1 2 3 4 5	MICHAEL F. SISSON, STATE BAR #1088 LAW OFFICE OF MICHAEL F. SISSON 3655 Torrance Boulevard, 3 rd Floor Torrance, CA 90503 Telephone: (310) 318-0970 Telecopier: (310) 318-0948 sissonlaw@gmail.com	Electronically FILED by Superior Court of California, County of Los Angeles 8/16/2024 1:13 PM David W. Slayton, Executive Officer/Clerk of Court, By E. Galicia, Deputy Clerk
6 7 8 9	CHRISTOPHER BRIZZOLARA (SBN 130 1532 16th Street Santa Monica, California 90404 Telephone: (310) 394-6447 Telecopier: (310) 656-7701 samorai@surfcity.net	304)
10 11	Attorneys for Plaintiff Brandon Taulli	
12	SUPERIOR COURT OF 3	THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA
13 14	FOR THE COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES	
15	UNLIMITED JURISDICTION	
16	UNLIMITED	JURISDICTION
17		
18	BRANDON TAULLI,) CASE NO.: 24STCV20782
19	Plaintiff,	OMPLAINT FOR DAMAGES AND OTHER RELIEF
20	VS.	
21 22	CITY OF LOS ANGELES and DOES 1 through 100, inclusive,	DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL)
23	Defendants))
24		
25		
26		
27		
28		1
		1
	COMPLAINT FOR DAMAGES AND OTHER RELIEF, ETC.	

Plaintiff Brandon Taulli ("plaintiff") alleges as follows:

GENERAL ALLEGATIONS

1. At all relevant times hereto, plaintiff Brandon Taulli ("Taulli") was and is a white Caucasian male employed as a firefighter of the rank of Captain 1 by the City of Los Angeles Fire Department ("LAFD"), a public agency and a department of the defendant City of Los Angeles ("City"), in the County of Los Angeles, State of California, and was and is a competent adult.

- 2. At all relevant times hereto, LAFD Afara Lalaind ("Lalaind"), was and is a black African American female, and was and is employed as a firefighter of the rank of Arson Investigator/Firefighter III by the LAFD and the City, in the County of Los Angeles, State of California.
- 3. Plaintiff is informed and believes and thereon alleges that, at all relevant times hereto, defendant City was an entity committing torts in and engaged as a matter of commercial actuality in purposeful economic activity within the County of Los Angeles, State of California, and owned, controlled, or operated the LAFD. Plaintiff is informed and believes and thereon alleges that, at all relevant times hereto, the LAFD was a department of defendant City.
- 4. Plaintiff is informed and believes and thereupon alleges that defendants DOES 1 through 33, inclusive, and each of them, were, at all relevant times hereto, public, business or other entities whose form is unknown, committing torts in or engaged as a matter of commercial actuality in purposeful economic activity within the County of Los Angeles, State of California.
- 5. Plaintiff is informed and believes and thereupon alleges that defendants DOES

- 6. Plaintiff is informed and believes and thereupon alleges that defendants DOES 68 through 100, inclusive, and each of them, at all relevant times hereto, were residents of the County of Los Angeles, State of California, and were officers, directors, managing agent, principals, agents, partners, or joint venturers of defendants City of Los Angeles, or DOES 1 through 67, acting as officers, directors, managing agents, principals, agents, partners, joint venturers, supervisors, managers, administrators, owners, or in some other unknown capacity.
- 7. The true names and capacities of defendants DOE 1 through 100, and each of them, whether individual, corporate, associate or otherwise, are unknown to plaintiff at this time, who therefore sues said defendants by such fictitious names. Plaintiff will file DOE amendments, or ask leave of court to amend this complaint to assert the true names and capacities of these defendants when they have been ascertained. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and upon such information and belief alleges, that each defendant herein designated as a DOE was and is in some manner, negligently, wrongfully, or otherwise responsible and liable to plaintiff for the injuries and damages herein alleged, and that plaintiff's damages as herein alleged were legally caused by their conduct.
- 8. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and thereon alleges, that at all times material herein, the defendants, and each of them, were the agents, servants, or employees, or ostensible agents, servants, or employees of each other defendant, and as such, were acting within the course and scope of said agency and employment or ostensible

agency and employment, except on those occasions when defendants were acting as principals, in which case, said defendants, and each of them, were negligent or otherwise acted in a wrongful manner in the selection, hiring, and use of the other defendants.

- 9. Plaintiff is informed and believes that each defendant principal or employer herein had advance knowledge of the unfitness of each defendant agent or employee, and employed each such agent or employee with a conscious disregard of the rights or safety of others or otherwise authorized or ratified the wrongful conduct of each such agent or employee. As to each such corporate or other entity defendant herein, the knowledge and conscious disregard, authorization, ratification, or act of oppression, fraud, or malice was on the part of an officer, director, or managing agent of the corporation or other entity.
- 10. Plaintiff is informed and believes that the interests and business dealings of defendants, and each of them, are so closely related and intertwined that the apparent separateness of the entities is a fiction. Treating these defendants as separate would result in great inequity to plaintiff. Plaintiff is informed and believe, and thereon allege, that each of these defendants had and has a unity and commingling of interest, control, and ownership with its parent/dominant corporation, limited liability company, or other entity, with its predecessors or successors corporation, limited liability company, or other entity, or with its individual principals, officers, directors, managing agents, owners, or shareholders. Plaintiff is further informed and believe, and thereon allege, that each defendant named herein was and is so completely dominated and controlled in the affairs of a said defendant by such defendant's parent/dominant corporation,

28

and entity defendants is a fiction. Treating these defendants as separate would result in great inequity to plaintiff. 18 11. Plaintiff is informed and believes that at all times relevant hereto, defendants, 19 and each of them, acted in concert and in furtherance of the interests of each other 20 defendant.

limited liability company, or other entity, with its predecessors or successors

corporation, limited liability company, or other entity, or with its individual principals,

formalities of each such corporate, limited liability or other entity defendant had and

predecessors or successors corporation, limited liability company, or other entity, or

have ceased and had and have been ignored by the actions or omissions of the

parent/dominant corporation, limited liability company, or other entity, with its

with its individual principals, officers, directors, managing agents, owners, or

shareholders, so as to make recognition of the separate existence of each such

corporation, limited liability company, or other entity a sham, and inequitable, unjust,

and fraudulent. The interests and business dealings of defendants, and each of them,

are so closely related and intertwined that the alleged separateness of the individual

officers, directors, managing agents, owners, or shareholders that all individuality and

12. This court is the proper court in which to file suit because the misconduct of 22 23 defendants, and each of them, or the injury or damage to plaintiff caused thereby 24 occurred in its jurisdictional area. Plaintiff has exhausted all applicable administrative 25 remedies, claims, or other prerequisites for filing this action, or is excused from 26 complying with same. 27

13. At all times pertinent hereto, plaintiff has been employed by defendant City as a

25 26

23

24

27 28 firefighter with the LAFD. From the date and time that plaintiff was first employed by defendant City, through the entire tenure of plaintiff's employment with defendant City, plaintiff competently and properly performed all of the essential and other functions. responsibilities, and obligations of plaintiff's employment with defendant City.

- 14. Plaintiff is a Captain 1 employed by defendant City and the LAFD assigned to the B Platoon at LAFD Fire Station 17 located at 1616 Santa Fe Avenue, Los Angeles, California.
- 15. On or about July 11, 2023, plaintiff performed a routine check of Fire Station 17 premises when he found an unlocked vehicle and an unsecured loaded firearm therein in violation of California Penal Code §25140 and other state or federal statutes, or violation of or noncompliance with one or more local, state, or federal rules or regulations. Upon inquiry, plaintiff determined that Lalaind was responsible for the unlocked vehicle and unsecured loaded firearm. Lalaind was and is as an arson investigator employed by the LAFD, a sworn peace officer, a member of law enforcement, and an active member and executive officer of Stentorians, an activist organization whose stated agenda is the favoring in the treatment, recruiting, hiring, and promoting of African Americans within the LAFD and the City. Plaintiff informed Lalaind that having an unlocked vehicle and unsecured loaded firearm in or near the Fire Station premises was dangerous and against protocol, and further that she should always secure her vehicle and lock her firearm.
- Plaintiff thereafter consulted with multiple LAFD Captains and his LAFD Battalion 16. Commander. Plaintiff was then directed by the Battalion 1 Battalion Commander to enter a summary of the events and circumstances set forth above into the LAFD

Complaint Tracking System ("CTS") including, *inter alia*, on or about July 15, 2023, reporting and disclosing violations of LAFD Department Policies and Rules and Regulations by Lalaind. In or around July 2023 and to the present and continuing, Lalaind and the City harassed, discriminated against, and retaliated against plaintiff by, *inter alia*, making false and malicious statements about him regarding illegal vehicle search, theft, blackmail, extortion, racism, and sexism. Lalaind's and the City's statements were made outside the scope of any privileged communications.

17. On or about July 28, 2023, plaintiff was notified via phone that he had been detailed from his regular work assignment (Fire Station 17, B Platoon) to Fire Station 76, B Platoon, effective immediately, and was to report to the new work location on July 29, 2023. The LAFD Emergency Operations Commander and LAFD Professional Standards Division Commander refused to explain (written or oral) the reason for the immediate detail. The unjustified detail was and is an adverse employment action.

FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION FOR

RETALIATION (LABOR CODE SECTION 1102.5)

(BY PLAINTIFF AGAINST DEFENDANT CITY)

- 18. Plaintiff repeats and re-alleges each and every general allegation set forth above and incorporate same by reference as though set forth fully herein.
- 19. Plaintiff disclosed or reported information to defendant City, the LAFD, the Los Angeles Police Department ("LAPD"), or to other government and law enforcement agencies, or to person(s) with authority over the plaintiff, or to other co-employee(s) who had and have the authority to investigate, discover, or correct the violation or

27

28

noncompliance, or provided information to or testified before, public body(s) conducting an investigation, hearing, or inquiry, that plaintiff had reasonable cause to believe disclosed one or more violations of state or federal statutes, or one or more violations of or noncompliance with one or more local, state, or federal rules or regulations, including, inter alia, violations of or conspiracies to violate Government Code §§ 3250, et seq., Government Code §§ 12940, et seq., Labor Code § 1102.5, California Penal Code §§ 25140, et seq., the Constitution of the State of California, Article I § 8, California Constitution, Article I, § 31, federal civil rights laws including 42 USC § 2000e, et seq., and 42 USC § 12112(d)(4)(A), the First and Fourteenth Amendments to the United States Constitution, Section 5(a)(1) of the Occupational Safety and Health Act of 1970 (OSHA standards for workplace safety from workplace violence) and other violations of local, state, or federal statutes, codes, or regulations, committed by Lalaind, the City, the City, and others. Said disclosures and reports are and remain a contributing cause or factor for defendant City's engaging, inter alia, in actions and a course or pattern of conduct that, taken as a whole, materially and adversely affected and continue to affect the terms, conditions, or privileges of plaintiff's employment, including a plethora of conduct that was and is reasonably likely to impair plaintiff's job performance or prospects for advancement or promotion, including but not limited to: a) subjecting plaintiff to adverse details or transfers; b) denying plaintiff coveted or favorable job positions and assignments; c) subjecting plaintiff to ostracism; d) moving plaintiff's work locations to less desirable work locations which impeded plaintiff's ability to perform plaintiff's job duties; e) removing from plaintiff job responsibilities which

27

28

would further plaintiff's career; f) knowingly making false, misleading or malicious statements regarding plaintiff which were and are reasonably calculated to harm or destroy the reputation, authority or official standing of the plaintiff; q) causing plaintiff to sustain loss of wages, income, and other compensation; h) causing plaintiff to lose opportunities to earn overtime compensation; i) denying plaintiff other compensation or benefits; j) falsely accusing plaintiff of misconduct; k) making plaintiff the subject of multiple unfounded charges subjecting plaintiff to specious, illegal, improper, and unfounded internal and investigations; I) subjecting plaintiff to repeated violations of Government Code §§3250 and 12940, et seq. and Labor Code § 1102.5; m) repeatedly violations of the rules, regulations, policies, and procedures of defendant City or the LAFD which were and are terms and conditions of plaintiff's employment; n) engaging in a pattern of acts and conduct that collectively had a substantial and material adverse effect on the terms, conditions, and privileges of plaintiff's employment and that collectively were and are reasonably likely to impair plaintiff's job performance or prospects for advancement in vocational, employment, and other opportunities; and o) other actions having a substantial and material adverse effect on plaintiff's employment. 20. A contributing cause or contributing factor for defendant City and the Los Angeles Fire Department engaging in the foregoing adverse employment actions against plaintiff was to retaliate for the plaintiff engaging in the protected activities of

disclosing or reporting information to defendant City, the LAFD, the LAPD, or other

government or law enforcement agencies, which the plaintiff had reasonable cause to

believe disclosed violations of state or federal statutes, or violations or noncompliance

with local, state or federal rules or regulations, in violation of *Labor Code* § 1102.5, et seq.

- 21. Defendant City and the LAFD further retaliated against plaintiff for refusing to participate in activities that would result in violation of one of more state or federal statutes, or a violation or noncompliance with one or more local, state or federal rules or regulations.
- 22. Further, defendant City and the LAFD made, adopted, or enforced one or more rules, regulations, or policies preventing plaintiff from disclosing or reporting information to a government or law enforcement agency, to a person with authority over plaintiff, or to another employee who has authority to investigate, discover, or correct the violation or noncompliance, or from providing information to, or testifying before, one or more public bodies conducting an investigation, hearing, or inquiry, that plaintiff had reasonable cause to believe that the information disclosed or reported a violation of one or more state or federal statutes, or a violation of or noncompliance with one or more local, state, or federal rules or regulations.
- 23. Labor Code § 1102.5 and Government Code §§ 3250, et seq. set forth fundamental public policies which protect employees in the State of California from being subjected to retaliation and adverse employment actions based upon the protected classes, activities, and conduct set forth therein. During the term of plaintiff's employment, plaintiff was subjected and continue to be subjected to retaliation based upon plaintiff's activities and conduct protected by Labor Code § 1102.5 and Government Code §§ 3250, et seq. Said retaliation and adverse decisions and employment actions of defendant City and the LAFD caused plaintiff injury, damage,

loss, or harm.

- 24. As a legal result of the above-described conduct of defendant City, plaintiff has sustained and will continue to sustain physical, mental, and emotional injuries, pain, distress, suffering, anguish, fright, nervousness, grief, anxiety, worry, shame, mortification, injured feelings, mental suffering, shock, humiliation and indignity, as well as other unpleasant physical, mental, and emotional reactions, damages to good name, reputation, standing in the community, and other non-economic damages.
- 25. As a further legal result of the above-described conduct of defendant City, plaintiff was required, or in the future may be required, to engage the services of health care providers, and incurred expenses for medicines, health care appliances, modalities, or other related expenses in a sum to be ascertained according to proof.
- 26. As a further legal result of the above-described conduct of defendant City, plaintiff were or may be hindered, prevented, or precluded from performing plaintiff's usual activities, school work, education, and occupation, causing the plaintiff to sustain damages for loss of income, wages, earning, and earning capacity, and other economic damages, in an amount to be ascertained according to proof.
- 27. As a further legal result of the above-described conduct of defendant City, plaintiff suffered incidental, consequential, or special damages, in an amount according to proof.
- 28. As a further legal result of the above-described conduct of defendant City, plaintiff have and will continue to incur attorneys' fees and costs in an amount according to proof.

SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION FOR DISPARATE TREATMENT DISCRIMINATION IN VIOLATION OF THE CALIFORNIA FAIR EMPLOYMENT AND HOUSING ACT BASED ON SEX OR GENDER

(BY PLAINTIFF AGAINST DEFENDANT CITY OF LOS ANGELES)

- 29. Plaintiff repeats and re-alleges each and every general allegation set forth above, and incorporates same by reference as though set forth fully herein.
- 30. At all times relevant hereto, plaintiff was a male firefighter employed by the defendant City.
- 31. At all times relevant hereto, plaintiff was a member of protected class as a male.
- 32. Plaintiff's sex or gender as a male was a substantial motivating reason for defendant City discriminating against plaintiff and perpetrating the adverse employment actions taken against him in violation of the California Fair Employment and Housing Act.
- 33. The defendant City subjected plaintiff to adverse employment actions, including, inter alia: engaging, inter alia, in actions and a course or pattern of conduct that, taken as a whole, materially and adversely affected and continue to affect the terms, conditions, or privileges of plaintiff's employment, including a plethora of conduct that was and is reasonably likely to impair plaintiff's job performance or prospects for advancement or promotion, including but not limited to: a) subjecting plaintiff to adverse details or transfers; b) denying plaintiff coveted or favorable job positions and assignments; c) subjecting plaintiff to ostracism; d) moving plaintiff's work locations to less desirable work locations which impeded plaintiff's ability to perform plaintiff's job

24

25

26

27

28

duties; e) removing from plaintiff job responsibilities which would further plaintiff's career; f) knowingly making false, misleading or malicious statements regarding plaintiff which were and are reasonably calculated to harm or destroy the reputation, authority or official standing of the plaintiff; g) causing plaintiff to sustain loss of wages, income, and other compensation; h) causing plaintiff to lose opportunities to earn overtime compensation; i) denying plaintiff other compensation or benefits; j) falsely accusing plaintiff of misconduct; k) making plaintiff the subject of multiple unfounded charges subjecting plaintiff to specious, illegal, improper, and unfounded internal and investigations; I) subjecting plaintiff to repeated violations of Government Code §§3250 and 12940, et seq. and Labor Code § 1102.5; m) repeatedly violating the rules, regulations, policies, and procedures of defendant City or the LAFD which were and are terms and conditions of plaintiff's employment; n) engaging in a pattern of acts and conduct that collectively had a substantial and material adverse effect on the terms, conditions, and privileges of his employment and that collectively were and are reasonably likely to impair plaintiff's job performance or prospects for advancement in vocational, employment, and other opportunities; and o) other actions having a substantial and material adverse effect on plaintiff's employment.

- 34. The aforementioned unlawful employment practices on the part of defendant City were a substantial factor in causing plaintiff to suffer, and to continue to suffer, injury, damage, loss, or harm.
- 35. As a legal result of the above-described conduct of the defendant City, plaintiff has sustained and will continue to sustain physical, mental, and emotional injuries, pain, distress, suffering, anguish, fright, nervousness, grief, anxiety, worry, shame,

mortification, injured feelings, shock, humiliation and indignity, as well as other

- 36. As a further legal result of the above-described conduct of the defendant City, plaintiff was required, or in the future may be required, to engage the services of health care providers, and incurred expenses for medicines, health care appliances, modalities, or other related expenses in an amount to be ascertained according to proof.
- 37. As a further legal result of the above-described conduct of the defendant City, plaintiff has suffered and will continue to suffer loss of income, wages, earnings, earning capacity, loss of or impairment of plaintiff's ability to promote, loss of or impairment of plaintiff's ability to obtain employment, and other economic loss in an amount to be ascertained according to proof.
- 38. As a further legal result of the above-described conduct of the defendant City, plaintiff was or may be hindered, prevented, or precluded from performing plaintiff's usual activities, school work, education, and occupation, causing plaintiff to sustain damages for loss of income, wages, earning, and earning capacity, and other economic damages, in an amount to be ascertained according to proof.
- 39. As a further legal result of the above-described conduct of the defendant City, plaintiff suffered incidental, consequential, or special damages, in an amount to be ascertained according to proof.
- 40. As a further legal result of the above-described conduct of the defendant City,

plaintiff has and will sustain attorneys' fees and costs in an amount to be ascertained according to proof.

41. As a further legal result of the above-described conduct of the defendant City, plaintiff seeks and is entitled to prejudgment interest in an amount to be ascertained according to proof pursuant to *California Civil Code* § 3287 or any other provision of law providing for prejudgment interest.

THIRD CAUSE OF ACTION FOR DISPARATE TREATMENT DISCRIMINATION IN VIOLATION OF THE CALIFORNIA FAIR EMPLOYMENT AND HOUSING ACT BASED ON RACE OR COLOR

(BY PLAINTIFF AGAINST DEFENDANT CITY OF LOS ANGELES)

- 42. Plaintiff repeats and re-alleges each and every general allegation set forth above, and incorporates same by reference as though set forth fully herein.
- 43. At all times relevant hereto, plaintiff was a white Caucasian firefighter employed by the defendant City.
- 44. At all times relevant hereto, plaintiff was a member of protected class as a white Caucasian.
- 45. Plaintiff's race or color as a white Caucasian was a substantial motivating reason for defendant City discriminating against plaintiff and perpetrating the adverse employment actions taken against him in violation of the California Fair Employment and Housing Act.
- 46. The defendant City subjected plaintiff to adverse employment actions, including, inter alia: engaging in actions and a course or pattern of conduct that, taken as a

whole, materially and adversely affected and continue to affect the terms, conditions, or privileges of plaintiff's employment, including a plethora of conduct that was and is reasonably likely to impair plaintiff's job performance or prospects for advancement or promotion, including but not limited to: a) subjecting plaintiff to adverse details or transfers; b) denying plaintiff coveted or favorable job positions and assignments; c) subjecting plaintiff to ostracism; d) moving plaintiff's work locations to less desirable work locations which impeded plaintiff's ability to perform plaintiff's job duties; e) removing from plaintiff job responsibilities which would further plaintiff's career; f) knowingly making false, misleading or malicious statements regarding plaintiff which were and are reasonably calculated to harm or destroy the reputation, authority or official standing of the plaintiff; g) causing plaintiff to sustain loss of wages, income, and other compensation; h) causing plaintiff to lose opportunities to earn overtime compensation; i) denying plaintiff other compensation or benefits; j) falsely accusing plaintiff of misconduct; k) making plaintiff the subject of multiple unfounded charges subjecting plaintiff to specious, illegal, improper, and unfounded internal and investigations; I) subjecting plaintiff to repeated violations of Government Code §§3250 and 12940, et seq. and Labor Code § 1102.5; m) repeatedly violating the rules, regulations, policies, and procedures of defendant City or the LAFD which were and are terms and conditions of plaintiff's employment; n) engaging in a pattern of acts and conduct that collectively had a substantial and material adverse effect on the terms, conditions, and privileges of his employment and that collectively were and are reasonably likely to impair plaintiff's job performance or prospects for advancement in vocational, employment, and other opportunities; and o) other actions having a

substantial and material adverse effect on plaintiff's employment.

- 47. The aforementioned unlawful employment practices on the part of defendant City were a substantial factor in causing plaintiff to suffer, and to continue to suffer, injury, damage, loss, or harm.
- 48. As a legal result of the above-described conduct of the defendant City, plaintiff has sustained and will continue to sustain physical, mental, and emotional injuries, pain, distress, suffering, anguish, fright, nervousness, grief, anxiety, worry, shame, mortification, injured feelings, shock, humiliation and indignity, as well as other unpleasant physical, mental, and emotional reactions, damages to good name, standing in the community, loss of or damage to reputation, and other non-economic or general damages in an amount to be ascertained according to proof.
- 49. As a further legal result of the above-described conduct of the defendant City, plaintiff was required, or in the future may be required, to engage the services of health care providers, and incurred expenses for medicines, health care appliances, modalities, or other related expenses in an amount to be ascertained according to proof.
- 50. As a further legal result of the above-described conduct of the defendant City, plaintiff has suffered and will continue to suffer loss of income, wages, earnings, earning capacity, loss of or impairment of plaintiff's ability to promote, loss of or impairment of plaintiff's ability to obtain employment, and other economic loss in an amount to be ascertained according to proof.
- 51. As a further legal result of the above-described conduct of the defendant City, plaintiff was or may be hindered, prevented, or precluded from performing plaintiff's

usual activities, school work, education, and occupation, causing plaintiff to sustain damages for loss of income, wages, earning, and earning capacity, and other economic damages, in an amount to be ascertained according to proof.

- 52. As a further legal result of the above-described conduct of the defendant City, plaintiff suffered incidental, consequential, or special damages, in an amount to be ascertained according to proof.
- 53. As a further legal result of the above-described conduct of the defendant City, plaintiff has and will sustain attorneys' fees and costs in an amount to be ascertained according to proof.
- 54. As a further legal result of the above-described conduct of the defendant City, plaintiff seeks and is entitled to prejudgment interest in an amount to be ascertained according to proof pursuant to *California Civil Code* § 3287 or any other provision of law providing for prejudgment interest.

FOURTH CAUSE OF ACTION FOR DISPARATE IMPACT DISCRIMINATION BASED ON SEXUAL OR GENDER IN VIOLATION OF THE CALIFORNIA FAIR EMPLOYMENT AND HOUSING ACT (BY PLAINTIFF AGAINST DEFENDANT CITY OF LOS ANGELES)

- 55. Plaintiff repeats and re-alleges each and every general allegation set forth above, and incorporates same by reference as though set forth fully herein.
- 56. At all times relevant hereto, Lalaind was a female with the rank of arson investigator/firefighter III employed by the defendant City.
- 57. At all times relevant hereto, plaintiff was a male firefighter with the rank of

Captain 1 employed by the defendant City.

- 58. On or about December 24, 2003, the defendant City enacted Los Angeles City Ordinance 175735, which provides in pertinent part that the defendant City would adopt polices, practices, and procedure regarding persons of female sex or gender as follows:
- (a) the right to the same employment opportunities, including the application of the same criteria for selection in matters of employment and the right to receive access to and vocational training for nontraditional jobs;
- (b) the right to promotion, job security and all benefits and conditions of service, regardless of parental status, particularly encouraging the appointment of women to decision-making posts, city revenue generating and managing commissions and departments.
- 59. On or about August 26, 2015, the Mayor of defendant City issued Executive Directive 11, in which the Mayor ordered agents or employees of defendant City in pertinent part as follows:

"Each General Manager or Head of Department Office shall designate a Gender Equity Liaison for the Department Office, and shall notify my Office of that person's name and contact information (including when there is a subsequent personnel change or change to that person's contact information).

I hereby create the Gender Equity Coalition, which shall be comprised of the departmental Gender Equity Liaisons and representatives from, and designated by, my Office. Each General Manager or Head of Department Office shall ensure departmental Gender Equity Liaison representation at regular Gender Equity Coalition meetings held by my Office.

The Gender Equity Coalition shall:

coordinate with the Commission on the Status of Women to fulfill the City's responsibilities under the City's CEDAW ordinance;

review and monitor all plans and dashboards required by this Executive Directive;

identify additional goals and critical areas that require focus, including targeting women from particularly vulnerable groups such as transgender women, women living with HIV/AIDS, undocumented women, lesbians, women of color, seniors, and young women and girls; and

form working groups as necessary to achieve specific results that will lead to greater gender parity.

By February 1, 2016, each General Manager or Head of Department Office shall submit to my Office a Gender Equity Action Plan to implement a gender-equity strategy that:

upholds an inclusive work environment that promotes fairness and fosters the equal participation of women in leadership positions at all levels;

tracks recruitment in fields where women remain under represented (such as public safety, science, technology, engineering, and mathematics) and addresses such under representation;

tracks contracts and promotes ways to ensure equal contracting opportunities for women-owned business enterprises;

evaluates City services to discover ways to increase gender parity and to promote equal opportunities for, and the advancement of, women and girls;

provides any raw data regarding sex and gender on the City's open-data portal;

identifies and develops baseline metrics regarding the status of women and girls in relation to the Department Office; and

publishes to my Office's online Gender Equity Dashboard metrics and indicators related to the status of women and girls.

The General Manager of the Personnel Department and the City Administrative Officer collaboratively shall conduct salary analyses on an as-needed basis to ensure that there is no gender wage gap between City employees holding comparable positions. All other General Managers, Heads of Departments Offices, and Commissions of City Government shall ensure the cooperation of their Departments/Offices/Commissions with these tasks."

60. On or about July 18, 2016, the Fire Chief of the LAFD issued a Gender Equity Action Report, which provided in pertinent part as follows:

"For every 250 available firefighter positions, the Department receives between 10,000 to 12,000 applicants." Outreach and Mentoring Goals for the 2016 fiscal year: ...

The Preparatory Unit to train and mentor at least 250 new (female) candidates." (Emphasis added.)"

61. The Gender Equity Action Report, also provided in pertinent part that the LAFD implemented and utilized written testing using a "Stratified Random Sampling" (SRS) of candidates to occur after passing the written exam versus prior to taking the written exam, which involved an alleged random sampling from the applicant pool to produce a

smaller group of applicants that is demographically proportionate to the original pool of applicants. For example, if 10% of the applicants are female then 10% will be invited to interview from the female group of applicants." (Emphasis added.)

- 62. The defendant City and the LAFD have illegally and improperly implemented and utilized Los Angeles City Ordinance 175735, Executive Directive 11, and the LAFD's Gender Equity Action Report and other alleged "gender equity" polices, procedures, and protocols to engage in a systematic pattern of harassment, discrimination, and retaliation against male firefighters employed by the LAFD, including plaintiff, and others.
- 63. The Los Angeles Women in the Fire Service was and are an activist organization comprised almost exclusively of female firefighters whose stated agenda is to advocate for the recruitment, hiring, and promotion of females to command staff and other positions in the LAFD. The stated agenda of the Los Angeles Women in the Fire Service is to implement the LAFD's Affirmative Action program disparately discriminating in favor of females in the recruitment, hiring, and promotion of females. The Los Angeles Women in the Fire Service had and has extensive influence in regard to issues regarding the LAFD, including recruitment, promotional and, disciplinary matters, and substantial access to and influence with the Mayor, City Council, and other officials of the City, including Kristin Crowley, the current Fire Chief of the LAFD, and other members of the LAFD Command Staff.
- 64. Upon information and belief, Lalaind was or is a member of the Los Angeles Women in the Fire Service or is associated therewith. Upon information and belief, multiple command staff members and others involved with the matters and issues 22

regarding Lalaind and plaintiff are members of the Los Angeles Women in the Fire Service or are associated therewith, including, *inter alia*, Fire Chief Kristin Crowley, former Assistant Chief and commanding officer of the LAFD Professional Standards Division ("PSD") and now Deputy Chief Kristina Kepner, and other members of the LAFD, and engaged in harassing, discriminatory, or retaliatory conduct in favor of Lalaind, a female, and against plaintiff, a male.

- 65. Lalaind's sex or gender as a female was a substantial motivating reason for defendant City engaging in favoritism in favor of Lalaind based upon Lalaind's sex or gender and have and will continue to have a discriminatory impact against plaintiff, a male, including, *inter alia*, the perpetrating of the adverse employment actions taken against plaintiff in violation of the California Fair Employment and Housing Act.
- 66. The discrimination and harassment based upon sexual or gender favoritism in favor of female employees of the LAFD and the City in the workplace was and is severe or pervasive. A reasonable male in plaintiff's circumstances would have considered and continued to consider the work environment to be hostile, intimidating, offensive, oppressive, or abusive because of the sexual or gender favoritism. Plaintiff considered and considers the work environment to be hostile, intimidating, offensive, oppressive, or abusive because of the sexual or gender favoritism. The City participated in, assisted or encouraged the sexual or gender favoritism.
- 67. As a result of the above disparate impact of the ordinances, executive directives. and "gender equity" policies, procedures, protocols of defendant City favoring females based on sex or gender, defendant City subjected plaintiff to adverse employment actions, including, *inter alia*, in actions and a course or pattern of conduct that, taken as

a whole, materially and adversely affected and continue to affect the terms, conditions, or privileges of plaintiff's employment, including a plethora of conduct that was and is reasonably likely to impair plaintiff's job performance or prospects for advancement or promotion, including but not limited to: a) subjecting plaintiff to adverse details or transfers; b) denying plaintiff coveted or favorable job positions and assignments; c) subjecting plaintiff to ostracism; d) moving plaintiff's work locations to less desirable work locations which impeded plaintiff's ability to perform plaintiff's job duties; e) removing from plaintiff job responsibilities which would further plaintiff's career; f) knowingly making false, misleading or malicious statements regarding plaintiff which were and are reasonably calculated to harm or destroy the reputation, authority or official standing of the plaintiff; g) causing plaintiff to sustain loss of wages, income, and other compensation; h) causing plaintiff to lose opportunities to earn overtime compensation; i) denying plaintiff other compensation or benefits; j) falsely accusing plaintiff of misconduct; k) making plaintiff the subject of multiple unfounded charges subjecting plaintiff to specious, illegal, improper, and unfounded internal and investigations; I) subjecting plaintiff to repeated violations of Government Code §§3250 and 12940, et seq. and Labor Code § 1102.5; m) repeatedly violating the rules, regulations, policies, and procedures of defendant City or the LAFD which were and are terms and conditions of plaintiff's employment; n) engaging in a pattern of acts and conduct that collectively had a substantial and material adverse effect on the terms, conditions, and privileges of his employment and that collectively were and are reasonably likely to impair plaintiff's job performance or prospects for advancement in vocational, employment, and other opportunities; and o) other actions having a

substantial and material adverse effect on plaintiff's employment.

- 68. The aforementioned unlawful employment practices on the part of defendant City were a substantial factor in causing plaintiff to suffer, and to continue to suffer, injury, damage, loss, or harm.
- 69. As a legal result of the above-described conduct of the defendant City, plaintiff has sustained and will continue to sustain physical, mental, and emotional injuries, pain, distress, suffering, anguish, fright, nervousness, grief, anxiety, worry, shame, mortification, injured feelings, shock, humiliation and indignity, as well as other unpleasant physical, mental, and emotional reactions, damages to good name, standing in the community, loss of or damage to reputation, and other non-economic or general damages in an amount to be ascertained according to proof.
- 70. As a further legal result of the above-described conduct of the defendant City, plaintiff was required, or in the future may be required, to engage the services of health care providers, and incurred expenses for medicines, health care appliances, modalities, or other related expenses in an amount to be ascertained according to proof.
- 71. As a further legal result of the above-described conduct of the defendant City, plaintiff has suffered and will continue to suffer loss of income, wages, earnings, earning capacity, loss of or impairment of plaintiff's ability to promote, loss of or impairment of plaintiff's ability to obtain employment, and other economic loss in an amount to be ascertained according to proof.
- 72. As a further legal result of the above-described conduct of the defendant City, plaintiff was or may be hindered, prevented, or precluded from performing plaintiff's

usual activities, school work, education, and occupation, causing plaintiff to sustain damages for loss of income, wages, earning, and earning capacity, and other economic damages, in an amount to be ascertained according to proof.

- 73. As a further legal result of the above-described conduct of the defendant City, plaintiff suffered incidental, consequential, or special damages, in an amount to be ascertained according to proof.
- 74. As a further legal result of the above-described conduct of the defendant City, plaintiff has and will sustain attorneys' fees and costs in an amount to be ascertained according to proof.
- 75. As a further legal result of the above-described conduct of the defendant City, plaintiff seeks and is entitled to prejudgment interest in an amount to be ascertained according to proof pursuant to *California Civil Code* § 3287 or any other provision of law providing for prejudgment interest.

SIXTH CAUSE OF ACTION FOR DISPARATE IMPACT DISCRIMINATION IN VIOLATION OF THE CALIFORNIA FAIR EMPLOYMENT AND HOUSING ACT BASED ON RACE OR COLOR

(BY PLAINTIFF AGAINST DEFENDANT CITY OF LOS ANGELES)

- 76. Plaintiff repeats and re-alleges each and every general allegation set forth above, and incorporates same by reference as though set forth fully herein.
- 77. At all times relevant hereto, plaintiff was a white Caucasian firefighter employed by the defendant City.
- 78. At all times relevant hereto, plaintiff was a member of a protected class as a

8

11

12 13

15

16

14

17

18 19

20 21

22

23 24

25 26

27

28

white Caucasian.

79. The Stentorians are an activist organization comprised almost exclusively of African American firefighters whose stated agenda is to advocate for the recruitment and promotion of African Americans to command staff and other positions in the Los Angeles City and County Fire Departments. The logo of the Stentorians is a flaming black fist clutching an axe. The Stentorians had and have extensive political influence with the defendant City of Los Angeles and the LAFD, and substantial access to and influence with the Mayor, City Council, and other officials of the City of Los Angeles. Four of the previous five Fire Chiefs of the LAFD have been African American black members of the Stentorians. Upon information and belief, the current LAFD Fire Chief is also a member of the Stentorians. No other racial or ethnic association has more influence in regard to issues regarding the LAFD, including recruitment, promotional and, disciplinary matters, and access to and influence with, the Mayor, City Council, and other officials of the City of Los Angeles, including Kristin Crowley, the current Fire Chief of the LAFD, and other members of the LAFD Command Staff, regarding such matters than the Stentorians. Upon information and belief, the defendant City of Los Angeles and the LAFD gave or otherwise provided the Stentorians with former LAFD Fire Station 46 and later former LAFD Fire Station 30 to be used as the headquarters of the Stentorians.

80. Lalaind was and is a member of the Stentorians and an executive officer of the Stentorians. Upon information and belief, multiple command staff members involved with the matters and issues regarding Lalaind and plaintiff are members of the Stentorians or are associated therewith, and engaged in harassing, discriminatory, or

retaliatory conduct in favor of Lalaind, a black African American, and against plaintiff, a white Caucasian.

- 81. The LAFD and the City had and has employment policies and practices favoring African Americans and blacks, including alleged diversity, equity, and inclusion policies and practices, that had a disproportionate adverse impact and effect on white Caucasians, such as plaintiff. Plaintiff was harmed by those employment policies and practices, and the LAFD and the City's discriminatory employment policies, practices, protocols based on "racial equity" were and are a substantial factor in causing plaintiff harm.
- 82. Lalaind's race or color as a black African American was a substantial motivating reason for defendant City engaging in racially discriminatory favoritism in favor of Lalaind based upon Lalaind's race or color and have had and will continue to have a discriminatory impact against plaintiff, a white Caucasian, including, *inter alia*, the perpetrating of the adverse employment actions taken against plaintiff in violation of the California Fair Employment and Housing Act.
- 83. The discrimination and harassment based upon racial favoritism or color in favor of African American or black employees of the LAFD and the City in the workplace was and is severe or pervasive. A reasonable white Caucasian person in plaintiff's circumstances would have considered and continued to consider the work environment to be hostile, intimidating, offensive, oppressive, or abusive because of the racial or color favoritism. Plaintiff considered and considers the work environment to be hostile, intimidating, offensive, oppressive, or abusive because of the racial or color favoritism. The City participated in, assisted or encouraged the racial or color favoritism.

- 84. Lailand's race or color as a black African American was a substantial motivating reason for defendant City discriminating against plaintiff and perpetrating the adverse employment actions taken against him in violation of the California Fair Employment and Housing Act.
- 85. The defendant City subjected plaintiff to adverse employment actions, including, inter alia: engaging in actions and a course or pattern of conduct that, taken as a whole, materially and adversely affected and continue to affect the terms, conditions, or privileges of plaintiff's employment, including a plethora of conduct that was and is reasonably likely to impair plaintiff's job performance or prospects for advancement or promotion, including but not limited to: a) subjecting plaintiff to adverse details or transfers; b) denying plaintiff coveted or favorable job positions and assignments; c) subjecting plaintiff to ostracism; d) moving plaintiff's work locations to less desirable work locations which impeded plaintiff's ability to perform plaintiff's job duties; e) removing from plaintiff job responsibilities which would further plaintiff's career; f) knowingly making false, misleading or malicious statements regarding plaintiff which were and are reasonably calculated to harm or destroy the reputation, authority or official standing of the plaintiff; g) causing plaintiff to sustain loss of wages, income, and other compensation; h) causing plaintiff to lose opportunities to earn overtime compensation; i) denying plaintiff other compensation or benefits; j) falsely accusing plaintiff of misconduct; k) making plaintiff the subject of multiple unfounded charges subjecting plaintiff to specious, illegal, improper, and unfounded internal and investigations; I) subjecting plaintiff to repeated violations of Government Code §§3250 and 12940, et seq. and Labor Code § 1102.5; m) repeatedly violating the rules,

regulations, policies, and procedures of defendant City or the LAFD which were and are terms and conditions of plaintiff's employment; n) engaging in a pattern of acts and conduct that collectively had a substantial and material adverse effect on the terms, conditions, and privileges of his employment and that collectively were and are reasonably likely to impair plaintiff's job performance or prospects for advancement in vocational, employment, and other opportunities; and o) other actions having a substantial and material adverse effect on plaintiff's employment.

- 86. The aforementioned unlawful employment practices on the part of defendant City were a substantial factor in causing plaintiff to suffer, and to continue to suffer, injury, damage, loss, or harm.
- 87. As a legal result of the illegal and other misconduct of Lalaind, the City, and others, plaintiff was subjected to a pattern of adverse employment actions, including, inter alia: a) subjecting plaintiff to adverse details or transfers; b) denying plaintiff coveted or favorable job positions and assignments; c) subjecting plaintiff to ostracism; d) moving plaintiff's work locations to less desirable work locations which impeded plaintiff's ability to perform plaintiff's job duties; e) removing from plaintiff job responsibilities which would further plaintiff's career; f) knowingly making false, misleading or malicious statements regarding plaintiff which were and are reasonably calculated to harm or destroy the reputation, authority or official standing of the plaintiff; g) causing plaintiff to sustain loss of wages, income, and other compensation; h) causing plaintiff to lose opportunities to earn overtime compensation; i) denying plaintiff other compensation or benefits; j) falsely accusing plaintiff of misconduct; k) making plaintiff the subject of multiple unfounded charges subjecting plaintiff to specious,

illegal, improper, and unfounded internal and investigations; I) subjecting plaintiff to repeated violations of *Government Code* §§3250 and 12940, et seq. and *Labor Code* § 1102.5; m) repeatedly violating the rules, regulations, policies, and procedures of defendant City or the LAFD which were and are terms and conditions of plaintiff's employment; n) engaging in a pattern of acts and conduct that collectively had a substantial and material adverse effect on the terms, conditions, and privileges of his employment and that collectively were and are reasonably likely to impair plaintiff's job performance or prospects for advancement in vocational, employment, and other opportunities; and o) other actions having a substantial and material adverse effect on plaintiff's employment.

88. A contributing cause/factor/motivating reason for the LAFD and the City engaging in the foregoing adverse employment actions against complainant was the disparate impact on complainant and other white Caucasians caused by employment policies, practices, protocols regarding "racial equity" that the LAFD and the City have implemented and executed that have the disparate impact of discriminating against plaintiff and other white Caucasians. The LAFD and the City had and has employment policies and practices favoring African Americans and blacks, including alleged diversity, equity, and inclusion policies and practices, that had and have a disproportionate adverse impact and effect on white Caucasians, including plaintiff. The LAFD and the City's employment policies and practices were and are a substantial factor in causing harm to plaintiff.

89. As a legal result of the above-described conduct of the defendant City, plaintiff

19 20

21 22

23 24

25

26 27

28

has sustained and will continue to sustain physical, mental, and emotional injuries, pain, distress, suffering, anguish, fright, nervousness, grief, anxiety, worry, shame, mortification, injured feelings, shock, humiliation and indignity, as well as other unpleasant physical, mental, and emotional reactions, damages to good name, standing in the community, loss of or damage to reputation, and other non-economic or general damages in an amount to be ascertained according to proof.

- 90. As a further legal result of the above-described conduct of the defendant City, plaintiff was required, or in the future may be required, to engage the services of health care providers, and incurred expenses for medicines, health care appliances, modalities, or other related expenses in an amount to be ascertained according to proof.
- 91. As a further legal result of the above-described conduct of the defendant City, plaintiff has suffered and will continue to suffer loss of income, wages, earnings, earning capacity, loss of or impairment of plaintiff's ability to promote, loss of or impairment of plaintiff's ability to obtain employment, and other economic loss in an amount to be ascertained according to proof.
- 92. As a further legal result of the above-described conduct of the defendant City, plaintiff was or may be hindered, prevented, or precluded from performing plaintiff's usual activities, school work, education, and occupation, causing plaintiff to sustain damages for loss of income, wages, earning, and earning capacity, and other economic damages, in an amount to be ascertained according to proof.
- 93. As a further legal result of the above-described conduct of the defendant City, plaintiff suffered incidental, consequential, or special damages, in an amount to be 32

ascertained according to proof.

- 94. As a further legal result of the above-described conduct of the defendant City, plaintiff has and will sustain attorneys' fees and costs in an amount to be ascertained according to proof.
- 95. As a further legal result of the above-described conduct of the defendant City, plaintiff seeks and is entitled to prejudgment interest in an amount to be ascertained according to proof pursuant to *California Civil Code* § 3287 or any other provision of law providing for prejudgment interest.

SEVENTH CAUSE OF ACTION FOR RETALIATION IN VIOLATION OF THE CALIFORNIA FAIR EMPLOYMENT AND HOUSING ACT (BY PLAINTIFF AGAINST DEFENDANT CITY OF LOS ANGELES)

- 96. Plaintiff repeats and re-alleges each and every general allegation set forth above, and incorporates same by reference as though set forth fully herein.
- 97. At all times relevant hereto, plaintiff engaged in legally protected activities, including, *inter alia*, opposing practices forbidden by the California Fair Employment and Housing Act or because plaintiff had filed or made complaints, testified in, or assisted in proceedings under the California Fair Employment and Housing Act.
- 98. Plaintiff's engaging in the protected activities of, *inter alia*, opposing practices forbidden by the California Fair Employment and Housing Act or because plaintiff had filed or made complaints, testified in, or assisted in proceedings under the California Fair Employment and Housing Act were and are a substantial motivating reason for defendant City retaliating against plaintiff and perpetrating the adverse employment

28

actions taken against plaintiff.

99. The defendant City subjected plaintiff to adverse employment actions, including, inter alia: a) subjecting plaintiff to adverse details or transfers; b) denying plaintiff coveted or favorable job positions and assignments; c) subjecting plaintiff to ostracism; d) moving plaintiff's work locations to less desirable work locations which impeded plaintiff's ability to perform plaintiff's job duties; e) removing from plaintiff job responsibilities which would further plaintiff's career; f) knowingly making false, misleading or malicious statements regarding plaintiff which were and are reasonably calculated to harm or destroy the reputation, authority or official standing of the plaintiff; g) causing plaintiff to sustain loss of wages, income, and other compensation; h) causing plaintiff to lose opportunities to earn overtime compensation; i) denying plaintiff other compensation or benefits; j) falsely accusing plaintiff of misconduct; k) making plaintiff the subject of multiple unfounded charges subjecting plaintiff to specious, illegal, improper, and unfounded internal and investigations; I) subjecting plaintiff to repeated violations of Government Code §§3250 and 12940, et seq. and Labor Code § 1102.5; m) repeatedly violating the rules, regulations, policies, and procedures of defendant City or the LAFD which were and are terms and conditions of plaintiff's employment; n) engaging in a pattern of acts and conduct that collectively had a substantial and material adverse effect on the terms, conditions, and privileges of his employment and that collectively were and are reasonably likely to impair plaintiff's job performance or prospects for advancement in vocational, employment, and other opportunities; and o) other actions having a substantial and material adverse effect on

plaintiff's employment.

- 100. The aforementioned unlawful employment practices on the part of defendant City were a substantial factor in causing plaintiff to suffer, and to continue to suffer, injury, damage, loss, or harm.
- 101. As a legal result of the above-described conduct of the defendant City, plaintiff has sustained and will continue to sustain physical, mental, and emotional injuries, pain, distress, suffering, anguish, fright, nervousness, grief, anxiety, worry, shame, mortification, injured feelings, shock, humiliation and indignity, as well as other unpleasant physical, mental, and emotional reactions, damages to good name, standing in the community, loss of or damage to reputation, and other non-economic or general damages in an amount to be ascertained according to proof.
- 102. As a further legal result of the above-described conduct of the defendant City, plaintiff was required, or in the future may be required, to engage the services of health care providers, and incurred expenses for medicines, health care appliances, modalities, or other related expenses in an amount to be ascertained according to proof.
- 103. As a further legal result of the above-described conduct of the defendant City, plaintiff has suffered and will continue to suffer loss of income, wages, earnings, earning capacity, loss of or impairment of plaintiff's ability to promote, loss of or impairment of plaintiff's ability to obtain employment, and other economic loss in an amount to be ascertained according to proof.
- 104. As a further legal result of the above-described conduct of the defendant City, plaintiff was or may be hindered, prevented, or precluded from performing plaintiff's 35

usual activities, school work, education, and occupation, causing plaintiff to sustain damages for loss of income, wages, earning, and earning capacity, and other economic damages, in an amount to be ascertained according to proof.

- 105. As a further legal result of the above-described conduct of the defendant City, plaintiff suffered incidental, consequential, or special damages, in an amount to be ascertained according to proof.
- 106. As a further legal result of the above-described conduct of the defendant City, plaintiff has and will sustain attorneys' fees and costs in an amount to be ascertained according to proof.
- 107. As a further legal result of the above-described conduct of the defendant City, plaintiff seeks and is entitled to prejudgment interest in an amount to be ascertained according to proof pursuant to *California Civil Code* § 3287 or any other provision of law providing for prejudgment interest.

EIGHTH CAUSE OF ACTION FOR

FOR FAILURE TO TAKE ALL REASONABLE STEPS NECESSARY TO PREVENT DISCRIMINATION AND

RETALIATION FROM OCCURRING IN VIOLATION OF THE CALIFORNIA FAIR EMPLOYMENT AND HOUSING ACT

(BY PLAINTIFF AGAINST DEFENDANT CITY OF LOS ANGELES)

- 108. Plaintiff repeats and re-alleges each and every general allegation set forth above, and incorporates same by reference as though set forth fully herein.
- 109. Defendant City and the LAFD had and have a duty to take all reasonable steps

27

28

necessary to prevent discrimination and retaliation from occurring. Defendant failed to take all reasonable steps necessary to prevent discrimination and retaliation from occurring to plaintiff, and failed and refused and continue to fail and refuse to take immediate and appropriate corrective action in regard thereto. As a result of such conduct by defendant City and the LAFD, plaintiff was subjected to discrimination or retaliation, or was rendered helpless to remedy or stop the discrimination or retaliation. The defendant City and the LAFD failed to take all reasonable steps to prevent, discrimination and retaliation from occurring to plaintiff as required by Government Code § 12940(j), et seq., Government Code § 12940(k), et seq. and other authorities. The LAFD and the defendant City failed and refused to conduct proper threat assessments and discrimination and retaliation investigations as required by defendant City's own practices, policies, and procedures and the law. Defendant City and the LAFD, and their agents or supervisors, knew or should have known of Lalaind's misconduct and the misconduct of other agents or employees of the City or the LAFD, and have failed and refused and continue to fail and refuse to take immediate and appropriate corrective action in regard thereto.

- 111. The failure of defendant City and the LAFD to take all reasonable steps necessary to prevent discrimination and retaliation from occurring, and failing and refusing and continuing to fail and refuse to take immediate and appropriate corrective action in regard thereto, has caused plaintiff injury, damage, loss, or harm.
- 112. Said actions and conduct of defendant City and the LAFD consisting of the aforementioned failure to take all reasonable steps necessary to prevent discrimination or retaliation from occurring, and failing and refusing and continuing to fail and refuse

28

to take immediate and appropriate corrective action in regard thereto, constitute unlawful employment practices pursuant to *California Government Code* § 12940, et seq. Such violations were a substantial factor in causing damages and injuries to plaintiff as set forth below.

113. The defendant City subjected plaintiff to adverse employment actions, including, inter alia: a) subjecting plaintiff to adverse details or transfers; b) denying plaintiff coveted or favorable job positions and assignments; c) subjecting plaintiff to ostracism; d) moving plaintiff's work locations to less desirable work locations which impeded plaintiff's ability to perform plaintiff's job duties; e) removing from plaintiff job responsibilities which would further plaintiff's career; f) knowingly making false, misleading or malicious statements regarding plaintiff which were and are reasonably calculated to harm or destroy the reputation, authority or official standing of the plaintiff; g) causing plaintiff to sustain loss of wages, income, and other compensation; h) causing plaintiff to lose opportunities to earn overtime compensation; i) denying plaintiff other compensation or benefits; j) falsely accusing plaintiff of misconduct; k) making plaintiff the subject of multiple unfounded charges subjecting plaintiff to specious, illegal, improper, and unfounded internal and investigations; I) subjecting plaintiff to repeated violations of Government Code §§3250 and 12940, et seq. and Labor Code § 1102.5; m) repeatedly violating the rules, regulations, policies, and procedures of defendant City or the LAFD which were and are terms and conditions of plaintiff's employment; n) engaging in a pattern of acts and conduct that collectively had a substantial and material adverse effect on the terms, conditions, and privileges of his

employment and that collectively were and are reasonably likely to impair plaintiff's job performance or prospects for advancement in vocational, employment, and other opportunities; and o) other actions having a substantial and material adverse effect on plaintiff's employment.

- 114. The aforementioned unlawful employment practices on the part of defendant City were a substantial factor in causing plaintiff to suffer, and to continue to suffer, injury, damage, loss, or harm.
- 115. As a legal result of the above-described conduct of the defendant City, plaintiff has sustained and will continue to sustain physical, mental, and emotional injuries, pain, distress, suffering, anguish, fright, nervousness, grief, anxiety, worry, shame, mortification, injured feelings, shock, humiliation and indignity, as well as other unpleasant physical, mental, and emotional reactions, damages to good name, standing in the community, loss of and/or damage to reputation, and other non-economic or general damages in an amount to be ascertained according to proof.
- 116. As a further legal result of the above-described conduct of the defendant City, plaintiff was required, or in the future may be required, to engage the services of health care providers, and incurred expenses for medicines, health care appliances, modalities, or other related expenses in an amount to be ascertained according to proof.
- 117. As a further legal result of the above-described conduct of the defendant City, plaintiff has suffered and will continue to suffer loss of income, wages, earnings, earning capacity, loss of or impairment of plaintiff's ability to promote, loss of and/or

25

22

26 27

28

amount to be ascertained according to proof.

- 118. As a further legal result of the above-described conduct of the defendant City, plaintiff was or may be hindered, prevented, and/or precluded from performing plaintiff's usual activities, school work, education, and occupation, causing plaintiff to sustain damages for loss of income, wages, earning, and earning capacity, and other economic damages, in an amount to be ascertained according to proof.
- 119. As a further legal result of the above-described conduct of the defendant City, plaintiff suffered incidental, consequential, and/or special damages, in an amount to be ascertained according to proof.
- 120. As a further legal result of the above-described conduct of the defendant City, plaintiff has and will sustain attorneys' fees and costs in an amount to be ascertained according to proof.
- 121. As a further legal result of the above-described conduct of the defendant City, plaintiff seeks and is entitled to prejudgment interest in an amount to be ascertained according to proof pursuant to California Civil Code § 3287 and/or any other provision of law providing for prejudgment interest.

NINTH CAUSE OF ACTION FOR

VIOLATION OF THE CALIFORNIA CONSTITUTION, ARTICLE I, §§ 8 AND 31 (BY PLAINTIFF AGAINST DEFENDANT CITY)

Plaintiff repeats and re-alleges each and every general allegation set forth above, and incorporates same by reference as though set forth fully herein.

123. The California Constitution, Article I, § 8 provides as follows:

"§ 8. Employment discrimination

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." (Emphasis added.)

124. The California Constitution, Article I, § 31, provides in pertinent part as follows:

"§ 31. Affirmative action

- (a) The state shall not discriminate against, or grant preferential treatment to, any individual or group on the basis of race, sex, color, ethnicity, or national origin in the operation of public employment, public education, or public contracting. ...
- (f) For the purposes of this section, "state" shall include, but not necessarily be limited to, the state itself, **any city**, county, city and county, public university system, including the University of California, community college district, school district, special district, or any other political subdivision or governmental instrumentality of or within the state.
- (g) The remedies available for violations of this section shall be the same, regardless of the injured party's race, sex, color, ethnicity, or national origin, as are otherwise available for violations of then-existing California antidiscrimination law.
- (h) This section shall be self-executing. If any part or parts of this section are found to be in conflict with federal law or the United States Constitution, the section shall be implemented to the maximum extent that federal law and the United States Constitution permit. Any provision held invalid shall be severable from the remaining portions of this

section. (Emphasis added.)

Defendant City and the LAFD have engaged and continue to engage in granting preferential treatment (i.e., "affirmative action") to African Americans, blacks, and females on the basis of race, sex, color, ethnicity, or national origin in the operation of the public employment of firefighters, including but not limited to granting preferential treatment to Lalaind, and discriminate against males and white Caucasians, including plaintiff, on the basis of race, sex, color, ethnicity, or national origin. 126. As a result of defendant City violating the California Constitution, Article I, §§ 8 and 31, defendant City subjected plaintiff to adverse employment actions, including, inter alia: a) subjecting plaintiff to adverse details or transfers; b) denying plaintiff coveted or favorable job positions and assignments; c) subjecting plaintiff to ostracism; d) moving plaintiff's work locations to less desirable work locations which impeded plaintiff's ability to perform plaintiff's job duties; e) removing from plaintiff job responsibilities which would further plaintiff's career; f) knowingly making false, misleading or malicious statements regarding plaintiff which were and are reasonably calculated to harm or destroy the reputation, authority or official standing of the plaintiff; g) causing plaintiff to sustain loss of wages, income, and other compensation; h) causing plaintiff to lose opportunities to earn overtime compensation; i) denying plaintiff other compensation or benefits; j) falsely accusing plaintiff of misconduct; k) making plaintiff the subject of multiple unfounded charges subjecting plaintiff to specious,

repeated violations of Government Code §§3250 and 12940, et seq. and Labor Code §

illegal, improper, and unfounded internal and investigations; I) subjecting plaintiff to

1102.5; m) repeatedly violating the rules, regulations, policies, and procedures of

defendant City or the LAFD which were and are terms and conditions of plaintiff's employment; n) engaging in a pattern of acts and conduct that collectively had a substantial and material adverse effect on the terms, conditions, and privileges of his employment and that collectively were and are reasonably likely to impair plaintiff's job performance or prospects for advancement in vocational, employment, and other opportunities; and o) other actions having a substantial and material adverse effect on plaintiff's employment.

- 127. The aforementioned unlawful employment practices on the part of defendant City were a substantial factors in causing plaintiff to suffer, and to continue to suffer, injury, damage, loss, or harm.
- 128. A contributing cause/factor/motivating reason for the LAFD and the City engaging in the foregoing adverse employment actions against complainant was the City and the LAFD granting and continuing to grant preferential treatment to Lalaind and other individuals or groups on the basis of race, sex, color, ethnicity, or national origin in the operation of public employment, public education, or public contracting, in violation of the *California Constitution*, Article I, §§ 8 and 31, while treating complainant and other white males disparately and adversely.
- 129. As set forth in the *California Constitution*, Article I, § 31(g) the remedies available to and sought by plaintiff for the violations by the City of the California Constitution are the same as are otherwise available for violations of California antidiscrimination law.
- 130. As a legal result of the above-described conduct of the defendant City, plaintiff has sustained and will continue to sustain physical, mental, and emotional injuries,

pain, distress, suffering, anguish, fright, nervousness, grief, anxiety, worry, shame, mortification, injured feelings, shock, humiliation and indignity, as well as other unpleasant physical, mental, and emotional reactions, damages to good name, standing in the community, loss of or damage to reputation, and other non-economic or general damages in an amount to be ascertained according to proof.

- 131. As a further legal result of the above-described conduct of the defendant City, plaintiff was required, or in the future may be required, to engage the services of health care providers, and incurred expenses for medicines, health care appliances, modalities, or other related expenses in an amount to be ascertained according to proof.
- 132. As a further legal result of the above-described conduct of the defendant City, plaintiff has suffered and will continue to suffer loss of income, wages, earnings, earning capacity, loss of or impairment of plaintiff's ability to promote, loss of or impairment of plaintiff's ability to obtain employment, and other economic loss in an amount to be ascertained according to proof.
- 133. As a further legal result of the above-described conduct of the defendant City, plaintiff was or may be hindered, prevented, or precluded from performing plaintiff's usual activities, school work, education, and occupation, causing plaintiff to sustain damages for loss of income, wages, earning, and earning capacity, and other economic damages, in an amount to be ascertained according to proof.
- 134. As a further legal result of the above-described conduct of the defendant City, plaintiff suffered incidental, consequential, or special damages, in an amount to be ascertained according to proof.

135. As a further legal result of the above-described conduct of the defendant City, plaintiff has and will sustain attorneys' fees and costs in an amount to be ascertained according to proof.

136. As a further legal result of the above-described conduct of the defendant City, plaintiff seeks and is entitled to prejudgment interest in an amount to be ascertained according to proof pursuant to *California Civil Code* § 3287 or any other provision of law providing for prejudgment interest.

TENTH CAUSE OF ACTION FOR

(BY PLAINTIFF AGAINST DEFENDANT CITY)

- 137. Plaintiff repeats and re-alleges each and every allegation set forth above, and incorporate same by reference as though set forth fully herein.
- 138. Defendants' conduct was outrageous since the conduct was so extreme that it went beyond all possible bounds of decency, and a reasonable person would regard the conduct as intolerable in a civilized community. Defendants knew that defendants' conduct would likely result in harm to plaintiff due to mental distress.
- 139. Defendants intended to cause plaintiff emotional distress, or acted with reckless disregard of the probability that plaintiff would suffer emotional distress, knowing that plaintiff was present when the conduct occurred.
- 140. Plaintiff has and will suffered severe emotional distress.
- 141. Defendants' conduct was a substantial factor in causing plaintiff severe emotional distress.

142. As a legal result of the above-described conduct of defendants, plaintiff has				
sustained and will continue to sustain physical, mental, and emotional injuries, pain,				
distress, suffering, anguish, fright, nervousness, grief, anxiety, worry, shame,				
mortification, injured feelings, mental suffering, shock, humiliation and indignity, as well				
as other unpleasant physical, mental, and emotional reactions, damages to good name				
reputation, standing in the community, and other non-economic damages.				

- 143. As a further legal result of the above-described conduct of defendants, plaintiff was required, or in the future may be required, to engage the services of health care providers, and incurred expenses for medicines, health care appliances, modalities, or other related expenses in a sum to be ascertained according to proof.
- 144. As a further legal result of the above-described conduct of defendants, plaintiff was or may be hindered, prevented, or precluded from performing plaintiff's usual activities, school work, education, and occupation, causing the plaintiff to sustain damages for loss of income, wages, earning, and earning capacity, and other economic damages, in an amount to be ascertained according to proof.
- 145. As a further legal result of the above-described conduct of defendants, plaintiff suffered incidental, consequential, or special damages, in an amount according to proof.
- 146. As a further legal result of the above-described conduct of defendant, plaintiff has and will continue to incur costs in an amount according to proof.
- 147. The aforesaid acts directed toward plaintiffs were carried out by defendants with a conscious disregard of plaintiff's rights and with the intent to vex, injure, and annoy plaintiffs, such as to constitute oppression, fraud or malice pursuant to *California*46

Civil Code § 3294, entitling plaintiffs to punitive or exemplary damages in an amount appropriate to punish and set an example of Lalaind and deter Lalaind from engaging in such conduct in the future.

ELEVENTH CAUSE OF ACTION FOR

NEGLIGENT INFLICTION OF EMOTIONAL DISTRESS

(BY PLAINTIFF AGAINST DEFENDANT CITY)

- 148. Plaintiff repeats and re-alleges each and every allegation set forth above, and incorporate same by reference as though set forth fully herein.
- 149. Defendants were negligent in regard to defendants' conduct toward plaintiff.
- 150. Plaintiff has and will suffered serious emotional distress.
- 151. Defendants' negligence was a substantial factor in causing plaintiff serious emotional distress, including, *inter alia*, suffering anguish, fright, horror, nervousness, grief, anxiety, worry, shock, humiliation, and shame which an ordinary, reasonable person would be unable to cope with.
- 152. As a legal result of the above-described conduct of defendants, plaintiff has sustained and will continue to sustain physical, mental, and emotional injuries, pain, distress, suffering, anguish, fright, nervousness, grief, anxiety, worry, shame, mortification, injured feelings, mental suffering, shock, humiliation and indignity, as well as other unpleasant physical, mental, and emotional reactions, damages to good name, reputation, standing in the community, and other non-economic damages.
- 153. As a further legal result of the above-described conduct of defendants, plaintiff was required, or in the future may be required, to engage the services of health care

providers, and incurred expenses for medicines, health care appliances, modalities, or other related expenses in a sum to be ascertained according to proof.

- 154. As a further legal result of the above-described conduct of defendants, plaintiff was or may be hindered, prevented, or precluded from performing plaintiff's usual activities, school work, edution, and occupation, causing plaintiff to sustain damages for loss of income, wages, earning, and earning capacity, and other economic damages, in an amount to be ascertained according to proof.
- 155. As a further legal result of the above-described conduct of defendants, plaintiff suffered incidental, consequential, or special damages, in an amount according to proof.
- 156. As a further legal result of the above-described conduct of defendants, plaintiff has and will continue to incur costs in an amount according to proof.

TWELFTH CAUSE OF ACTION FOR

VIOLATION OF THE FIREFIGHTERS BILL OF RIGHTS (BY PLAINTIFF AGAINST DEFENDANT CITY)

- 157. Plaintiffs repeat and re-allege each and every allegation set forth above and incorporate same by reference as though set forth fully herein.
- 158. Plaintiff, as firefighter, was and is at all times pertinent hereto entitled to the protections of the *Government Code* § 3250, et seq., popularly referred to as the Firefighters Bill of Rights ("FBOR").
- 159. From in pr around July 2023 to present and continuing, defendant City and the LAFD maliciously violated the FBOR, with the intent to injure plaintiff, including but not

8

11

13

15 16

17

19

21

23

26

28

limited to:

- entering comments adverse to plaintiff's interest in plaintiff's' personnel file or other files used for personnel purposes by defendant City, without plaintiff having first read and signed the instruments containing the adverse comments indicating plaintiff is aware of such comments, in violation of Government Code §§ 3255 and 3305;
- b. failing to provide plaintiff 30 days within which to file written responses to each adverse comment entered in plaintiff's personnel file or other files used for personnel purposes by defendant City, in violation of Government Code §§ 3255, 3256, and 3305;
- failing to permit plaintiff to inspect personnel files that are used or have been C. used to determine plaintiff's qualifications for employment, promotion, additional compensation, termination, or other disciplinary action, in violation of Government Code §§ 3255, 3256, 3256.5, 3305, 3306, and 3306.5;
- d. failing to make a copy of or keep available for inspection plaintiff's personnel file or other files used for personnel purposes by defendant City, in violation of Government Code Section 3255, 3256, 3256.5, 3305, 3306, and 3306.5;
- failing to make a copy of or keep available for inspection plaintiff's personnel file e. or other files used for personnel purposes by defendant City so that plaintiff could examine same, determine the portions thereof that plaintiff believes are mistakenly or unlawfully placed in the file so as to allow plaintiff to request, in writing, that any mistaken or unlawful portions be corrected or deleted, and making any such statements submitted by plaintiff a part of the personnel file of plaintiff, in violation of Government Code §§ 3255, 3256, 3265.5. 3305, 3306, and 3306.5;

f.	subjecting plaintiff to punitive action, denying plaintiff coveted positions or
promo	otions, or threatening plaintiff with such treatment, because of the lawful exercise
of the	rights granted under the FBOR, or the exercise of any rights under existing
admin	istrative grievance procedures, in violation of Government Code §§ 3254 and
3304;	

- g. subjecting plaintiff to punitive action or denying plaintiff coveted positions(s) or promotion on grounds other than merit, without providing plaintiff with an opportunity for administrative appeal, in violation of *Government Code* §§ 3254 and 3304;
- h. placing complainant under investigations and subjecting complainant to interrogations regarding matters that could lead to punitive action, and failing to inform complainant, prior to the interrogations, of the nature of the investigations prior to the interrogations, in violation of *Government Code* §§ 3253(c);
- i. subjecting complainant to offensive language or threatening complainant with punitive action during the interrogations, in violation of *Government Code* §§ 3253(e);
- j. failing to provide to, and obtain from or for complainant, a formal grant of immunity from criminal prosecution, in writing, before the complainant was compelled to respond to potentially incriminating questions in the interrogations, in violation of *Government Code* §§ 3253(e);
- k. failing to provide complainant with access to the recordings of the interrogations where further proceedings were contemplated or prior to any further interrogations at a subsequent time, in violation of *Government Code* §§ 3253(e);
- I. failing to provide complainant with access to transcribed copies of any notes made by a stenographer or to any reports or complaints made by investigators or other 50

person, in violation of Government Code §§ 3253(g);

- m. failing to immediately inform complainant of complainant's constitutional rights prior to or during the interrogations of complainant where it was contemplated that complainant may be charged with a criminal offense, in violation of *Government Code* §§ 3253(h);
- n. denying or attempting to deny complainant the representative of complainant's choice to be present at all times during the interrogations focusing on matters that may result in punitive action against complainant, in violation of *Government Code* §§ 3253(i);
- o. loaning or temporarily reassigning complainant to a location or duty assignment that a firefighter in complainant's department would not normally be sent to that location or would not normally be given that duty assignment under similar circumstances, in violation of *Government Code* § 3253(j);
- p. subjecting complainant to investigations and interrogations that could lead to punitive action or denial of promotion on grounds other than merit for alleged acts, omissions, or other allegations of misconduct reported or discovered to the City more that one year after the reporting or discovery by the LAFD or the City in violation of *Government Code* § 3254(d); and
- q. other violations of the FBOR.
- 160. As a legal result of the above-described conduct of defendant City, plaintiff has sustained and will continue to sustain physical, mental, and emotional injuries, pain, distress, suffering, anguish, fright, nervousness, grief, anxiety, worry, shame, mortification, injured feelings, mental suffering, shock, humiliation and indignity, as well 51

as other unpleasant physical, mental, and emotional reactions, damages to good name, reputation, standing in the community, and other non-economic damages.

- 161. As a further legal result of the above-described conduct of defendant City, plaintiff was required or in the future may be required, to engage the services of health care providers, and incurred expenses for medicines, health care appliances, modalities, or other related expenses in a sum to be ascertained according to proof.
- 162. As a further legal result of the above-described conduct of defendant City, plaintiff was or may be hindered, prevented, or precluded from performing plaintiff's usual activities, school work, education, and occupation, causing the plaintiff to sustain damages for loss of income, wages, earning, and earning capacity, and other economic damages, in an amount to be ascertained according to proof.
- 163. As a further legal result of the above-described conduct of defendant City, plaintiff suffered incidental, consequential, or special damages, in an amount according to proof.
- 164. As a further legal result of the above-described conduct of defendant City, plaintiff has and will continue to incur attorneys' fees and costs in an amount according to proof.
- 165. As a further legal result of the above-described conduct of defendant City, plaintiff is entitled to civil penalties of twenty-five thousand dollars(\$25,000) against defendant City for each and every violation of the FBOR.

PRAYER FOR RELIEF

WHEREFORE, plaintiffs seek judgment against defendants as follows:

1. On each cause of action, for past and future physical, mental, and emotional 52

injuries, pain, distress, suffering, anguish, fright, nervousness, grief, anxiety, worry, shame, mortification, injured feelings, shock, humiliation and indignity, as well as other unpleasant physical, mental, and emotional reactions, damages to good name, standing in the community, loss of and damage to reputation, and other non-economic damages, in a sum to be ascertained according to proof;

- 2. On each cause of action, for past and future health care, services, supplies, medicines, health care appliances, modalities, and other related expenses in a sum to be ascertained according to proof;
- 3. On each cause of action, past and future for loss of wages, income, earnings, earning capacity, support, domestic services, benefits, and other economic damages in a sum to be ascertained according to proof;
- 4. On each cause of action, for other past and future actual, consequential, and incidental damages in a sum to be ascertained according to proof;
- 5. On the tenth cause of action, for punitive/exemplary damages against defendant Laliand in an amount appropriate to punish and set an example of defendant Lalaind and to deter defendant Lalaind, and others, from engaging in such conduct in the future;
- 6. On the First through Ninth and the Twelfth causes of action, for past and future attorney fees and costs of suit pursuant to *C.C.P.* § 1021.5, *Government Code* §§ 3260 and 12965(b), et seq., *Labor Code* 1102.5, and other authorities;
- 7. On the Twelfth cause of action, for civil penalties of twenty-five thousand dollars(\$25,000) against defendant City for each and every violation of the FBOR;
- 8. On each cause of action, for costs of suit herein incurred;

1	9.	On each cause of action, for prejudgment and post judgment interest on any and
2	all am	ounts awarded pursuant to Civil Code § 3287 and any other authorities or
3	provis	ion of law providing for prejudgment or post judgment interest; and
5	10.	Such other and further relief as the Court may deem just and proper.
6		
7		DEMAND FOR HIDV TRIAL
8		DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL
9		Plaintiffs request and demand a jury trial on all issues in this action,
10		
11	Dated	: August 16, 2024
12		By: <u>MSisson</u>
13		MICHAEL F. SISSON CHRISTOPHER BRIZZOLARA
14		Attorneys for Plaintiff BRANDON TAULLI
15 16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
2526		
20 27		
28		
		54