



**INSTRUCTIONS FOR ATTORNEYS COMPLETING CIVIL COVER SHEET FORM JS 44****Authority For Civil Cover Sheet**

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

- I.(a) Plaintiffs-Defendants.** Enter names (last, first, middle initial) of plaintiff and defendant. If the plaintiff or defendant is a government agency, use only the full name or standard abbreviations. If the plaintiff or defendant is an official within a government agency, identify first the agency and then the official, giving both name and title.
- (b) County of Residence.** For each civil case filed, except U.S. plaintiff cases, enter the name of the county where the first listed plaintiff resides at the time of filing. In U.S. plaintiff cases, enter the name of the county in which the first listed defendant resides at the time of filing. (NOTE: In land condemnation cases, the county of residence of the "defendant" is the location of the tract of land involved.)
- (c) Attorneys.** Enter the firm name, address, telephone number, and attorney of record. If there are several attorneys, list them on an attachment, noting in this section "(see attachment)".
- II. Jurisdiction.** The basis of jurisdiction is set forth under Rule 8(a), F.R.Cv.P., which requires that jurisdictions be shown in pleadings. Place an "X" in one of the boxes. If there is more than one basis of jurisdiction, precedence is given in the order shown below.
- United States plaintiff. (1) Jurisdiction based on 28 U.S.C. 1345 and 1348. Suits by agencies and officers of the United States are included here.
- United States defendant. (2) When the plaintiff is suing the United States, its officers or agencies, place an "X" in this box.
- Federal question. (3) This refers to suits under 28 U.S.C. 1331, where jurisdiction arises under the Constitution of the United States, an amendment to the Constitution, an act of Congress or a treaty of the United States. In cases where the U.S. is a party, the U.S. plaintiff or defendant code takes precedence, and box 1 or 2 should be marked.
- Diversity of citizenship. (4) This refers to suits under 28 U.S.C. 1332, where parties are citizens of different states. When Box 4 is checked, the citizenship of the different parties must be checked. (See Section III below; **NOTE: federal question actions take precedence over diversity cases.**)
- III. Residence (citizenship) of Principal Parties.** This section of the JS 44 is to be completed if diversity of citizenship was indicated above. Mark this section for each principal party.
- IV. Nature of Suit.** Place an "X" in the appropriate box. If there are multiple nature of suit codes associated with the case, pick the nature of suit code that is most applicable. Click here for: [Nature of Suit Code Descriptions](#).
- V. Origin.** Place an "X" in one of the seven boxes.
- Original Proceedings. (1) Cases which originate in the United States district courts.
- Removed from State Court. (2) Proceedings initiated in state courts may be removed to the district courts under Title 28 U.S.C., Section 1441.
- Remanded from Appellate Court. (3) Check this box for cases remanded to the district court for further action. Use the date of remand as the filing date.
- Reinstated or Reopened. (4) Check this box for cases reinstated or reopened in the district court. Use the reopening date as the filing date.
- Transferred from Another District. (5) For cases transferred under Title 28 U.S.C. Section 1404(a). Do not use this for within district transfers or multidistrict litigation transfers.
- Multidistrict Litigation – Transfer. (6) Check this box when a multidistrict case is transferred into the district under authority of Title 28 U.S.C. Section 1407.
- Multidistrict Litigation – Direct File. (8) Check this box when a multidistrict case is filed in the same district as the Master MDL docket.
- PLEASE NOTE THAT THERE IS NOT AN ORIGIN CODE 7.** Origin Code 7 was used for historical records and is no longer relevant due to changes in statute.
- VI. Cause of Action.** Report the civil statute directly related to the cause of action and give a brief description of the cause. **Do not cite jurisdictional statutes unless diversity.** Example: U.S. Civil Statute: 47 USC 553 Brief Description: Unauthorized reception of cable service.
- VII. Requested in Complaint.** Class Action. Place an "X" in this box if you are filing a class action under Rule 23, F.R.Cv.P.
- Demand. In this space enter the actual dollar amount being demanded or indicate other demand, such as a preliminary injunction.
- Jury Demand. Check the appropriate box to indicate whether or not a jury is being demanded.
- VIII. Related Cases.** This section of the JS 44 is used to reference related pending cases, if any. If there are related pending cases, insert the docket numbers and the corresponding judge names for such cases.

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

**DESIGNATION FORM**

(to be used by counsel or pro se plaintiff to indicate the category of the case for the purpose of assignment to the appropriate calendar)

Address of Plaintiff: \_\_\_\_\_

6940 Ditman Street, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19135

Address of Defendant: \_\_\_\_\_

240 Spring Garden Street, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19123

Place of Accident, Incident or Transaction: \_\_\_\_\_

240 Spring Garden Street, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19123

**RELATED CASE, IF ANY:**

Case Number: \_\_\_\_\_ Judge: \_\_\_\_\_ Date Terminated: \_\_\_\_\_

Civil cases are deemed related when **Yes** is answered to any of the following questions:

- |  |                              |  |
|--|------------------------------|--|
| 1. Is this case related to property included in an earlier numbered suit pending or within one year previously terminated action in this court?  | Yes <input type="checkbox"/> | No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| 2. Does this case involve the same issue of fact or grow out of the same transaction as a prior suit pending or within one year previously terminated action in this court?            | Yes <input type="checkbox"/> | No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| 3. Does this case involve the validity or infringement of a patent already in suit or any earlier numbered case pending or within one year previously terminated action of this court? | Yes <input type="checkbox"/> | No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| 4. Is this case a second or successive habeas corpus, social security appeal, or pro se civil rights case filed by the same individual?  | Yes <input type="checkbox"/> | No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

I certify that, to my knowledge, the within case  is /  is not related to any case now pending or within one year previously terminated action in this court except as noted above.

DATE: 01/27/2021

/s/ Sidney L. Gold, Esq.

21374

Attorney-at-Law / Pro Se Plaintiff

Attorney I.D. # (if applicable)

**CIVIL: (Place a ✓ in one category only)**

**A. Federal Question Cases:**

1. Indemnity Contract, Marine Contract, and All Other Contracts  
 2. FELA  
 3. Jones Act-Personal Injury  
 4. Antitrust  
 5. Patent  
 6. Labor-Management Relations  
 7. Civil Rights  
 8. Habeas Corpus  
 9. Securities Act(s) Cases  
 10. Social Security Review Cases  
 11. All other Federal Question Cases  
(Please specify): \_\_\_\_\_

**B. Diversity Jurisdiction Cases:**

1. Insurance Contract and Other Contracts  
 2. Airplane Personal Injury  
 3. Assault, Defamation  
 4. Marine Personal Injury  
 5. Motor Vehicle Personal Injury  
 6. Other Personal Injury (Please specify): \_\_\_\_\_  
 7. Products Liability  
 8. Products Liability – Asbestos  
 9. All other Diversity Cases  
(Please specify): \_\_\_\_\_

**ARBITRATION CERTIFICATION**  
(The effect of this certification is to remove the case from eligibility for arbitration.)

I, SIDNEY L. GOLD, ESQUIRE, counsel of record or pro se plaintiff, do hereby certify:

Pursuant to Local Civil Rule 53.2, § 3(c) (2), that to the best of my knowledge and belief, the damages recoverable in this civil action case exceed the sum of \$150,000.00 exclusive of interest and costs:

Relief other than monetary damages is sought.

DATE: 01/27/2021

/s/ Sidney L. Gold, Esq.

21374

Attorney-at-Law / Pro Se Plaintiff

Attorney I.D. # (if applicable)

NOTE: A trial de novo will be a trial by jury only if there has been compliance with F.R.C.P. 38.

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA**

**CASE MANAGEMENT TRACK DESIGNATION FORM**

MALCOLM LINDSAY	:	CIVIL ACTION
	:	
v.	:	
CITY OF PHILADELPHIA	:	NO.
	:	

In accordance with the Civil Justice Expense and Delay Reduction Plan of this court, counsel for plaintiff shall complete a Case Management Track Designation Form in all civil cases at the time of filing the complaint and serve a copy on all defendants. (See § 1:03 of the plan set forth on the reverse side of this form.) In the event that a defendant does not agree with the plaintiff regarding said designation, that defendant shall, with its first appearance, submit to the clerk of court and serve on the plaintiff and all other parties, a Case Management Track Designation Form specifying the track to which that defendant believes the case should be assigned.

**SELECT ONE OF THE FOLLOWING CASE MANAGEMENT TRACKS:**

- (a) Habeas Corpus – Cases brought under 28 U.S.C. § 2241 through § 2255. ( )
- (b) Social Security – Cases requesting review of a decision of the Secretary of Health and Human Services denying plaintiff Social Security Benefits. ( )
- (c) Arbitration – Cases required to be designated for arbitration under Local Civil Rule 53.2. ( )
- (d) Asbestos – Cases involving claims for personal injury or property damage from exposure to asbestos. ( )
- (e) Special Management – Cases that do not fall into tracks (a) through (d) that are commonly referred to as complex and that need special or intense management by the court. (See reverse side of this form for a detailed explanation of special management cases.) ( )
- (f) Standard Management – Cases that do not fall into any one of the other tracks. (  )

<u>01/27/2021</u>	<u>/s/ Sidney L. Gold, Esq.</u>	<u>PLAINTIFF</u>
<u>Date</u>	<u>Attorney-at-law</u>	<u>Attorney for</u>
<u>(215) 569-1999</u>	<u>(215) 569-3870</u>	<u>sgold@discrimlaw.net</u>
<u>Telephone</u>	<u>FAX Number</u>	<u>E-Mail Address</u>

**Civil Justice Expense and Delay Reduction Plan**  
**Section 1:03 - Assignment to a Management Track**

(a) The clerk of court will assign cases to tracks (a) through (d) based on the initial pleading.

(b) In all cases not appropriate for assignment by the clerk of court to tracks (a) through (d), the plaintiff shall submit to the clerk of court and serve with the complaint on all defendants a case management track designation form specifying that the plaintiff believes the case requires Standard Management or Special Management. In the event that a defendant does not agree with the plaintiff regarding said designation, that defendant shall, with its first appearance, submit to the clerk of court and serve on the plaintiff and all other parties, a case management track designation form specifying the track to which that defendant believes the case should be assigned.

(c) The court may, on its own initiative or upon the request of any party, change the track assignment of any case at any time.

(d) Nothing in this Plan is intended to abrogate or limit a judicial officer's authority in any case pending before that judicial officer, to direct pretrial and trial proceedings that are more stringent than those of the Plan and that are designed to accomplish cost and delay reduction.

(e) Nothing in this Plan is intended to supersede Local Civil Rules 40.1 and 72.1, or the procedure for random assignment of Habeas Corpus and Social Security cases referred to magistrate judges of the court.

**SPECIAL MANAGEMENT CASE ASSIGNMENTS**  
**(See §1.02 (e) Management Track Definitions of the**  
**Civil Justice Expense and Delay Reduction Plan)**

Special Management cases will usually include that class of cases commonly referred to as "complex litigation" as that term has been used in the Manuals for Complex Litigation. The first manual was prepared in 1969 and the Manual for Complex Litigation Second, MCL 2d was prepared in 1985. This term is intended to include cases that present unusual problems and require extraordinary treatment. See §0.1 of the first manual. Cases may require special or intense management by the court due to one or more of the following factors: (1) large number of parties; (2) large number of claims or defenses; (3) complex factual issues; (4) large volume of evidence; (5) problems locating or preserving evidence; (6) extensive discovery; (7) exceptionally long time needed to prepare for disposition; (8) decision needed within an exceptionally short time; and (9) need to decide preliminary issues before final disposition. It may include two or more related cases. Complex litigation typically includes such cases as antitrust cases; cases involving a large number of parties or an unincorporated association of large membership; cases involving requests for injunctive relief affecting the operation of large business entities; patent cases; copyright and trademark cases; common disaster cases such as those arising from aircraft crashes or marine disasters; actions brought by individual stockholders; stockholder's derivative and stockholder's representative actions; class actions or potential class actions; and other civil (and criminal) cases involving unusual multiplicity or complexity of factual issues. See §0.22 of the first Manual for Complex Litigation and Manual for Complex Litigation Second, Chapter 33.

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA**

MALCOLM LINDSAY,	:	
	:	
<i>Plaintiff,</i>	:	
	:	
v.	:	<b>CIVIL ACTION NO. _____</b>
	:	
CITY OF PHILADELPHIA,	:	
	:	
<i>Defendant.</i>	:	
	:	

---

**COMPLAINT AND JURY DEMAND**

**I. PRELIMINARY STATEMENT:**

1. This is an action for an award of damages, attorneys' fees and other relief on behalf of the Plaintiff, Malcolm Lindsay ("Plaintiff Lindsay"), a former employee of the Defendant, City of Philadelphia ("Defendant"), who has been harmed by the Defendant's discriminatory and retaliatory employment practices.

2. This action is brought under Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, 42 U.S.C. §2000(e), et seq., as amended by the Civil Rights Act of 1991 ("Title VII") and the Pennsylvania Human Relations Act ("PHRA"), 43 P.S. §951 et seq.

**II. JURISDICTION AND VENUE:**

3. The jurisdiction of this Court is invoked, and venue is proper in this district, pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §§1331 and 1391, as Plaintiff Lindsay's claims are substantively based on Title VII.

4. The supplemental jurisdiction of this Court is invoked pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §1367 to consider Plaintiff Lindsay's claims arising under the PHRA.

5. All conditions precedent to the institution of this suit have been fulfilled and Plaintiff Lindsay has satisfied all other jurisdictional prerequisites to the maintenance of this action. On November 3, 2020, a Notice of Right to Sue was issued by the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission and this action has been filed within ninety (90) days of receipt of said notice.

**III. PARTIES:**

6. Plaintiff, Malcolm Lindsay (“Plaintiff Lindsay”), is an adult individual and citizen of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, residing therein at 6940 Ditman Street, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19135.

7. Defendant, City of Philadelphia (“Defendant”), is duly organized and existing under the laws of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, maintaining a place of business located at 240 Spring Garden Street, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19123.

8. At all times relevant hereto, Defendant was acting through its agents, servants, and employees, who were acting within the scope of their authority, course of employment, and under the direct control of the Defendant.

9. At all times material herein, the Defendant has been a “person” and “employer” as defined by Title VII and the PHRA, and has been, and is, subject to the provisions of each said Act.

**IV. STATEMENT OF FACTS:**

10. Plaintiff Lindsay, a Muslim male, was employed by the Defendant from on or about February 19, 2019 until on or about April 3, 2019, the date of his unlawful termination.

11. During the course of his employment with the Defendant, Plaintiff Lindsay held the position of Firefighter Cadet and at all times maintained a satisfactory job performance rating in said capacity.

12. On or about February 19, 2019, Plaintiff Lindsay reported to the Defendant's workplace for his first day of work wearing cuffed pants above the ankle and had facial hair, in observance of his religion (Islam). On the same day, Hector Sierra ("Sierra"), Fire Captain, informed Plaintiff Lindsay that his pants and facial hair were in violation of the Defendant's dress code and grooming policy. Plaintiff Lindsay informed Sierra that he required a religious accommodation and was told to speak with Michael Roelinghoff ("Roelinghoff"), Fire Lieutenant and Robert Jeter ("Jeter"), Fire Captain.

13. On the same date, Plaintiff Lindsay informed Jeter and Roelinghoff of his religious observances and that wearing pants below the ankle and shaving his face would be in direct conflict with his religious beliefs. Accordingly, Plaintiff Lindsay requested that the Defendant allow him to wear his pants above the ankle and maintain his facial hair as a religious accommodation.

14. In response thereto, Jeter denied Plaintiff Lindsay's request for religious accommodation and demanded he remove his facial hair and comply with the fire academy's dress code or face the termination of his employment.

15. On or about February 20, 2019, Jeter and Roelinghoff again engaged Plaintiff Lindsay in a discussion regarding his failure to comport to the Defendant's dress code. Plaintiff Lindsay informed the Defendant that he would have his pants professionally hemmed at his own expense, and the Defendant ultimately acceded to said request. Furthermore, Plaintiff Lindsay

requested an update regarding whether the Defendant would accommodate his religious need to grow facial hair. The Defendant failed to provide Plaintiff Lindsay with a response.

16. On or about February 21, 2019, Plaintiff Lindsay passed the OSHA Fit Test, which certified that his face mask was able to create an appropriate seal even with his facial hair.

17. On or about March 15, 2019, Jeter, Roelinghoff, and Thor (“Thor”), Fire Lieutenant, met with Plaintiff Lindsay under the pretense of resolving a “paper work issue.” Curiously, however, Jeter took said meeting as an opportunity to suggest that Plaintiff Lindsay was being untruthful regarding his religious observance of growing facial hair. In response to this accusation, Plaintiff Lindsay empathically stated Jeter’s perception was erroneous and that he, in fact, had a religious purpose for maintaining his facial hair. Further, the Defendant claimed in order for Plaintiff Lindsay to receive a religious accommodation Jeter would need to “punt this off to someone else.”

18. On or about March 22, 2019, Roelinghoff and Sierra again riddled Plaintiff Lindsay with a barrage of questions regarding his growth of facial hair. Again, Plaintiff Lindsay informed the Defendant of his religious observance. In response, the Defendant ordered Plaintiff Lindsay to change out of his gear and wait to speak to the Deputy Chief.

19. On the same date, in retaliation for Plaintiff Lindsay’s numerous requests for a religious accommodation, the Defendant terminated Plaintiff Lindsay’s employment, falsely claiming that compliance with the grooming policy was necessary to “maintain compliance with OSHA safety standards regarding the seal of the self-contained breathing apparatus.” Telling of the Defendant’s discriminatory intent, it completely disregarded the fact that Plaintiff Lindsay had passed the OSHA Fit Test.

20. On or about April 3, 2019, Plaintiff Lindsay received a termination letter that included additional alleged compliance issues. Interestingly, these “issues” were never addressed to Plaintiff Lindsay while employed with the Defendant and he had never received a write-up or any disciplinary warnings for same. Upon information and belief, other similarly situated non-Muslim Firefighter Cadets such as Alonzo Thompson were not reprimanded for participating in the same activity as alleged in the termination letter.

21. Plaintiff Lindsay believes and avers that the actions of the Defendant were discriminatory and retaliatory in nature, as there existed no undue hardship for the Defendant to allow Plaintiff Lindsay to have facial hair in the workplace.

**COUNT I**  
**(Title VII- Religious Discrimination, Retaliation)**  
**Plaintiff Lindsay v. Defendant**

22. Plaintiff Lindsay incorporates by reference paragraphs 1 through 21 of this Complaint as though fully set forth at length herein.

23. The actions of the Defendant, through its agents, servants and employees, in subjecting Plaintiff Lindsay to discrimination based on his religion (Islam), and in subjecting him to retaliation for opposing unlawful discrimination in the workplace, constituted violations of Title VII.

24. As a direct result of the aforesaid unlawful discriminatory and retaliatory employment practices engaged in by Defendant in violation of Title VII, Plaintiff Lindsay has sustained permanent and irreparable harm, which caused him to sustain a loss of earnings, plus the value of certain benefits, plus loss of future earning power, plus back pay, front pay, and interest due thereon.

25. As further direct result of the aforesaid unlawful discriminatory and retaliatory employment practices engaged in by Defendant in violation of Title VII, Plaintiff Lindsay suffered severe emotional distress, embarrassment, humiliation, and loss of self-esteem.

**COUNT II**  
**(PHRA - Religious Discrimination, Retaliation)**  
**Plaintiff Lindsay v. Defendant**

26. Plaintiff Lindsay incorporates by reference paragraphs 1 through 25 of this Complaint as though fully set forth at length herein.

27. The actions of the Defendant, through its agents, servants and employees, in subjecting Plaintiff Lindsay to discrimination based on his religion (Islam), and in subjecting him to retaliation for opposing discrimination in the workplace, constituted violations of the PHRA.

28. As a direct result of the aforesaid unlawful discriminatory and retaliatory employment practices engaged in by Defendant in violation of the PHRA, Plaintiff Lindsay has sustained permanent and irreparable harm, which caused him to sustain a loss of earnings, plus the value of certain benefits, plus loss of future earning power, plus back pay, front pay, and interest due thereon.

29. As further direct result of the aforesaid unlawful discriminatory and retaliatory employment practices engaged in by Defendant in violation of the PHRA, Plaintiff Lindsay suffered severe emotional distress, embarrassment, humiliation, and loss of self-esteem.

**PRAYER FOR RELIEF**

30. Plaintiff Lindsay incorporates by reference paragraphs 1 through 29 of this Complaint as though fully set forth at length herein.

**WHEREFORE**, Plaintiff Lindsay requests that this Court enter judgment in his favor and against the Defendant, and order that:

- a. Defendant compensate Plaintiff Lindsay with a rate of pay and other benefits and emoluments of employment to which he would have been entitled had he not been subjected to unlawful discrimination;
- b. Defendant compensate Plaintiff Lindsay with an award of front pay, if appropriate;
- c. Defendant pay to Plaintiff Lindsay punitive damages, compensatory damages for future pecuniary losses, pain, suffering, inconvenience, mental anguish, loss of enjoyment of life and other nonpecuniary losses as allowable;
- d. Defendant pay to Plaintiff Lindsay pre and post judgment interest, costs of suit and attorney and expert witness fees as allowed by law;
- e. The Court award such other relief as is deemed just and proper.

**JURY DEMAND**

Plaintiff Lindsay demands trial by jury.

SIDNEY L. GOLD & ASSOC., P.C.

By: /s/ Sidney L. Gold, Esquire  
SIDNEY L. GOLD, ESQUIRE  
I.D. No.: 21374  
1835 Market Street, Suite 515  
Philadelphia, PA 19103  
(215) 569-1999  
**Attorneys for Plaintiff**

DATED: January 27, 2021

**VERIFICATION**

I hereby verify that the statements contained in this **Complaint** are true and correct to the best of my knowledge, information and belief. I understand that false statements herein are made subject to the penalties of Title 18 Pa. C.S.A. §4904, relating to unsworn falsification to authorities.

DATE: 1.22.21



MALCOLM LINDSAY, PLAINTIFF