, Suite 600, Los Angeles, CA 90067.

I served, will serve or will cause to be served, the attached AMENDMENT TO COMPLAINT (DOE 1), on April 4, 2013, [] BY PERSONAL HAND-DELIVERY AT DEFENDANTS' PLACE OF BUSINESS, [-X-] by depositing a copy of the document in the United States mail at City of Los Angeles, County of Los Angeles, State of California, in a sealed envelope, with postage fully prepaid, [] EXPRESS MAIL; [] PRIORITY MAIL; [-X-] Regular Mail; AND BY [] Fax (when a fax number is listed below), addressed to:

Mr. Michael G. Dave (SBN 035898)
MARCUS, WATANABE & DAVE, LLP
1901 Avenue of the Stars, Suite 300
Los Angeles CA 90067-6005

Phone: (310) 284-2020 Fax: (310) 284-2025 Defendants, MACROLIFE NATURALS, INC.; FIT FOR YOU, INC.; FFY, INT'L, dba FIT FOR YOU; MIRACLE GREENS, INC.; SYLVIA ROSALINDA ORTIZ, aka SYLVIA ORTIZ; JOSE ROBERTO ORTIZ, aka J.R. ORTIZ, and Cross-Complainant, SYLVIA ORTIZ

who are the attorneys of record for the Defendants (or the Defendants themselves) in the above-entitled cause. At that time there was regular delivery of United States mail between the place of deposit and place of address, [] and in the usual course such method of service would usually be received by the addressees no later than the next Court day after filing this document with the Court

(USE FOR MOTION OPPOSITIONS).

Dated: April 4, 2013

SCOTT D. MYER, ESC



	Pret Suite 600	126048	그는 가장 되는 이 학교에게 되어 보다는 사람이 있으며 없었다. 모양이다고
800 Century Park I os Angeles, CA 900 hone (310) 277-300	Cast Suite 600		
os Angeles, CA 900 none (310) 277-300		Table Land to	ORIGINAL COPY
ione (310) 277-300	067-1508		SUPEL TO SUBTON
TORNEY FOR (Name): Plain	00 - Fax (310) 855-3380		OKICINAL 3D SUPEL VA SURT OF CALIFORNIA
	ntiff, NORMA E. GUZMAN-MORALES,	aka NORMA GUZMAN	
IPERIOR COURT	OF CALIFORNIA, COUNTY OF LO	SANGELES	APR 05 2013
URTHOUSE ADDRESS:			A Clause, Executive Officer/Clerk
1 North Hill Stre	et, Los Angeles, CA 90012		
AINTIFF:			Glorietta Koumson Deputy
	ALES, aka NORMA GUZMAN		
FENDANT: CROLIFE NATURALS,	TNC . et al		
	AMENDMENT TO COMPLAINT		CASE NUMBER:
	(Fictitious/Incorrect Name)		BC489103Dept.48-Hon.White
A A A A A A A A A A A A A A A A A A A	(Ficultious, micorrect Name)		The state of the s
	e complaint, the plaintiff, being ignorant ndant in the complaint by the fictitious n		defendant and having
and having discover	ed the true name of the defendant to be		
JOHN GROGAN			
	- 61 4 60 J. 1974 B. J. J. J. 122 65 J.		
	nt by substituting the true name for the t	fictitious name whereve	r it appears in the complaint.
DATE	A fact of the second of the se	SIGNATURE OF ATTORNE	(4)
April 4, 2013	Scott D. Myer (SBN 126048)		
	(Order required) designated a defendant in the complair	nt by the incorrect name	of:
The plaintiff, having incorrect NAME	designated a defendant in the complair		of:
The plaintiff, having incorrect NAME			of:
The plaintiff, having incorrect NAME	designated a defendant in the complair		of:
The plaintiff, having incorrect NAME and having discovered TRUE NAME	designated a defendant in the complained the true name of the defendant to be		
and having discovered true name	designated a defendant in the complair		er it appears in the complaint,

LACIV 105 (Rev. 01/07) LASC Approved 03-04 AMENDMENT TO COMPLAINT (Fictitious / Incorrect Name)

Code Civ. Proc., §§ 471.5, 472, 473, 474

ATTORNEY'S CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE BY MAIL

[Code Civ. Proc. § 1013a(2)]

I, SCOTT D. MYER, certify:

I am, and at all times mentioned herein was, an active member of the State Bar of California and not a party to the above-entitled cause. My business address is Myer Law Firm, 1800 Century Park East, Suite 600, Los Angeles, CA 90067.

I served, will serve or will cause to be served, the attached AMENDMENT TO COMPLAINT (DOE 2), on April 4, 2013, [] BY PERSONAL HAND-DELIVERY AT DEFENDANTS' PLACE OF BUSINESS, [-X-] by depositing a copy of the document in the United States mail at City of Los Angeles, County of Los Angeles, State of California, in a sealed envelope, with postage fully prepaid, [] EXPRESS MAIL; [] PRIORITY MAIL; [-X-] Regular Mail; AND BY [] Fax (when a fax number is listed below), addressed to:

Mr. Michael G. Dave (SBN 035898) MARCUS, WATANABE & DAVE, LLP 1901 Avenue of the Stars, Suite 300 Los Angeles CA 90067-6005

Phone: (310) 284-2020 Fax: (310) 284-2025

Defendants, MACROLIFE NATURALS, INC.; FIT FOR YOU, INC.; FFY, INT'L, dba FIT FOR YOU; MIRACLE GREENS, INC.; SYLVIA ROSALINDA ORTIZ, aka SYLVIA ORTIZ; JOSE ROBERTO ORTIZ, aka J.R. ORTIZ, and Cross-Complainant, SYLVIA ORTIZ

who are the attorneys of record for the Defendants (or the Defendants themselves) in the above-entitled cause. At that time there was regular delivery of United States mail between the place of deposit and place of address, [] and in the usual course such method of service would usually be received by the addressees no later than the next Court day after filing this document with the Court

(USE FOR MOTION OPPOSITIONS).

Dated: April 4, 2013

27

1

2

3

4

6

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26



YER LAW FIRM 800 Century Park os Angeles, CA 90	East, Suite 600	RNEY: STATE BAR NUMBER 1.26048	Reserved for Clerk's File Stamp CRILINAL FILED PROFINE DURT OF CALIFORNIA STA OF LOS ANGELES
hone (310) 277-30	APK 0.5 2013		
TTORNEY FOR (Name): Plai	untinen/Clark		
UPERIOR COURT	Unicer/Clerk		
COURTHOUSE ADDRESS: 11 North Hill Street, Los Angeles, CA 90012			Clorietis Rollfison
LAINTIFF: ORMA E. GUZMAN-MO EFENDANT:	ORALES, aka NORMA GUZMAN		
ACROLIFE NATURALS	, INC.; et al.		
	AMENDMENT TO COMPLAIN (Fictitious /Incorrect Name)	T	CASE NUMBER: BC489103Dept.48-Hon.White
FICTITIOUS NAME DOE 3	endant in the complaint by the fictitious ered the true name of the defendant to be		
TRUE NAME LISA JAVORIC &		JE	
amends the compla	int by substituting the true name for the	fictitious name whereve	r it appears in the complaint.
April 4, 2013	Scott D. Myer (SBN 126048)	200	
INCORRECT NAM		int by the incorrect name	of:
The plaintiff, having	E (Order required)		of:
The plaintiff, having incorrect name and having discovered name	E (Order required) godesignated a defendant in the compla	e:	
The plaintiff, having incorrect name and having discovered name	E (Order required) godesignated a defendant in the compla	e:	or it appears in the complaint.
The plaintiff, having incorrect name and having discover true name amends the compla	E (Order required) designated a defendant in the complated the true name of the defendant to be the substituting the true name for the TYPE OR PRINT NAME	e: e incorrect name whereve signature of attorne	or it appears in the complaint.
The plaintiff, having incorrect name and having discover true name amends the compla	E (Order required) g designated a defendant in the complated the true name of the defendant to be the substituting the true name for the TYPE OR PRINT NAME	e: a incorrect name whereve	or it appears in the complaint.
The plaintiff, having incorrect name and having discover true name amends the compla	E (Order required) designated a defendant in the complated the true name of the defendant to be the substituting the true name for the TYPE OR PRINT NAME	e: e incorrect name whereve signature of attorne	or it appears in the complaint.

LACIV 105 (Rev. 01/07) LASC Approved 03-04 AMENDMENT TO COMPLAINT (Fictitious / Incorrect Name)

Code Civ. Proc., §§ 471.5, 472, 473, 474

ATTORNEY'S CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE BY MAIL

[Code Civ. Proc. § 1013a(2)]

I, SCOTT D. MYER, certify:

I am, and at all times mentioned herein was, an active member of the State Bar of California and not a party to the above-entitled cause. My business address is Myer Law Firm, 1800 Century Park East, Suite 600, Los Angeles, CA 90067.

I served, will serve or will cause to be served, the attached AMENDMENT TO COMPLAINT (DOE 3), on April 4, 2013, [] BY PERSONAL HAND-DELIVERY AT DEFENDANTS' PLACE OF BUSINESS, [-X-] by depositing a copy of the document in the United States mail at City of Los Angeles, County of Los Angeles, State of California, in a sealed envelope, with postage fully prepaid, [] EXPRESS MAIL; [] PRIORITY MAIL; [-X-] Regular Mail; AND BY [] Fax (when a fax number is listed below), addressed to:

Mr. Michael G. Dave (SBN 035898)
MARCUS, WATANABE & DAVE, LLP
1901 Avenue of the Stars, Suite 300
Los Angeles CA 90067-6005

Phone: (310) 284-2020 Fax: (310) 284-2025

Dated: April 4, 2013

Defendants, MACROLIFE NATURALS, INC.; FIT FOR YOU, INC.; FFY, INT'L, dba FIT FOR YOU; MIRACLE GREENS, INC.; SYLVIA ROSALINDA ORTIZ, aka SYLVIA ORTIZ; JOSE ROBERTO ORTIZ, aka J.R. ORTIZ, and Cross-Complainant, SYLVIA ORTIZ

who are the attorneys of record for the Defendants (or the Defendants themselves) in the above-entitled cause. At that time there was regular delivery of United States mail between the place of deposit and place of address, [] and in the usual course such method of service would usually be received by the addressees no later than the next Court day after filing this document with the Court

(USE FOR MOTION OPPOSITIONS).

SCOTED MYBR. ESC



	ONE NUMBER OF ATTORNEY OR PARTY WITHOUT ATTORNEY:	STATE BAR NUMBER	CHESTAN DURT OF 1-30
dott D. Myer MYER LAW FIRM			Chestary and clare the sampy
l800 Century Park Los Angeles, CA 9	East, Suite 600 0067-1508		. [1] 용기 : [1] 전 "이 가게 되었다. 아르네트 "그리고 "
Phone (310) 277-3000 - Fax (310) 855-3380			APR 05 2013
ATTORNEY FOR (Name): Plaintiff, NORMA E. GUZMAN-MORALES, aka NORMA GUZMAN			ohin A Ciarde, executive Officer/Clerk
	OF CALIFORNIA, COUNTY OF LOS	ANGELES	Glonetta Roll fisox
	reet, Los Angeles, CA 90012		No Maria
LAINTIFF: ORMA E. GUZMAN-MC EFENDANT:	DRALES, aka NORMA GUZMAN		
ACROLIFE NATURALS	S, INC.; et al.		
	AMENDMENT TO COMPLAINT		CASE NUMBER:
	(Fictitious /Incorrect Name)		BC489103Dept.48-Hon.White
	ne complaint, the plaintiff, being ignorant of endant in the complaint by the fictitious nan		
	ered the true name of the defendant to be:	Eller Jon	
TRUE NAME LISA JAVORIC			
to the second	but his asshablt offing the true name for the field		
	int by substituting the true name for the fict	itious name wherever	it appears in the complaint.
DATE DATE	TYPE OR PRINT NAME	signature of attorner	it appears in the complaint,
	TYPE OR PRINT NAME	SIGNATURE OF ATTORNEY	it appears in the complaint,
DATE	TYPE OR PRINT NAME	itious name wherevel	it appears in the complaint.
April 4, 2013	TYPEOR PRINT NAME Scott D. Myer (SBN 126048)	itious name wherevel	it appears in the complaint.
April 4, 2013	TYPE OR PRINT NAME Scott D. Myer (SBN 126048) IE (Order required)	SIGNATURE OF ATTORNEY	
DATE April 4, 2013 INCORRECT NAM The plaintiff, having	TYPEOR PRINT NAME Scott D. Myer (SBN 126048)	SIGNATURE OF ATTORNEY	M = -
DATE April 4, 2013 INCORRECT NAM	TYPE OR PRINT NAME Scott D. Myer (SBN 126048) IE (Order required)	SIGNATURE OF ATTORNEY	M = -
DATE April 4, 2013 INCORRECT NAM The plaintiff, having INCORRECT NAME	TYPE OR PRINT NAME SCOTT D. Myer (SBN 126048) IE (Order required) g designated a defendant in the complaint in	SIGNATURE OF ATTORNEY	
DATE April 4, 2013 INCORRECT NAM The plaintiff, having INCORRECT NAME	TYPE OR PRINT NAME Scott D. Myer (SBN 126048) IE (Order required)	SIGNATURE OF ATTORNEY	M = -
INCORRECT NAM The plaintiff, having incorrect name and having discove	TYPE OR PRINT NAME SCOTT D. Myer (SBN 126048) IE (Order required) g designated a defendant in the complaint in	SIGNATURE OF ATTORNEY	M = -
DATE April 4, 2013 INCORRECT NAM The plaintiff, having INCORRECT NAME and having discove TRUE NAME	TYPE OR PRINT NAME Scott D. Myer (SBN 126048) IE (Order required) g designated a defendant in the complaint be red the true name of the defendant to be:	by the incorrect name	of:
INCORRECT NAM The plaintiff, having incorrect name and having discove	TYPE OR PRINT NAME SCOTT D. Myer (SBN 126048) IE (Order required) g designated a defendant in the complaint in	by the incorrect name	of:
INCORRECT NAM The plaintiff, having incorrect NAME and having discove TRUE NAME amends the complaintiff	TYPE OR PRINT NAME Scott D. Myer (SBN 126048) IE (Order required) g designated a defendant in the complaint be red the true name of the defendant to be:	by the incorrect name	of:
INCORRECT NAM The plaintiff, having INCORRECT NAME and having discove TRUE NAME amends the complaintiff	TYPE OR PRINT NAME Scott D. Myer (SBN 126048) IE (Order required) g designated a defendant in the complaint be red the true name of the defendant to be:	by the incorrect name	of:
INCORRECT NAM The plaintiff, having incorrect name and having discove TRUE NAME amends the complaintiff	TYPE OR PRINT NAME Scott D. Myer (SBN 126048) IE (Order required) g designated a defendant in the complaint is red the true name of the defendant to be: TYPE OR PRINT NAME	by the incorrect name	of:
INCORRECT NAM The plaintiff, having incorrect NAME and having discove TRUE NAME amends the complaintiff	TYPE OR PRINT NAME Scott D. Myer (SBN 126048) IE (Order required) g designated a defendant in the complaint be red the true name of the defendant to be:	by the incorrect name	of:
INCORRECT NAM The plaintiff, having incorrect name and having discove TRUE NAME amends the complainments	TYPE OR PRINT NAME Scott D. Myer (SBN 126048) IE (Order required) g designated a defendant in the complaint is red the true name of the defendant to be: TYPE OR PRINT NAME	by the incorrect name	of:
INCORRECT NAM The plaintiff, having incorrect name and having discove TRUE NAME amends the complainments.	TYPE OR PRINT NAME Scott D. Myer (SBN 126048) IE (Order required) g designated a defendant in the complaint is red the true name of the defendant to be: Int by substituting the true name for the incomplete or print NAME. ORDE	by the incorrect name	of:
INCORRECT NAM The plaintiff, having incorrect name and having discove TRUE NAME amends the complainments	TYPE OR PRINT NAME Scott D. Myer (SBN 126048) IE (Order required) g designated a defendant in the complaint is red the true name of the defendant to be: Int by substituting the true name for the incomplete or print NAME. ORDE	by the incorrect name	of:

LACIV 105 (Rev. 01/07) LASC Approved 03-04 AMENDMENT TO COMPLAINT (Fictitious / Incorrect Name)

472, 473, 474

ATTORNEY'S CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE BY MAIL

[Code Civ. Proc. § 1013a(2)]

I, SCOTT D. MYER, certify:

I am, and at all times mentioned herein was, an active member of the State Bar of California and not a party to the above-entitled cause. My business address is Myer Law Firm, 1800 Century Park East, Suite 600, Los Angeles, CA 90067.

I served, will serve or will cause to be served, the attached AMENDMENT TO COMPLAINT (DOE 4), on April 4, 2013, [] BY PERSONAL HAND-DELIVERY AT DEFENDANTS' PLACE OF BUSINESS, [-X-] by depositing a copy of the document in the United States mail at City of Los Angeles, County of Los Angeles, State of California, in a sealed envelope, with postage fully prepaid, [] EXPRESS MAIL; [] PRIORITY MAIL; [-X-] Regular Mail; AND BY [] Fax (when a fax number is listed below), addressed to:

Mr. Michael G. Dave (SBN 035898) MARCUS, WATANABE & DAVE, LLP 1901 Avenue of the Stars, Suite 300 Los Angeles CA 90067-6005

Phone: (310) 284-2020 Fax: (310) 284-2025 Defendants, MACROLIFE NATURALS, INC.; FIT FOR YOU, INC.; FFY, INT'L, dba FIT FOR YOU; MIRACLE GREENS, INC.; SYLVIA ROSALINDA ORTIZ, aka SYLVIA ORTIZ; JOSE ROBERTO ORTIZ, aka J.R. ORTIZ, and Cross-Complainant, SYLVIA ORTIZ

nei.

who are the attorneys of record for the Defendants (or the Defendants themselves) in the above-entitled cause. At that time there was regular delivery of United States mail between the place of deposit and place of address, [] and in the usual course such method of service would usually be received by the addressees no later than the next Court day after filing this document with the Court

(USE FOR MOTION OPPOSITIONS).

Dated: April 4, 2013

SCOTT D. MYER, ESQ

w E

27

1.

2

3

4

7

10

11

12

13

-14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26



MYER LAW FIRM 1 CONFORMED COPY SCOTT D. MYER, ESQ. (SBN 126048) 1800 Century Park East, Suite 600 OF ORIGINAL FILED Los Angeles Superior Court Los Angeles, CA 90067 Phone (310) 277-3000 JUL 26 2012 Fax (310) 855-3380 sdm@myerlaw.com John A. Clarke, Executive Officer/Clerk SHAUNYA-WESLE Attorney for Plaintiff, 5 NORMA E. GUZMÁN-MORALES, aka NORMA GUZMAN 6 7 SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA, UNLIMITED JURISDICTION 8 9 FOR THE COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES 10 BC489103 11 NORMA E. GUZMAN-MORALES, CASE NO. aka NORMA GUZMAN, COMPLAINT 12 FOR DAMAGES, Plaintiff. INCLUDING PUNITIVE DAMAGES, AND INJUNCTIVE RELIEF; AND, JURY 13 DEMAND VS. 14 MACROLIFE NATURALS, INC.; FIT FOR YOU, INC.; FFY, INT'L, dba FIT 15 FOR YOU; MIRACLE GREENS, INC.; SYLVÍA ROSALINDA ORTIZ, 16 aka SYLVIA ORTIZ; JOSE ROBERTÓ ORTIZ, aka J.R. ORTIZ; and, DOES 1 17 TO 100, inclusive., 18 Defendants. 19 Plaintiff complains and alleges as follows: 20 21 PARTIES At all material times, plaintiff NORMA E. GUZMAN-MORALES, aka 22 NORMA GUZMAN, (hereinafter, "Plaintiff" and/or "GUZMAN"), was a resident of the 23 State of California. 24 2. 25 Plaintiff is a Hispanic, of Central-American and Guatemalan national origin, and protected by the race and national origin discrimination laws. 26 27 3. The employment on which she sues herein was in and performed in the County 28 of Los Angeles, State of California.

COMPLAINT FOR DAMAGES; JURY DEMAND

- 4. Further, Plaintiff is informed and believes that the employment records at issue are located in the County of Los Angeles, State of California.
- 5. Plaintiff is informed and believes that defendant MACROLIFE NATURALS, INC., (herein sometimes referred to as "MACROLIFE"), is a California corporation with its principal place of business in the County of Los Angeles, State of California.
- 6. Plaintiff is informed and believes that defendant FIT FOR YOU, INC., (herein sometimes referred to as "FIT"), is a California corporation with its principal place of business in the County of Los Angeles, State of California.
- 7. Plaintiff is informed and believes that defendant FFY, INT'L, dba FIT FOR YOU, (hereinafter, "FFY"), is an unknown business entity with its principal place of business in the State of California.
- 8. Plaintiff is informed and believes that defendant MIRACLE GREENS, INC., (hereinafter, "MIRACLE"), is an unknown business entity with its principal place of business in the State of California.
- Herein, MACROLIFE, FIT, FFY and MIRACLE will be individually and collectively referred to as "EMPLOYERS."
- 10. Plaintiff is informed and believes that defendant SYLVIA ROSALINDA ORTIZ, aka SYLVIA ORTIZ, (hereinafter, "S-ORTIZ"), is a resident of the State of California. Plaintiff is informed and believes that at all material times, defendant S-ORTIZ was and is an owner and/or managing supervisor, and was and is a Co-founder, Creator, Executive Director, and as such was a managing agent of Defendant EMPLOYERS, and was acting at least in part within the course and scope of his/her employment with Defendant EMPLOYERS.
- 11. Plaintiff is informed and believes that defendant JOSE ROBERTO ORTIZ, aka J.R. ORTIZ, (hereinafter, "JR-ORTIZ"), is a resident of the State of California. Plaintiff is informed and believes that at all material times, defendant JR-ORTIZ was and is an owner and/or managing supervisor, and was and is Vice President, Sales, and as such was a managing agent of Defendant EMPLOYERS, and was acting at least in part within the

4

7

10 11

12 13

14

15 16

17 18

19

20 21

23

22

24 25 26

28

27

course and scope of his/her employment with Defendant EMPLOYERS.

- 12. Herein, S-ORTIZ and JR-ORTIZ will be individually and collectively referred to as "INDIVIDUALS."
- 13. Plaintiff is informed and believes that each of the supervisors, managers, agents and employees of Defendant EMPLOYERS, in doing the things alleged herein, were acting at least in part within the course and scope of his, her or its employment or agency with Defendant EMPLOYERS.
- The true names and capacities of the defendants named herein as DOES 1 TO 14. 100, inclusive, (hereinafter, "DOES"), whether individual, corporate, associate, or otherwise, are unknown to plaintiff who therefore sues such defendants by fictitious names under California Code of Civil Procedure §474. Plaintiff is informed and believes that the Defendant DOES are California residents. Plaintiff will amend this Complaint to show such true names and capacities when they have been determined. Plaintiff is informed and believes that each defendant was an agent of the other defendants and ratified the conduct of the other defendants.
- 15. Herein, Defendant EMPLOYERS, Defendant INDIVIDUALS and Defendant DOES will be individually and collectively referred to as "Defendants" and/or "Defendant."

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

- 16. Plaintiff was a shipping/packer for the Defendants. Plaintiff began her employment for the Defendants at least as early as 2002 or 2003. Plaintiff's employment was wrongfully terminated on or about July 27, 2010.
- In or about July to August 2010, and at other times, the Defendants, and each of them, harassed the Plaintiff, demanding that she admit to stealing an expensive ring that the Defendants, and each of them, lost. Defendants told the Plaintiff that she should take money from them and return to where she came, i.e., Central America and Guatemala, in consideration for their demand that she falsely admit to stealing the ring, which she did not steal.

- 18. Plaintiff is informed and believes that the Defendant was looking for a way to cover up the fact that she lost the ring, so that her husband who gave her the ring would not be as upset and so that she could make an insurance claim for the loss of the ring.
- 19. On or about July 26, 2010, Defendants, and each of them, took the Plaintiff against her will to a Polygraph company, to perform a polygraph and/or lie detector test on her. The Defendants, and each of them, keep the Plaintiff waiting at this third party location for approximately three hours to interrogate her.
- 20. This polygraph was taken not only without the willful and written formal consent, but also without even the willful and oral consent, of Plaintiff, and in violation of State and Federal law.
- 21. Thereafter, on or about that same date of July 26, 2010, the Defendants, and each of them, took the Plaintiff against her will to a jewelry shop on Broadway in Los Angeles in order to further attempt to harass her into falsely admitting to something she did not do.
- 22. Thereafter on that date of on or about July 26, 2010, the Defendants, and each of them, release the Plaintiff and tell her she was told to report to work the following date, i.e., on or about July 27, 2010.
- 23. On or about July 27, 2010, Plaintiff returns to work as instructed. However, instead of being allowed to work as usual, she is instructed to proceed to a different location.
- 24. Then, sometime on or about July 27, 2010, the Defendants, and each of them, took the Plaintiff against her will to the Defendant INDIVIDUALS' residence, where they further harassed her and held her against her will, demanding that she admit to something she did not do.
- 25. Then, while being held by the Defendants, and each of them, at the Defendant INDIVIDUAL's residence, the Defendants, and each of them, have the police department come and arrest her on false charges, and the Defendants', and each of their, demand to take possession of all of the Plaintiff's personal effects on her person, and to take position of her house key.

- 26. Plaintiff remained falsely imprisoned on these false charges in jail for about two weeks, as a result of the Defendants' false accusations.
 - 27. On or about August 10, 2010, the Plaintiff was released on bond.
- 28. On or about August 19, 2010, the Defendants continued to harass the Plaintiff by having a female from the polygraph company call her to give up information on someone they claim purchased the ring.
- 29. At various times, the Defendants told the Plaintiff that she should just lie and "admit" to stealing the ring and go back "home" to Guatemala, and that they would pay her money if she did so. Plaintiff refused to participate in such illegal activity.
- 30. The criminal case against the Plaintiff was dismissed in the interests of justice on or about March 20, 2012.
- 31. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based upon such information and belief, the Plaintiff alleges that currently, the Defendant S-ORTIZ is being criminally prosecuted for various crimes, including but not limited to her alleged grand theft of monies from a business partner.
- 32. The Plaintiff's claims have been equitably tolled during the period of her confinement and during the period of the prosecution against her, i.e., from on or about July 27, 2010, to on or about March 20, 2012.
- 33. During the above periods of time, the Defendants, and each of them, stated and implied that Plaintiff was a thief because she was a certain type of Hispanic and from Central America and from Guatemala.
- 34. Defendants, and each of them, have stated that certain Hispanics, particularly from Central America and Guatemala, are, words to the effect, thieves.
- 35. Plaintiff is informed and believes that Defendant EMPLOYERS failed and have failed to the present time to take any disciplinary action against the employees/agents who discriminated against and/or harassed the Plaintiff, such as issuing a formal warning, providing counseling, or imposing probation, suspension, or termination.
 - 36. Plaintiff is informed and believes that Defendant EMPLOYERS have never

had a written policy about age discrimination and harassment, has never conducted any age discrimination and harassment training, and has never posted any age discrimination and harassment policies for its supervisors and employees.

FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION

(Race and National Origin Discrimination-California Government Code §12940)

- 37. Each of the allegations in the paragraphs above are realleged and incorporated herein by reference. This cause of action is pleaded against the Defendant EMPLOYERS.
- 38. Defendants were at all material times an employer within the meaning of California *Government Code* §12926(d), and, as such, barred from discriminating or retaliating in employment decisions on the basis of race and national origin as set forth in California *Government Code* §12940.
- 39. Plaintiff was at all material times an applicant covered by California Government Code §12940 prohibiting discrimination, harassment or retaliation in employment, including during the application process, on the basis of race and national origin.
- 40. Defendants and each of them engaged in a pattern and practice of discriminating against employees of Hispanic, Central American, Indian, and/or Guatemalan race and/or national origin, including Plaintiff, on the basis of race and/or national origin in violation of California Government Code §§12940 and 12940(a) by engaging in a course of conduct that included subjecting Plaintiff to age discrimination because of her race and/or national origin.
- 41. Defendant EMPLOYERS failed to exercise reasonable care to prevent and promptly correct the race and national origin discriminatory behavior.
- 42. Further, the Defendant DOES, and each of them, aided and abetted Defendant EMPLOYERS in engaging in illegal discrimination on the basis of race and/or national origin against employees, including subjecting Plaintiff to race and national origin discrimination because of her race and/or national origin, in violation of California

?

- 43. On or about July 26, 2012, Plaintiff filed timely charges of race and national origin discrimination with the California Department of Fair Employment and Housing ("DFEH"), and she has received her right-to-sue letters. Thus, Plaintiff has exhausted her administrative remedies. During the period of the criminal prosecution against the Plaintiff, the DFEH one-year period was equitably tolled.
- 44. As a proximate result of Defendant's conduct, Plaintiff has suffered and continues to suffer substantial losses incurred in seeking and performing substitute employment and in earnings, and other employment benefits he would have received had defendants not taken such adverse employment actions against her as a result of her race and/or national origin.
- 45. As a proximate result of Defendant's conduct, Plaintiff has suffered and continues to suffer embarrassment, anxiety, humiliation, and emotional distress, as well as medical expenses, all to her damage in an amount according to proof.
- 46. Defendants committed the acts alleged herein maliciously, fraudulently, and oppressively, in bad faith, with the wrongful intention of injuring plaintiff, from an improper and evil motive amounting to malice, and in conscious disregard of Plaintiff's rights. Plaintiff thus is entitled to recover punitive damages from Defendants in an amount according to proof.
- 47. As a result of Defendant's discriminatory acts as alleged herein, Plaintiff has no plain, adequate, or complete remedy at law, and Defendants continue to engage in said alleged wrongful practices. Therefore, Plaintiff requests:
 - (a) That she be made whole and afforded all benefits attendant thereto that would have been afforded Plaintiff but for said discrimination; and
 - (b) That Defendants, their agents, successors, employees, and those acting in concert with them be enjoined permanently from engaging in each of the unlawful practices, policies, usages, and customs set forth herein, and that they be required to develop posting policies, grievance

procedures, and training regarding race and national origin discrimination and harassment.

48. As a result of Defendant's discriminatory acts as alleged herein, Plaintiff is entitled to reasonable attorney fees and costs of suit as provided by California *Government Code* §12965(b) and other authorities.

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff requests relief as hereinafter provided.

SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION

(Race and National Origin Harassment-California Government Code §12940)

- 49. Each of the allegations in the paragraphs above are realleged and incorporated herein by reference. This cause of action is pleaded against all Defendants.
- 50. Defendant was at all material times an employer within the meaning of California *Government Code* §12926(d), and, as such, barred from harassing employees and job applicants on the basis of race and/or national origin as set forth in California *Government Code* §12940.
- 51. Plaintiff was at all material times an applicant covered by California Government Code §12940 prohibiting discrimination, harassment or retaliation in employment on the basis of race and/or national origin.
- 52. Defendants and each of them engaged in a pattern and practice of discriminating against and harassing employees of Hispanic, Central American, Indian, and/or Guatemalan race and/or national origin, including Plaintiff, on the basis of race and/or national origin in violation of California Government Code §§12940 and 12940(j)(1) by engaging in a course of conduct that included subjecting Plaintiff to race and/or national origin harassment because of her race and/or national origin.
- 53. Defendant EMPLOYERS failed to exercise reasonable care to prevent and promptly correct the race and national origin harassment.
- 54. Further, the Defendant DOES, and each of them, aided and abetted the Defendant EMPLOYERS, and the other Defendants, and each of them, in engaging in illegal

harassment on the basis of race and/or national origin against employees and applicants, including subjecting Plaintiff to age harassment because of her race and/or national origin, in violation of California *Government Code* §12940(i).

- 55. On or about July 26, 2012, Plaintiff filed timely charges of race and national origin discrimination with the DFEH, and she has received his right-to-sue letters. Thus, Plaintiff has exhausted her administrative remedies. During the period of the criminal prosecution against the Plaintiff, the DFEH one-year period was equitably tolled.
- 56. As a proximate result of Defendant's conduct, Plaintiff has suffered and continues to suffer substantial losses incurred in seeking and performing substitute employment and in earnings, and other employment benefits she would have received had defendants not discriminated against her and harassed her as a result of her race and national origin.
- 57. As a proximate result of Defendant's conduct, Plaintiff has suffered and continues to suffer embarrassment, anxiety, humiliation, and emotional distress, as well as medical expenses, all to her damage in an amount according to proof.
- 58. Defendants committed the acts alleged herein maliciously, fraudulently, and oppressively, in bad faith, with the wrongful intention of injuring plaintiff, from an improper and evil motive amounting to malice, and in conscious disregard of Plaintiff's rights. Plaintiff thus is entitled to recover punitive damages from Defendants in an amount according to proof.
- 59. As a result of Defendant's discriminatory and harassing acts as alleged herein, Plaintiff has no plain, adequate, or complete remedy at law, and Defendants continue to engage in said alleged wrongful practices. Therefore, Plaintiff requests:
 - (a) That she be made whole and afforded all benefits attendant thereto that would have been afforded Plaintiff but for said discrimination and harassment; and
 - (b) That Defendants, their agents, successors, employees, and those acting in concert with them be enjoined permanently from engaging in each

of the unlawful practices, policies, usages, and customs set forth herein, and that they be required to develop posting policies, grievance procedures, and training regarding race and national origin discrimination and harassment.

60. As a result of Defendant's discriminatory acts and harassment as alleged herein, Plaintiff is entitled to reasonable attorney fees and costs of suit as provided by California *Government Code* §12965(b) and other authorities.

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff requests relief as hereinafter provided.

THIRD CAUSE OF ACTION

(Retaliation-California Government Code §12940(h))

- 61. Each of the allegations in the paragraphs above are realleged and incorporated herein by reference. This cause of action is pleaded against Defendants, and each of them.
- 62. Defendants, and each of them, have retaliated against Plaintiff In violation of California Government Code §12940(h), by engaging in a course of retaliatory conduct, including, among other things, the conduct set forth in the paragraphs above, when she complained about harassment, discrimination and hostility and conduct based on her race and national origin. This retaliation continued until Plaintiff's termination, and even thereafter, at least through the date of the dismissal of the criminal complaint against the Plaintiff, carried out by Defendants, and each of them, and/or employees acting within the course and scope of their employment.
- 63. On or about July 26, 2012, Plaintiff filed timely charges of race and national origin discrimination with the DFEH, and she has received her right-to-sue letters. Thus, Plaintiff has exhausted her administrative remedies. During the period of the criminal prosecution against the Plaintiff, the DFEH one-year period was equitably tolled.
- 64. As a proximate result of Defendant's conduct, Plaintiff has suffered and continues to suffer substantial losses incurred in seeking and performing substitute employment and in earnings, and other employment benefits she would have received had

defendants not discriminated and/or retaliated against her and/or harassed her as a result of his age.

- 65. As a proximate result of Defendant's conduct, Plaintiff has suffered and continues to suffer embarrassment, anxiety, humiliation, and emotional distress, as well as medical expenses, all to her damage in an amount according to proof.
- 66. Defendants committed the acts alleged herein maliciously, fraudulently, and oppressively, in bad faith, with the wrongful intention of injuring plaintiff, from an improper and evil motive amounting to malice, and in conscious disregard of Plaintiff's rights. Plaintiff thus is entitled to recover punitive damages from Defendants in an amount according to proof.
- 67. As a result of Defendant's discriminatory, retaliatory and harassing acts as alleged herein, Plaintiff has no plain, adequate, or complete remedy at law, and Defendants continue to engage in said alleged wrongful practices. Therefore, Plaintiff requests:
 - (a) That she be made whole and afforded all benefits attendant thereto that would have been afforded Plaintiff but for said discrimination, retaliation and harassment; and
 - (b) That Defendants, their agents, successors, employees, and those acting in concert with them be enjoined permanently from engaging in each of the unlawful practices, policies, usages, and customs set forth herein, and that they be required to develop posting policies, grievance procedures, and training regarding race and national origin discrimination, retaliation and harassment.
- 68. As a result of Defendant's discriminatory acts and harassment as alleged herein, Plaintiff is entitled to reasonable attorney fees and costs of suit as provided by California *Government Code* §12965(b) and other authorities.

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff requests relief as hereinafter provided.

27 ///

FOURTH CAUSE OF ACTION

(Failure to Maintain Environment Free from Harassment-

California Government Code §12940(k))

- 69. Each of the allegations in the paragraphs above are realleged and incorporated herein by reference. This cause of action is pleaded against the Defendant EMPLOYERS.
- 70. Defendants failed to take all reasonable steps to prevent discrimination and harassment against plaintiff from occurring, and to take immediate and appropriate corrective action to remedy the discrimination and harassment, in violation of California *Government Code* §12940(k), by engaging in the course of conduct set forth in the paragraphs above, among other things.
- 71. The Defendant EMPLOYERS failed to exercise reasonable care to prevent and promptly correct the race and national origin discrimination, retaliation and harassment.
- 72. Further, the Defendant DOES, and each of them, aided and abetted the Defendant EMPLOYERS in engaging in illegal harassment on the basis of race and/or national origin against employees, including subjecting Plaintiff to race and national origin harassment because of her race and national origin, in violation of California *Government Code* §12940(i).
- 73. On or about July 26, 2012, Plaintiff filed timely charges of race and national origin discrimination with the DFEH, and she has received his right-to-sue letters. Thus, Plaintiff has exhausted her administrative remedies. During the period of the criminal prosecution against the Plaintiff, the DFEH one-year period was equitably tolled.
- 74. As a proximate result of Defendant's conduct, Plaintiff has suffered and continues to suffer substantial losses incurred in seeking and performing substitute employment and in earnings, and other employment benefits he would have received had defendants not discriminated against him and harassed him as a result of her race and national origin.
- 75. As a proximate result of Defendant's conduct, Plaintiff has suffered and continues to suffer embarrassment, anxiety, humiliation, and emotional distress, as well as

25

26

27

28

medical expenses, all to her damage in an amount according to proof.

- 76. Defendants committed the acts alleged herein maliciously, fraudulently, and oppressively, in bad faith, with the wrongful intention of injuring plaintiff, from an improper and evil motive amounting to malice, and in conscious disregard of Plaintiff's rights. Plaintiff thus is entitled to recover punitive damages from Defendants in an amount according to proof.
- 77. As a result of Defendant's discriminatory and harassing acts as alleged herein, Plaintiff has no plain, adequate, or complete remedy at law, and Defendants continue to engage in said alleged wrongful practices. Therefore, Plaintiff requests:
 - (a) That he be made whole and afforded all benefits attendant thereto that would have been afforded Plaintiff but for said discrimination and harassment; and
 - (b) That Defendants, their agents, successors, employees, and those acting in concert with them be enjoined permanently from engaging in each of the unlawful practices, policies, usages, and customs set forth herein, and that they be required to develop posting policies, grievance procedures, and training regarding race and national origin discrimination and harassment.
- 78. As a result of Defendant's discriminatory acts and harassment as alleged herein, Plaintiff is entitled to reasonable attorney fees and costs of suit as provided by California *Government Code* §12965(b) and other authorities.

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff requests relief as hereinafter provided.

FIFTH CAUSE OF ACTION

(Violation of the Employee Polygraph Protection Act of 1988 and Other Law)

- 79. Each of the allegations in the paragraphs above are realleged and incorporated herein by reference. This cause of action is pleaded against Defendants, and each of them.
 - 80. In forcing and coercing the Plaintiff, against her will, into having a lie detector

and/or polygraph test performed upon her, the Defendants, and each of them, have violated her rights under the *Employee Polygraph Protection Act of 1988*, 29 USC §2001, et seq., and other State and Federal law, which prohibits employers from using, threatening, requiring that an employee take a lie detector and/or polygraph test.

- 81. The conduct set forth above was extreme and outrageous and an abuse of the authority and position of the Defendants, and each of them. Said conduct was intended to cause severe emotional distress, or was done in conscious disregard of the probability of causing such distress.
- 82. The foregoing conduct did in fact cause the Plaintiff to suffer extreme emotional distress. As a proximate result of said conduct, Plaintiff suffered pain, discomfort, anxiety, humiliation, and emotional distress, and will continue to suffer said emotional distress in the future in an amount according to proof.
- 83. In addition to other damages sought herein, lost wages and benefits, medical expenses, emotional distress, punitive damages, etc., the Plaintiff additionally seeks the \$10,000.00 Civil Penalty pursuant to 29 USC §2005(a)(1).
- 84. In addition to other damages and penalties sought herein, the Plaintiff additionally seeks her costs and attorneys' fees pursuant to 29 USC §2005(c)(3).

WHEREFORE, plaintiff requests relief as hereinafter provided.

SIXTH CAUSE OF ACTION

(Wrongful Termination in Violation of Public Policy)

- 85. Each of the allegations in the paragraphs above are realleged and incorporated herein by reference. This cause of action is pleaded against Defendants, and each of them.
- 86. Plaintiff was employed by Defendants, and her employment was terminated on or about July 27, 2010, in violation of well-established, substantial and fundamental public policies of the State of California. Said policies are set forth in the California Fair Employment & Housing Act, Cal. Gov. Code Section 12900 et seq, the California Constitution, the Social Security Administration regulations, the Mandatory Reporting Laws

the Employee Polygraph Protection Act of 1988, 29 USC §2001, et seq., and other statutory and common laws. Plaintiff was terminated, at least in part, because of these violations of law, and/or her complaints and findings of violations of such.

- 87. Plaintiff's termination was wrongful in violation of well-established, substantial and fundamental public policies of the State of California prohibiting termination of an employee based on discriminatory reasons, in violation of the California Constitution, including but not limited to in violation of Article I, Section 8, which states that "A person may not be disqualified from entering or pursuing a business, profession, vocation or employment because of sex, race, creed, color or national or ethnic origin."
- 88. Defendants' termination in wrongful violation of well-established, substantial and fundamental public policies of the State of California and other public policies caused Plaintiff to suffered damage, loss and harm. As a direct and foreseeable result of the aforesaid acts of Defendants, their agents and employees, Plaintiff has lost and is continuing to lose income and benefits in an amount to be proven at the time of trial.
- 89. Plaintiff has also incurred attorneys' fees. Plaintiff claims such amount as damages together with pre-judgment interest pursuant to *Civil Code* §3287 and/or any other provision of law providing for pre-judgment interest.
- 90. Plaintiff was terminated, at least in part, because of these violations of law, and/or her complaints and findings of violations of such, including but not limited to, her complaints about discrimination, retaliation and/or harassment and/or the illegal actions of Defendants', including an illegal polygraph test.

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff requests relief as hereinafter provided.

SEVENTH CAUSE OF ACTION

(False Imprisonment)

- 91. Each of the allegations in the paragraphs above are realleged and incorporated herein by reference. This cause of action is pleaded against Defendants, and each of them.
 - 92. The above actions by Defendants, and each of them, were conducted in such

a way that the Plaintiff felt reasonably restrained from leaving and thus was held against her will, including but not limited to, while being taken to and while at the polygraph testing, while being taken to and while at the Defendants' home address, and while being taken to and while at the other locations. Such conduct by Defendants, and each of them, constitutes a unlawful violations of Plaintiff's personal liberty.

- 93. The conduct set forth above was extreme and outrageous and an abuse of the authority and position of the Defendants, and each of them. Said conduct was intended to cause severe emotional distress, or was done in conscious disregard of the probability of causing such distress.
- 94. The foregoing conduct did in fact cause the Plaintiff to suffer extreme emotional distress. As a proximate result of said conduct, Plaintiff suffered pain, discomfort, anxiety, humiliation, and emotional distress, and will continue to suffer said emotional distress in the future in an amount according to proof.

WHEREFORE, plaintiff requests relief as hereinafter provided.

EIGHTH CAUSE OF ACTION

(Abuse of Process)

- 95. Each of the allegations in the paragraphs above are realleged and incorporated herein by reference. This cause of action is pleaded against Defendants, and each of them.
- 96. Defendants, and each of them, made a malicious and deliberate misuse or perversion of regularly issued court process not justified by the underlying legal action.
- 97. Defendants, and each of them, had an ulterior purpose or motive underlying the use of process, based upon information and belief, in order to attempt to coerce the Plaintiff falsely admit to, or falsely be convicted of, the theft of jewelry in order that the Defendants could submit a false insurance claim on said item.
- 98. Defendants', and each of their, use of the legal process was not proper in the regular prosecution of the proceedings.
 - 99. The Defendants', and each of their, actions lead to the Plaintiff's unjustified

arrest or an unfounded criminal prosecution.

- 100. As a proximate result of these wrongful actions by Defendants, and each of them, as aforesaid, Plaintiff has suffered injury, expenses, and costs, and continues to suffer embarrassment, humiliation, emotional distress and anguish, all to her damage in an amount according to proof.
- 101. Defendants, and each of them, committed the acts alleged herein maliciously, despicably, fraudulently, and oppressively, with the wrongful intention of injuring Plaintiff, from an improper and evil motive amounting to malice, and a conscious disregard of Plaintiff's rights. Plaintiff, thus, is entitled to recover punitive damages from Defendants, and each of them, in an amount according to proof.

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff requests relief as hereinafter provided.

NINTH CAUSE OF ACTION

(Defamation)

- 102. Each of the allegations in the paragraphs above are realleged and incorporated herein by reference. This cause of action is pleaded against Defendants, and each of them.
- 103. Defendants, and each of them, individually and through their officers, partners, agents and employees, acting within the course of their employment, caused to be published false and unprivileged communications tending to directly injure Plaintiff and her business and professional reputations. Specifically, Defendants, and each of them, made untrue statements to Plaintiff's co-employees, and each of them, and others, among other things, that she was a thief and a liar and had stolen jewelry from Defendants, when such was not true.
- 104. The statements set forth above were published with express and implied malice on the part of Defendants with the designed intent to injure Plaintiff and her good name, reputation and employment.
- 105. As a proximate result of the defamatory statements made by Defendants, and each of them, as aforesaid, Plaintiff has suffered injury to her business and professional reputation, and further has suffered and continues to suffer embarrassment, humiliation, and

- 18 -COMPLAINT FOR DAMAGES; JURY DEMAND

of the authority and position of Defendants, and each of them. Said conduct was intended to cause severe emotional distress, or was done in conscious disregard of the probability of causing such distress. Said conduct exceeded the inherent risks of employment and was not the sort of conduct normally expected to occur in the workplace. Defendants, and each of them, abused their position of authority toward Plaintiff, and engaged in conduct intended to humiliate the Plaintiff and to convey the message that she was powerless to defend her rights. Defendants, and each of them, abused their authority and directly injured the Plaintiff by his, her and/or its ratification of the other Defendants acts and by their employees' actions in falling to protect and violating the rights and privacy of the Plaintiff.

113. The foregoing conduct did in fact cause the Plaintiff to suffer extreme emotional distress. As a proximate result of said conduct, the Plaintiff suffered embarrassment, anxiety, humiliation, and emotional distress, and will continue to suffer said emotional distress in the future in an amount according to proof.

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff requests relief as hereinafter provided.

TWELFTH CAUSE OF ACTION

(Negligent Infliction of Emotional Distress)

- 114. Each of the allegations in the paragraphs above are realleged and incorporated herein by reference. This cause of action is pleaded against Defendants, and each of them.
- 115. In carrying out the above conduct, Defendants, and each of them, breached a duty owed to Plaintiff to provide a workplace free from unfair treatment, discrimination, and retaliation, and abused their positions of authority toward her. Said conduct exceeded the inherent risks of employment and was not the sort of conduct normally expected to occur in the workplace. Each of the Defendants violated said duty directly by ratifying conduct of each of the other Defendants.
- 116. Defendants, and each of them, knew, or should have known, that said conduct would cause Plaintiff extreme emotional distress. As a proximate result of Defendants', and each of their, negligent conduct, Plaintiff suffered and will continue to suffer extreme

- 20 -COMPLAINT FOR DAMAGES; JURY DEMAND

		į			ų.	
1	discrimination and hara	assment, req	uiring tra	ining abou	it race and	national origin
2	discrimination and haras	sment for all	l employe	es, for a pe	ermanent inju	nction enjoining
3	defendants, their agents, successors, employees, and those acting in concert with them from					
4	engaging in each unlawful practice, policy, usage, and custom set forth hereinabove, and for					
5	such other injunctive relief as the Court may deem proper;					
6	7. For costs of the suit, including reasonable attorney fees; and					
7	8. For such of	8. For such other and further relief as the Court may deem proper.				
8	It is respectfully submitted.					
9						
10	DATED: July 26, 20	12		MYER LA	WFIRM	
11	6 100		=			
12	, ,	•	BY:	SCOTT D. Attorney fo	MYER, ESQ	
13	ī		j	NORMA E	. GUZMAN- A GUZMAN	MORALES,
14						•
15		197				
16	, v					
17	*					
18	- 1 - 1 - 1 - 1 - 1 - 1 - 1 - 1 - 1 - 1	€ \$			*	
19					° g	
20						
21					ve.	
22						
23		-				
24	a 10 %	1				
25						
26						
27		1			4. [
28		1			4. F	

JURY DEMAND Plaintiff demands trial by jury in this action. It is respectfully submitted. July 26, 2012 DATED: MYER LAW FIRM SCOTT D. MYER, ESQ. Attorney for Plaintiff, NORMA E. GUZMAN-MORALES, aka NORMA GUZMAN