

HELMER FRIEDMAN LLP Andrew H. Friedman, P.C. (SBN 153166) 2 Email: afriedman@helmerfriedman.com Courtney Abrams, Esq. (SBN 265742) 3 Email: cabrams@helmerfriedman.com 9301 Wilshire Blvd., Suite 609 4 Beverly Hills, California 90210 (310) 396-7714 Tel.: 5 (310) 396-9215 Fax: FILING WINDOWN 6 Attorneys for Plaintiff, MELISSA LEGREE 7 SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA 8 FOR THE COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES 9 MELISSA LEGREE, **CASE NO. BC674748** 10 PLAINTIFF'S FIRST AMENDED Plaintiff, 11 **COMPLAINT FOR DAMAGES:** V. 12 RACE DISCRIMINATION IN (1)VIOLATION OF THE CALIFORNIA 13 FAIR EMPLOYMENT AND HOUSING OneLegacy, a corporation; OneLegacy Foundation, a corporation; Cynthia Perley, ACT (CALIFORNIA GOVERNMENT 14 an individual; and DOES 1 through 50, CODE § 12940(a)) inclusive, 15 (2)RACE HARASSMENT IN VIOLATION Defendants. OF THE CALIFORNIA FAIR 16 EMPLOYMENT AND HOUSING ACT (CALIFORNIA GOVERNMENT CODE § 17 12940(i)) 18 (3) UNLAWFUL RETALIATION IN VIOLATION OF THE CALIFORNIA 19 FAIR EMPLOYMENT AND HOUSING ACT (CALIFORNIA GOVERNMENT 20 CODE § 12940(h)) 21 FAILURE TO PREVENT HARASSMENT (4)(CALIFORNIA GOVERNMENT CODE § 22 12940(K)) 23 VIOLATION OF CALIFORNIA LABOR CODE SECTION 1102.5 24 WRONGFUL DEMOTION IN (6)25 VIOLATION OF PUBLIC POLICY 26 RETALIATION FOR EXERCISING (7)RIGHTS PURSUANT TO THE 27 CALIFORNIA FAMILY RIGHTS ACT [CALIFORNIA GOVERNMENT CODE § 28 12945.2(1)]

- 1	II							
1		(8)	NEGLIGENT HIRING, SUPERVISION, TRAINING, AND RETENTION					
2 3		(9)	FAILURE TO PAY ALL WAGES OWED (CALIFORNIA LABOR CODE SECTION 200 ET SEQ.)					
4		(10)	FAILURE TO PROVIDE REST PERIODS					
5		(11)	FAILURE TO PROVIDE ACCURATE ITEMIZED WAGE STATEMENTS					
6			(CALIFORNIA LABOR CODE § 226)					
7 8		(12)	NEGLIGENT INFLICTION OF EMOTIONAL DISTRESS					
9		(13)	INTENTIONAL INFLICTION OF EMOTIONAL DISTRESS					
10		DT A						
11	1	<u>PLA</u>	INTIFF'S DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL					
12								
13	Plaintiff MELISSA LEGREE (hereinafte	er re	eferred to as "Ms. LeGree" and/or "Plaintiff"					
14	Plaintiff MELISSA LEGREE (hereinafter referred to as "Ms. LeGree" and/or "Plaintiff") complains and alleges as follows:							
15	INTROI	DIIC	TTION					
16								
17	1. While defendant OneLegacy – a federally designated organ procurement organization earning in excess of \$100 million per year – boasts that it is dedicated to providing							
18	a "sense of purpose and comfort to those families [it] serve[s]," its treatment of those families							
19	and its own employees falls deplorably short of							
20			ntinely discriminates and harasses its minority					
21	employees, and retaliates against them when the		•					
22	rampant wage and hour violations in which it ro							
23	to) its employees. Such conduct is perpetrated a							
24	OneLegacy's management including OneLegacy's CEO, Tom Mone.							
25								
26	employee with glowing performance evaluations	s, be	egan reporting unrelenting and systematic					
27	race discrimination and harassment at the hands							
28								

defendant Cynthia Perley. Defendant Perley, who was hired in February 2016, engaged in systematic offensive and demeaning racial harassment against non-Caucasian employees including towards Ms. LeGree (who is African-American). With respect to Ms. LeGree, Defendant Perley, among other things, engaged in the following racial harassment:

- Telling Ms. LeGree: "White women and Asian women can get away with more than you can because of the way you are built;"
- Ostracizing and ignoring Ms. LeGree, but routinely engaging in small talk with Ms. LeGree's Caucasian colleagues;
- Giving Ms. LeGree's Caucasian colleagues gift cards but giving Ms. LeGree nothing;
- Engaging in unwarranted criticism towards Ms. LeGree;
- Implying or suggesting that Ms. LeGree was a prostitute or slut by:
 - o Telling Ms. LeGree: "I heard you wore an outfit so provocative that it was offensive;"
 - o Telling Ms. LeGree: "You look like you are going to the club;" and
 - Telling Ms. LeGree: "Men have made a lot of sexual comments about your physicality. Do you know the connotation that comes with wearing high heels?"
- 4. Among others, Ms. LeGree complained to officials in OneLegacy's Human Resources Department (including Anita Corliss and Cheryl Kritz) and to the Company's CEO, Tom Mone.
- 5. In the face of Ms. LeGree's complaints to Human Resources and CEO Tom Mone, OneLegacy, which is mandated to take immediate steps to stop harassment, did absolutely *nothing*. Ms. Corliss' refusal to investigate Ms. LeGree's complaints was disappointing, albeit not surprising. Indeed, Ms. Corliss herself had previously spread a disgusting rumor about Ms. LeGree, telling Ms. LeGree's colleagues that a OneLegacy board member did not like Ms. LeGree because Ms. LeGree reminded the board member of "*all the ghetto black people*."

- 6. When Ms. LeGree reported defendant Perley's harassment to CEO Tom Mone in January 2017 and March 2017, Mr. Mone likewise admitted he was "unsurprised" but, like, Ms. Corliss, Mr. Mone neither began an investigation into Ms. LeGree's complaints nor took prompt effective remedial action to ensure that defendant Perley's racially inappropriate conduct ceased.
- 7. Indeed, rather than launching an investigation and taking steps to protect Ms. LeGree (as it was required to do by law), OneLegacy demoted Ms. LeGree in April 2017, *less than a month* after Ms. LeGree's second meeting with Tom Mone in retaliation for her complaints and in the hopes that she would resign.
- 8. Ms. LeGree was devastated by OneLegacy's retaliation. Ms. LeGree simply could not believe that OneLegacy was punishing her because of complaints and doing nothing to stop defendant Perley's unlawful conduct. As a result of the harassment, discrimination and retaliation, Ms. LeGree began having panic attacks and developed psoriasis, a stress-related dermatological condition causing Ms. LeGree to have large, humiliating dark patches all over her face. After consultation with a therapist, Ms. LeGree began a medical leave of absence in late April 2017.
- 9. However, when Ms. LeGree attempted to return to work eight weeks later, OneLegacy retaliated again by banning her from the workplace and forcing her to take an "administrative leave," of an unspecified duration. It was only after nearly *two months* during which time OneLegacy allowed vituperative and damaging rumors to circulate that Ms. LeGree had engaged in misconduct warranting an exile of this length and only after Ms. LeGree complained to OneLegacy's Board of Directors that OneLegacy finally allowed Ms. LeGree to return to work. When Ms. LeGree finally did return to work, OneLegacy retaliated yet again by taking away her office and relegating her to a cubicle (even though OneLegacy had empty offices available).
- 10. In addition to the foregoing, Ms. LeGree is informed and believes and thereon alleges that OneLegacy's illegal conduct did not stop at OneLegacy's unlawful harassment, discrimination and retaliation. In particular, Ms. LeGree is informed and believes and thereon alleges that OneLegacy cares more about making money than it cares about its employees, its

organ donors, and the families of its organ donors. This drive for profit is, perhaps, explainable by the Company's need to pay the enormous compensation packages given to OneLegacy's executives such as CEO Thomas Mone (also known as Tom Mone) who, according to the Company's IRS Form 990 received more than \$740,000.00 in compensation in 2015 and Chowdary Garimella, the Company's COO/CIO, who received more than \$710,000.00 in 2015, and Anita Corliss, the Vice-President of Human Resources, who received more than \$350,000.00 in 2015. *See* http://pdfs.citizenaudit.org/2017_03_EO/95-3138799_990_201512.pdf.

JURISDICTION AND VENUE

- 2. The Court has personal jurisdiction over the defendants because they are residents of and/or doing business in the State of California.
- 3. Venue is proper in this county in accordance with Section 395(a) of the California Code of Civil Procedure because the defendants, or some of them, reside in this County, and the injuries alleged herein occurred in this County. Venue is also proper in this County in accordance with Section 12965(b) of the California Government Code because the unlawful practices alleged by Ms. LeGree in violation of the California Fair Employment and Housing Act [Cal. Gov't Code §§ 12940, et seq.] were committed in this County. In the alternative, venue is appropriate in this County in accordance with Section 395(a) and Section 395.5 of the California Code of Civil Procedure because Defendants and Ms. LeGree contracted to perform their obligations in this County, the contract was entered into in this county, and because the liability, obligation and breach occurred within this County.

THE PARTIES

- 4. Ms. LeGree is an individual who, at relevant times during the events alleged herein, resided in North Hollywood, California.
- 5. Ms. LeGree is a current employee of defendants OneLegacy and OneLegacy Foundation with a current employment dispute against them.

6

12

10

13

14 15

16

17

18

19 20

21

22

2324

25

26

27

- 6. Ms. LeGree is informed and believes, and thereon alleges, that Defendants OneLegacy and OneLegacy Foundation and Does 1-25 and each of them, are, and at all times herein mentioned were, California corporations or other business entities qualified to and doing business in California. Ms. LeGree is informed and believes, and thereon alleges, that Defendants Cynthia Perley and Does 26 50 are individuals.
- 7. Ms. LeGree is informed and believes, and thereon alleges, that Defendants OneLegacy and OneLegacy Foundation and Does 1-25 and each of them, are, and were, at all relevant times mentioned herein, "employer[s]" within the meaning of Sections 12926(d) and 12940(j)(4)(A) of the California Government Code. Ms. LeGree is informed and believes, and thereon alleges, that, at all relevant times herein mentioned, Tom Mone was an officer, a director, or a managing agent of Defendants OneLegacy and OneLegacy Foundation and that he knew of the conduct alleged herein constituting malice, oppression, or fraud and that he adopted or approved that conduct after it occurred. Ms. LeGree is also informed and believes, and thereon alleges, that, at all relevant times herein mentioned, the Board of Directors of OneLegacy (William I. Chertok, Art Torress, Gloria Bohrer, Rob Blackman, Sandra Wallace Blaydow, Earle E. Crandall, William Gallio, Jason L. Gray, Rafeal Mendez, Robert Mendez, Thomas Mone, Darlene P. Robles, and J. Thomas Rosenthal) and OneLegacy Foundation (Gloria Ann Bohrer, William Chertock, William Gallio, Earle Crandall, Thomas Mone, and J. Thomas Rosenthal) were officers, directors, or managing agents of Defendants OneLegacy and OneLegacy Foundation and that they knew of the conduct alleged herein constituting malice, oppression, or fraud and that they adopted or approved that conduct after it occurred.
- 8. Ms. LeGree is informed and believes, and thereon alleges, that, at all relevant times herein mentioned, Cynthia Perley was the Chief Financial Officer of Defendants OneLegacy and OneLegacy Foundation, and Ms. Perley held supervisory authority over Ms. LeGree. Ms. LeGree is informed and believes, and thereon alleges, that, at all relevant times herein mentioned, Cynthia Perley was an officer, a director, or a managing agent of Defendants OneLegacy and OneLegacy Foundation and that she engaged in the conduct alleged herein constituting malice, oppression, or fraud.

- 9. The true names and capacities, whether corporate, associate, individual or otherwise of Defendants Does 1 through 50, inclusive, are unknown to Ms. LeGree, who therefore sues said Defendants by such fictitious names. Each of the Defendants designated herein as a Doe is negligently or otherwise legally responsible in some manner for the events and happenings herein referred to and caused injuries and damages proximately thereby to Ms. LeGree, as herein alleged. Ms. LeGree will seek leave of Court to amend this Complaint to show their names and capacities when the same have been ascertained.
- 10. At all times herein mentioned, Defendants, and each of them, were the agents, representatives, employees, successors and/or assigns, each of the other, and at all times pertinent hereto were acting within the course and scope of their authority as such agents, representatives, employees, successors and/or assigns and acting on behalf of, under the authority of, and subject to the control of each other.
- 11. Ms. LeGree is informed and believes, and thereon alleges, that each defendant named in this Complaint, including Does 1 through 50, inclusive, knowingly and willfully acted in concert, conspired and agreed together among themselves and entered into a combination and systemized campaign of activity to, inter alia, damage Ms. LeGree and to otherwise consciously and/or recklessly act in derogation of Ms. LeGree's rights, and the trust reposed by Ms. LeGree in each of said defendants, said acts being negligently and/or intentionally inflicted.
- 12. Said conspiracy, and defendants' concerted actions, were such that, to the information and belief of Ms. LeGree, and to all appearances, defendants and each of them, represented a unified body so that the actions of one defendant were accomplished in concert with, and with knowledge, ratification, authorization and approval of each of the other defendants.
- 13. At all times set forth herein, the acts and omissions of each defendant caused, led and/or contributed to the various acts and omissions of each and all of the other defendants, legally causing the injuries as set forth.
- 14. Ms. LeGree is informed and believes, and thereon alleges, that defendants OneLegacy and OneLegacy Foundation are, together, an integrated enterprise, containing,

among other things, interrelation of operations, common management and centralized control of labor relations. Ms. LeGree is further informed and believes, and thereon alleges, that defendants OneLegacy and OneLegacy Foundation are Ms. LeGree's joint or co-employers.

6

9

10

14

15

17

18

22

25

26

27

28

FACTS COMMON TO ALL CAUSES OF ACTION

- 15. With yearly revenues in excess of \$100 million and approximately 350 employees, OneLegacy and OneLegacy Foundation (collectively hereinafter referred to as "ONELEGACY") is headquartered in Los Angeles, California. ONELEGACY is the largest nonprofit, federally-designated organ procurement organization in the United States and receives funding from major federal agencies including MediCare. ONELEGACY is also a licensed tissue bank and eye bank which is regulated by the Food & Drug Administration.
- 16. ONELEGACY's reach in Southern California is vast and deep. With a veritable monopoly over the Southern California organ donation market, ONELEGACY serves 215 hospitals 11 transplant centers, coroners, funeral homes and approximately 19 million people in Los Angeles, Kern, Orange, Riverside, San Bernardino, Santa Barbara and Ventura counties.
- 17. In particular, ONELEGACY's clients include medical giants such as Cedars-Sinai Medical Center, Children's Hospital Los Angeles, UCLA medical Center, City of Hope National Medical Center, Keck Hospital of USC, Loma Linda University Medical Center, and UC Irvine Medical Center, to name a few.
- 18. While ONELEGACY boasts that it is dedicated to providing a "sense of purpose and comfort to those families [it] serve[s]," its treatment of its own employees falls woefully short of this standard. Instead, and as described in further detail below, ONELEGACY engages in a pattern and practice of discriminatory conduct towards its minority employees, and retaliates against those (including Plaintiff Melissa LeGree), who dare to complain.
 - 19. Plaintiff Melissa LeGree, who is African-American, is a native Californian.
- MELISSA LEGREE IS HIRED BY ONELEGACY; ONELEGACY IMMEDIATELY A. MISCLASSIFIES MS. LEGREE AS "EXEMPT."

- 20. In April 2012, ONELEGACY hired Ms. LeGree as an Executive Assistant in its Donation, Science, Research and Education department. Despite the fact that Ms. LeGree was an "assistant" who neither managed anyone, nor regularly exercised discretion or independent judgment (to wit, her duties were purely secretarial in nature and included, for example, scheduling meetings and providing administrative support for ONELEGACY's managers and executives), ONELEGACY misclassified her as an exempt employee in an effort to deprive her of overtime pay so that it could earn more money.
- 21. While Ms. LeGree worked substantial amounts of overtime in this position, including working both nights and weekends (including receiving and/or responding to emails and telephone calls on "off" hours on her company cell phone that she was forced to carry at all times), ONELEGACY did not compensate her for these hours. Moreover, ONELEGACY did not provide Ms. LeGree with rest periods (nor did it compensate Ms. LeGree for these missed rest periods).
- 22. In August 2013, Ms. LeGree became an "Education Project Specialist." While Ms. LeGree's duties changed to preparing materials (including making copies and collating documents) for ONELEGACY's periodic employee trainings, Ms. LeGree, as in her Executive Assistant position, did not regularly exercise discretion or independent judgment, nor did she manage any employees. ONELEGACY also continued to misclassify Ms. LeGree as exempt. As in her Executive Assistant position, Ms. LeGree continued working substantial overtime hours, often late into the night and on weekends (including receiving and/or responding to emails and telephone calls on "off" hours on her company cell phone that she was forced to carry at all times). Also like in her Executive Assistant position, ONELEGACY did not provide Ms. LeGree with rest periods (nor did it compensate Ms. LeGree for these missed rest periods).

///

- 23. In March 2014, Ms. LeGree's position was transferred to ONELEGACY's Human Resources department.
- 24. Shortly after transferring to ONELEGACY's Human Resources Department, Ms. LeGree realized that neither ONELEGACY nor its Human Resources Department had any interest in protecting ONELEGACY employees from illegal discrimination, harassment and retaliation. To the contrary, when a ONELEGACY employee engaged in legally protected activity, the Company retaliated against them in an effort to force them to resign or set them up for firing. In particular, Anita Corliss, ONELEGACY's Vice President of Human Resources (and the highest-ranking executive in ONELEGACY's Human Resources department) had no interest in fulfilling her statutorily-mandated obligations to protect ONELEGACY employees from illegal discrimination, harassment and retaliation.
- 25. *Instead*, Ms. LeGree learned that Ms. Corliss herself had begun to engage in what she suspected might be illegal conduct. In particular, Ms. LeGree is informed and believes and thereon alleges that Ms. Corliss and ONELEGACY's then-Chief Financial Officer, David Graft had commenced an affair, and, misusing and/or misappropriating ONELEGACY funds, Ms. Corliss and Mr. Graft embarked on expensive trips to Las Vegas resorts and casinos.
- 26. Ms. LeGree is further informed and believes, and thereon alleges, that an internal independent audit later substantiated David Graft's embezzlement and/or misuse and/or misappropriation of ONELEGACY funds, and Mr. Graft was allowed to "resign," but ONELEGACY inexplicably continued to employ Ms. Corliss. As discussed below (*see infra* ¶ 77-81), ONELEGACY's decision to continue Ms. Corliss' employment (and allow Mr. Graft to "resign") was symptomatic of the Company's disparate treatment of African-American employees *i.e.*, if Ms. Corliss had been an African-American employee or if she had complained about illegal race discrimination/harassment, she would have been fired. Likewise, Mr. Graft never would have

been allowed to "resign," and remain on the Company website allowing him to secure other employment.

- 27. In addition to Ms. Corliss' apparent misuse of and/or benefiting from Mr. Graft's misuse of ONELEGACY funds, Ms. Corliss sanctioned and perpetuated a culture in which ONELEGACY routinely retaliated against its employees.
- 28. For instance, when one employee went on maternity leave in March 2015, Ms. Corliss informed Ms. LeGree and others that they needed to help Ms. Corliss "build a case" against the employee so she could be fired upon her return. Ms. LeGree refused to participate and reminded Ms. Corliss that the employee was on a protected medical leave.
- 29. Thereafter Ms. Corliss set her sights on Ms. LeGree and began launching vituperative and racially harassing attacks on Ms. LeGree. In particular, weeks after Ms. LeGree refused to participate in the pre-textual "investigation" of the employee who was on maternity leave, Ms. Corliss informed multiple individuals in Ms. LeGree's department that Sandra Blaydow, a Board Member at ONELEGACY, did not like Ms. LeGree because Ms. LeGree reminded the ONELEGACY Board Member of "all the ghetto black people." Ms. Corliss' disgusting comments confirmed what Ms. LeGree strongly suspected: the one person tasked with protecting her, would never do so.

C. <u>Defendant Cynthia Perley Is Hired To Be OneLegacy's Chief Financial</u> <u>Officer; Almost Immediately, She Begins to Harass Ms. LeGree on the Basis of Her Race.</u>

- 30. On February 1, 2016, defendant Cynthia Perley (hereinafter "defendant Perley" or "Perley") commenced employment with ONELEGACY as its new Chief Financial Officer. Almost immediately upon the commencement of her employment, defendant Perley began to harass Ms. LeGree and other minority employees because of their race (*e.g.*, their non-Caucasian race).
- 31. Among other things, defendant Perley began to incessantly comment upon Ms. LeGree's appearance (which, prior to defendant Perley's arrival, had never been an issue) implying that Ms. LeGree dressed like a prostitute or slut. In particular, defendant Perley made

- Using a demeaning tone of voice when speaking to Ms. LeGree but not when speaking to Caucasian employees.
- 33. Defendant Perley also began to engage in unwarranted criticism towards Ms. LeGree.
- 34. For instance, in response to a questionnaire about ways to improve the ONELEGACY's trainings on which Ms. LeGree worked, defendant Perley wrote the vague and unwarranted criticism, "Melissa should not make it all about her." When Ms. LeGree later reported this comment to ONELEGACY's CEO, Tom Mone, Mr. Mone admitted that such criticism was totally unwarranted. Likewise, none of the nearly 300 questionnaires in which ONELEGACY staff and executives commented on this training contained <u>any</u> criticism of Ms. LeGree.
- 35. Other times, defendant Perley, upon arriving at the office <u>at the same</u> time as Ms. LeGree, would snidely comment that Ms. LeGree who was classified as an exempt employee (albeit illegally classified as exempt) was "very late."
- 36. In addition to the foregoing, defendant Perley also organized a training to communicate to ONELEGACY's employees the "new look" of ONELEGACY. This training, which was spearheaded by defendant Perley and Ms. Corliss, displayed multiple PowerPoint slides which included how ONELEGACY employees should groom themselves and style their hair.
- 37. Notably, one slide which was meant to demonstrate how an ONELEGACY employee's hair should <u>not</u> look, showed a Caucasian woman with wavy hair. The next slide, which demonstrated how an ONELEGACY employee <u>should</u> look, showed the same Caucasian woman with her hair completely flat-ironed and straight. Ms. LeGree, an African-American woman with naturally curly hair, was offended and scared. Indeed, defendant Perley's training communicated the offensive and demeaning message that Ms. LeGree, an African-American woman with naturally curly hair was not welcome in the workplace because natural African-American was unkempt.
- 38. In addition to defendant Perley's abusive conduct towards Ms. LeGree, Ms. LeGree is informed and believes and thereon alleges that defendant Perley also harassed other

Kritz undertook any type of investigation or took any other immediately steps necessary to stop defendant Perley's harassment and discrimination from occurring.

42. Because ONELEGACY refused to take any corrective action to stop defendant Perley's illegal conduct, it continued.

ii. <u>Ms. LeGree Protests Defendant Perley's Discrimination and</u>Harassment to Defendant Perley Herself.

- 43. Accordingly, Ms. LeGree took it upon herself to protest defendant Perley's harassment to defendant Perley herself.
- 44. In particular, in an in-person, one-on-one meeting on January 18, 2017, Ms. LeGree informed defendant Perley that her comments about white women and Asian women being allowed to get away with more were very offensive and demeaning to Ms. LeGree. In response, defendant Perley denied making such comments, and confusingly and vaguely stated that such comments were Ms. LeGree's "perception." Ms. LeGree left the meeting knowing that she needed to complain to the top of the organization if she had any hope of stopping defendant Perley's harassment.

iii. <u>Ms. LeGree Objects to Defendant Perley's Discrimination and</u> <u>Harassment to ONELEGACY Chief Executive Officer, Tom Mone.</u>

- 45. Thus, in a series of meetings with ONELEGACY's CEO, Tom Mone, on January 20, 2017 and again on March 23, 2017, Ms. LeGree reported defendant Perley's verbal and non-verbal harassment and discrimination. During the March 23, 2017 meeting, both Ms. Corliss and Ms. Kritz were present.
- 46. During each of these meetings, Ms. LeGree who was now suffering from extensive anxiety and depression as a result of defendant Perley's actions informed Mr. Mone: "the one thing I can't change is the color of my skin, and yet, that was the one thing that [defendant] Perley hates me for." During her January 20, 2017 meeting with Mr. Mone, Ms. LeGree sobbed throughout the meeting.

- 47. Mr. Mone's response was much the same as Ms. Corliss'. Specifically, Mr. Mone informed Ms. LeGree that he was "*not surprised*" and that Mr. Mone had been forced to address defendant Perley's discriminatory comments on multiple other occasions.
- 48. As the meetings ended, Ms. LeGree informed Mr. Mone that she was frightened. She told him that she knew that ONELEGACY retaliated against those employees who complained of illegal conduct, and she knew that because she had come forward, she would most likely suffer adverse consequences.
- 49. Shockingly, Mr. Mone, who had an affirmative obligation to immediately take all necessary steps to stop defendant Perley's discrimination and harassment from occurring, responded that he "needed some time to figure out how to proceed."
- 50. Thereafter, ONELEGACY never took any steps to investigate or stop defendant Perley's illegal conduct; rather, ONELEGACY demoted Ms. LeGree and then placed her on an involuntary indefinite leave of absence and allowed rumors to fester that Ms. LeGree had been placed on leave as punishment for some type of misconduct.

E. CONFIRMING MS. LEGREE'S WORST FEARS, ONELEGACY RETALIATES AGAINST MS. LEGREE BY DEMOTING HER FOR HER COMPLAINTS OF ILLEGAL CONDUCT.

- 51. On April 11, 2017, less than a month after Ms. LeGree's last meeting with Mr. Mone, Ms. Corliss and Ms. Kritz in which Ms. LeGree reported defendant Perley's race discrimination and harassment, Ms. LeGree met with Ms. Corliss for her yearly performance evaluation. During this meeting, Ms. LeGree was informed that the Company had decided to alter her employment such that:
 - She now occupied a "lesser role" within the Company;
 - Because she occupied a "lesser role," she would now be classified as a non-exempt hourly employee; and
 - Her salary range was now capped and she could not earn any more money.
- 52. While Ms. LeGree asked Ms. Corliss why ONELEGACY was taking these actions, Ms. Corliss avoided the question and could not provide any answer to Ms. LeGree. In any event,

any reasoning ONELEGACY may proffer for such action is totally pre-textual; ONELEGACY's demotion of Ms. LeGree was clearly a transparent effort to force Ms. LeGree to resign.

- 53. Indeed, every single one of Ms. LeGree's performance evaluations for the five (5) years leading up to her demotion were uniformly positive.
- 54. Likewise, in Ms. LeGree's meetings with ONELEGACY CEO Tom Mone on January 20, 2017 and March 23, 2017, Mr. Mone reassured Ms. LeGree that she was doing a phenomenal job and told her that defendant Perley's unwarranted criticism was simply not true.
- 55. Moreover, Ms. LeGree's personnel file which Ms. LeGree obtained shortly before this Complaint was filed similarly confirmed there was not a shred of evidence to support her demotion.

F. MS. LEGREE IS FORCED TO TAKE A MEDICAL LEAVE OF ABSENCE TO ADDRESS THE SEVERE EMOTIONAL DISTRESS CAUSED BY DEFENDANT PERLEY'S AND ONELEGACY'S ILLEGAL CONDUCT; WHILE ON LEAVE, MS. LEGREE DESPERATELY CONTACTS ONELEGACY'S BOARD OF DIRECTORS FOR HELP.

- 56. Ms. LeGree was devastated. Due to defendant Perley's incessant harassment, as well as ONELEGACY's retaliation, Ms. LeGree began to suffer debilitating panic attacks, insomnia, anxiety and depression. She also developed psoriasis a stress-related dermatological condition which left her with large, conspicuous and humiliating dark patches of discolored skin on her face. Realizing that she could no longer work under such conditions and suffering from extreme emotional and physical manifestations of stress from defendant Perley's harassment, on April 28, 2017, Ms. LeGree went out on a medical leave of absence.
- 57. On June 13, 2017, while still on her medical leave of absence, Ms. LeGree, who was desperate to stop defendant Perley's illegal conduct, contacted Sandra Blaydow, a member of ONELEGACY's Board of Directors. Ms. LeGree again described defendant Perley's demeaning and offensive behavior, specifically informed her that she was "suffering from a racially hostile work environment," and asked for Ms. Blaydow's help. Ms. Blaydow sighed and

stated: "this is getting out of hand," alluding to other complaints Ms. Blaydow had heard about defendant Perley's harassing behavior.

G. MS. LEGREE ATTEMPTS TO RETURN TO WORK; SHE IS RETALIATED AGAINST FOR HER COMPLAINTS AND TOLD SHE IS NOT ALLOWED TO RETURN AND INSTEAD, IS BEING BANISHED FROM THE WORKPLACE.

58. While Ms. LeGree was scheduled to return to work on Monday, June 28, 2017, on Wednesday, June 23, 2017, Cheryl Kritz (an ONELEGACY Human Resources Manager) called Ms. LeGree to inform her that she was being placed on a forced "administrative leave of absence" until July 12, 2017. This forced and involuntary "administrative leave of absence" was clearly retaliatory in nature and designed to punish Ms. LeGree for her earlier complaints.

- 59. Then, two days before Ms. LeGree was scheduled to return to work on July 12th, Ms. Kritz again called Ms. LeGree to inform her that her banishment was being continued. Instead, Ms. LeGree's forced and involuntary "administrative leave" would continue until July 19, 2017. Ms. LeGree, who had watched another employee, _______, complain to the Company about defendant Perley's harassment and discrimination, and be fired in short order, knew her forced leave was all part of ONELEGACY's pattern and practice of retaliation.
- 60. By any measure, there is simply no plausible explanation for placing Ms. LeGree on a forced and involuntary "administrative leave," much less for leaving her in an exile of this length, and any attempt by ONELEGACY to justify this involuntary leave, much less a leave of this length, is pre-textual.

I. MS. LEGREE COMPLAINS TO ONELEGACY CEO, TOM MONE, IN WRITING, ABOUT DISCRIMINATION, HARASSMENT AND RETALIATION, AND FAILURE TO PAY ALL WAGES EARNED.

61. On July 13, 2017, Ms. LeGree, who was devastated by ONELEGACY's refusal to allow her to return to work, wrote to Mr. Mone. Among other things, Ms. LeGree wrote:

Tom, I feel like I am being punished and that OneLegacy's decision to ban me from the workplace is part of its ongoing pattern of retaliation against me for reporting Cynthia Perley's racial discrimination to you on January 20, 2017 and March 23, 2017, and because I directly opposed Cynthia's offensive actions in a one-on-one meeting with her on January 18, 2017.

Based on this retaliation (and the fact that OneLegacy had done nothing to stop Cynthia's offensive conduct), I went on medical leave in late April 2017, for the stress and sickness I was suffering as a result. I had hoped that by the end of my medical leave I would be able to return and start fresh. However, as you know, OneLegacy has now retaliated against me yet again by banning me from the workplace.

To add insult to injury, I have recently learned that for the last six years, while I should have been receiving overtime wages for the amount of hours I was working at nights and on the weekends, OneLegacy wrongfully made me an exempt employee and has not paid me all the wages that I am owed.

. . .

It devastates me to know that this is the way OneLegacy has chosen to treat me after I came forward with my complaints of race discrimination.

All I want to do is to come back to work, be reinstated to my former role, and be able to do my job in a non-discriminatory, non-harassing, and non-retaliatory environment. I would also like to be compensated for all of the overtime hours that I have worked without compensation.

When can I come back to work?

(Emphasis added).

62. In response to Ms. LeGree's written complaint of retaliation, Mr. Mone *admitted* that because Ms. LeGree had raised concerns *during her leave of absence* "that caused OneLegacy to initiate an independent investigation," Ms. LeGree would be forced to remain on the involuntary administrative leave. In other words, Mr. Mone admitted that Ms. LeGree's complaints of discrimination and harassment to OneLegacy's Board Member Sandra Blaydow were *the* motivating reason for OneLegacy's decision to retaliate against Ms. LeGree and banish her from the workplace.

63. Offended by Mr. Mone's statement that her forced "administrative leave" was not a form of retaliation, and shocked by Mr. Mone's suggestion that she had not previously raised issues that warranted an investigation, Ms. LeGree wrote back on July 19, 2017:

I'm not sure how forcing me to be on leave is not considered punishment, even if it is paid. I don't see how me being put on administrative leave is "simply a standard protocol." It's always been my understanding that if an employee reports discrimination, harassment or the like, OL would place the harasser/discriminator on leave, not the victim. Has Cynthia Perley been placed on leave? If the aggressor is present, how will staff feel comfortable to speak out? You and I both know that other employees have complained about Cynthia Perley's discrimination and harassment. As far as I know she hasn't been forced to take a leave like I am being forced to take leave. I reported

I'm also not sure why OL is looking into the discrimination and harassment now considering I reported this officially to you in January 2017 and in March 2017 after it got worse. Now that I think about it, why didn't the investigation happen in summer 2016 when I told Anita [Corliss] and Cheryl [Kritz] about Cynthia's discrimination? Anita told me she shared Cynthia's discrimination and harassment with you and that you would be coming to talk to me about it but you never did.

the discrimination, now I'm being retaliated against.

In any event, by forcing me on leave against my will, OL is not only causing me unnecessary stress and anxiety but its harming my reputation at work. I'm sure staff have caught on to my absence and would think I must have done something wrong in order to be in this position. I also think forcing me to be on leave (not to mention demoting me) because I formally complained to you and other people about the harassment and discrimination sets a bad example to our staff. They will be less likely to report current or future illegal stuff going on in the workplace for fear of retaliation.

I have always said and continue to be worried about being fired even though I followed OL policy in reporting the illegal discrimination and harassment. I want to come back to work and not be punished for reporting the truth and I want to be reinstated to my former position. I understand your email to mean that I am still not allowed to come back to work and OL is yet again extending my administrative leave. Can you please confirm that is correct? Also, when am I going to be paid for the overtime that I have worked?

(Emphasis added and in original).

64. Mr. Mone responded the same day (July 19, 2017). In Mr. Mone's response, he *admitted* that ONELEGACY <u>did not</u> conduct an investigation into previous Ms. LeGree's complaints, and further appeared to put the onus on Ms. LeGree for not "reporting" her overtime hours. Specifically, Mr. Mone wrote, in part:

[W]hile I did follow up with the parties and with you after you brought your concerns to my attention, it appears that my determination was not found to be acceptable to you.

Please send me details re. any overtime you have worked, as I am unaware of any possibly unpaid worked time, which of course should always be paid when reported.

- 65. Mr. Mone had still not answered Ms. LeGree's questions. Namely, Mr. Mone had still not informed Ms. LeGree when she could return to work, nor had Mr. Mone addressed Ms. LeGree's pleas to be reinstated to her previous position. ONELEGACY had also not honored its promise to Ms. LeGree to advise her about the status of her "administrative leave" by the close of business every Friday.
- 66. Accordingly, on Friday July 21, 2017, at 10:29 p.m., Ms. LeGree, who was experiencing a panic attack as a result of ONELEGACY's refusal update her as to the status of her employment, wrote to Mr. Mone again. Specifically, Ms. LeGree wrote:

You told me in your previous email that Cheryl Kritz would advise me by email today of the status of the investigation. I waited and waited all day and yet, I did not hear anything from Cheryl or anyone else. Leaving me hanging like this leaves me with an overwhelming sense of anxiety and is yet another act of retaliation by OL. I am assuming that because I have not heard anything, OL is making me take yet another week of forced leave. Please confirm immediately that this is the case.

I'm not sure why I need to be on leave when I am the victim and not the wrongdoer, and why I need to be on leave while an investigation is being completed. What is the purpose of this leave? Is Cynthia similarly on leave? You still have not answered these questions. In any event, I am being stigmatized by being banished from the workplace.

You also have not addressed OL's punishment and retaliation towards me after I complained to you about discrimination and harassment in January and March 2017. Is the company planning to reinstate me to my former position, give me my office back and reverse the salary cap that was imposed?

Also, when you say that you did "follow up with the parties," after I complained to you in January and March 2017 about discrimination and harassment, do you mean that an investigation was done? As I've learned from my time in the Human Resources department, California law requires that OL conduct an investigation after I stepped forward with my complaints of discrimination and harassment in January and March 2017. Did OL do this?

I'm also not sure what you mean by your "determination" after I complained to you in January and March 2017 about discrimination and harassment. You never informed me of a determination. The only "determination" that is acceptable, as you know, is for Cynthia's harassment and discrimination to stop, and, if it did not, for the OL to take all steps necessary to stop her discrimination and harassment. In my case, because Cynthia's discrimination and harassment did not stop, you are correct; your determination was not "acceptable."

I am in the process of compiling an estimate regarding the overtime I worked. I don't understand what you mean by should be paid "when reported." Why would I have reported it when the company misclassified me as "exempt" and told me I was not entitled to overtime?

I would really appreciate some answers to my questions. Your responses are very vague and do not address the questions I have. Please also let me know exactly when I can return to work.

(Emphasis added).

- 67. In response, Mr. Mone refused to answer <u>any</u> of Ms. LeGree's questions. Instead, Mr. Mone vaguely informed her she would have to wait "for the completion of the investigation before we meet and discuss these issues." Mr. Mone further informed Ms. LeGree that she would remain on her indefinite forced leave "until further notice."
- 68. So, each Friday thereafter, Ms. Kritz (a Human Resources Manager) would email Ms. LeGree to tell her that she would remain in exile for another week. And, each week, Ms.

LeGree would renew her protests that ONELEGACY was retaliating against her and ask to be reinstated. For instance, on August 11, 2017 Ms. LeGree wrote to ONELEGACY:

I do not understand why I am still on this forced administrative leave. It is has been 45 days since OL has begun this forced administrative leave and it is clearly in retaliation for my reporting of Cynthia Perley's racial discrimination to OL on January 20, 2017 and March 23, 2017, and because I complained about Cynthia's offensive actions in a one-on-one meeting with her on January 18, 2017.

This continued punishment of banishing me from my job, my colleagues and my workplace all because I reported race harassment and discrimination is causing me so much emotional turmoil, anxiety and depression. It is also damaging my career and totally stigmatizing me. I wonder what OL is telling all of my colleagues about my absence. It certainly sends the message that, should an employee dare to complain, they too will be banished on forced "administrative leave."

Please let me know when OL intends to reinstate me to my position and allow me to return to work.

(Emphasis in original and added).

69. ONELEGACY refused to respond. Instead, on August 18, 2017, ONELEGACY told Ms. LeGree she would remain on her forced leave of absence. So, Ms. LeGree again emailed ONELEGACY and protested:

It has been almost <u>two months</u> since I have been on forced "administrative leave." Why am I still on leave? What do you mean by the "administrative resolution process"? This term is very vague and given that any investigation should have been completed long ago, it makes no sense to me. As I previously stated, I believe OL's decision to banish me from the workplace (with no end in sight) is in retaliation for my reporting of Cynthia Perley's racial discrimination to OL on January 20, 2017 and March 23, 2017, and because I complained about Cynthia's offensive conduct in a one-on-one meeting with her on January 18, 2017, and to OL Board member Sandra Blaydow on June 13, 2017. Given that Cynthia Perley is the actual wrongdoer, is Cynthia Perley similarly on leave?

In any event, OL's decision to keep me on indefinite forced leave has stigmatized me and damaged my career. In fact, I

recently heard from a colleague that other colleagues are specifically asking what I did wrong. These horrible rumors are causing me even more anxiety and stress. What steps is OL taking to counter these false rumors and what steps is OL taking to ensure that I am not ostracized further upon my return?

(Emphasis in original and added).

- 70. Any explanation offered by ONELEGACY for Ms. LeGree's banishment is pre-text. Even the Department of Fair Employment and Housing, in its Workplace Harassment Guide for California Employers, warns that investigations should "conclude quickly" and states that "if the allegation is not urgent, many companies . . . strive to finish the investigation in a few weeks." See DFEH Workplace Harassment Guide for California Employers (Emphasis added). Given that Ms. LeGree's allegations were persistent and urgent, ONELEGACY should have completed its investigation much sooner "a few weeks." Instead, nearly two months later, ONELEGACY continued to flout its obligations and retaliate against Ms. LeGree.
- 71. Indeed, in her absence, Ms. LeGree was informed that multiple colleagues began perpetuating the damaging rumor that Ms. LeGree engaged in some type of misconduct and was being subjected to some type of discipline.

J. MS. LEGREF, WHO HAD LANGUISHED AT HOME ON FORCED LEAVE FOR NEARLY TWO MONTHS, ESCALATES HER PROTESTS OF ONELEGACY'S RETALIATORY CONDUCT TO ITS BOARD OF DIRECTORS.

72. By August 24, 2017, Ms. LeGree, who had been languishing at home, watching her health deteriorate due to ONELEGACY's egregiously retaliatory and seemingly never-ending forced leave of absence, could not take it anymore. She knew she had to contact ONELEGACY's Board of Directors if she would ever be allowed to return to work. So, on Thursday August 24, 2017, Ms. LeGree wrote a lengthy letter to Tom Mone and ONELEGACY's Board of Directors. In her letter, Ms. LeGree pled:

Dear Tom and Board of Directors:

I am writing this letter desperately seeking your help. From virtually the time Cynthia Perley began harassing and

discriminating against non-Caucasian employees, I repeatedly complained to Anita Corliss, Cheryl Kritz, and Tom Mone about the racial discrimination and harassment.

It is my belief that other employees including have also complained that Cynthia Perley was discriminating against and harassing non-Caucasian employees and Ms.

collapsed at work and became unconscious due to Ms. Perley's harassment.

The reason I am writing to you now is because following the last occasion on which I directly complained to Tom, Anita and Cheryl, the Company forced me out of work on an involuntary administrative leave. I have now been out on this involuntary leave for almost two months. I have repeatedly asked Tom and Cheryl why the Company has forced me out on leave and when am I going to be returned to work and nobody has provided any answers to me. I would like OneLegacy to reinstate me immediately and in addition to investigating Cynthia Perley for widespread discrimination and harassment against non-Caucasians, I would like the Board (the members of which I am copying on this letter) to investigate you (Tom), Cynthia and Anita for retaliation.

I do not understand why OneLegacy forced me out on an involuntary administrative leave of absence for nearly two months in retaliation for my complaints about discrimination and harassment. Likewise, why was fired after she was horribly discriminated against and harassed because of her race by Cynthia Perley? If anyone should have been placed on a leave of absence or fired, it should have been Cynthia Perley. Why wasn't she placed on a leave of absence? Also, why is Anita Corliss still employed by OneLegacy even after the Company learned that she was having an extramarital affair with David Graft, OneLegacy's CFO, that he (David Graft) was embezzling money from the Company, and that Ms. Corliss likely participated in that embezzlement?

It seems like the Company goes out of its way to protect people who engage in wrongdoing but does nothing to protect employees like me and who complain about the wrongdoing.

Respectfully, Melissa

K. ONELEGACY RETALIATES AGAINST MS. LEGREE BY DIRECTING HER TO RETURN TO

WORK DURING HER PRE-APPROVED VACATION.

73. In retaliation for her complaints to ONELEGACY, ONELEGACY responded on Friday August 25, 2017 by informing Ms. LeGree that she should report to work on Monday,

28

27

25

August 28th—a date that ONELEGACY <u>knew</u> (and had known for months) that Ms. LeGree would be on a pre-approved vacation.

- 74. In particular, long before Ms. LeGree was forced out on leave, Ms. LeGree had sought and received permission from ONELEGACY to visit her parents in Florida. However, intent on setting Ms. LeGree up for further retaliation (and to create a pre-text under which to fire her), ONELEGACY chose a date that it knew Ms. LeGree would be unable to return, emailed Ms. LeGree while she was in route to Florida to see her parents and told her to return to work on Monday.
- 75. Ms. LeGree, who feared for her health after almost two (2) months of her indefinite, abusive and forced leave of absence wrote back:

Tom and Cheryl:

I am writing this email to you en route to Florida.

As you know, more than five months ago, I submitted an email to Anita Corliss requesting the Company's permission to go on a vacation to Florida with my parents from Monday, August 28th to September 4th. As you also know, Anita Corliss approved my request. In addition to requesting the approval of and receiving permission for my vacation from Anita, both of you knew that I was going to Florida to be with my parents and family and neither of you have ever told me that I could not go on my vacation. So, I believe that the timing of your decision to demand that I return to work when you know I am on vacation is further evidence of discrimination, harassment and retaliation and your attempt to set me up to be fired.

. . .

I have been sitting at home every day of my forced leave worrying about my employment and what people are saying about me at work and watching my health deteriorate. The only thing that has gotten me through these last two months is looking forward to seeing my parents for so long. Now, OneLegacy has not only caused me this terrible stress, depression and anxiety because of its retaliatory forced leave, but it has also ruined my vacation — a respite I desperately needed — because I am worried that I am going to be fired for not leaving my pre-approved vacation.

(Emphasis added).

- 76. When Ms. LeGree returned to work on Tuesday, September 5, 2017, her worst fears were again confirmed. ONELEGACY had retaliated against Ms. LeGree once again for her protests of race discrimination, race harassment, retaliation and failure to pay all wages earned. In particular, instead of the office that Ms. LeGree occupied before her forced "administrative" leave and before her complaints of race discrimination race harassment, retaliation and failure to pay all wages earned, Ms. LeGree was now relegated from her office to a cubicle (even though the Company had vacant available offices to which it could have assigned her).
- L. ONELEGACY'S DISPARATE TREATMENT TOWARDS MS. LEGREE (WHO COMMITTED NO WRONGDOING) IS EVEN MORE GLARING AND INDICATIVE OF DISPARATE

 TREATMENT, DISCRIMINATION AND RETALIATION WHEN VIEWED THROUGH THE PRISM OF ONELEGACY'S TREATMENT OF MS. LEGREE'S NON-AFRICAN-AMERICAN COUNTERPARTS WHO VIOLATE COMPANY POLICIES AND THE LAW, AND WHO SUFFER NO CONSEQUENCES WHATSOEVER.
- 77. While Ms. LeGree, who committed absolutely no wrongdoing whatsoever, was subjected to a litany of abuse and retaliation for bringing her complaints of discrimination, harassment and retaliation to ONELEGACY's Human Resources Department, Chief Executive Officer and Board of Directors, Ms. LeGree's non-African-American counterparts, including Anita Corliss, David Graft, and Cynthia Perley, suffered absolutely no adverse consequences for violating both Company policies and the law.
- 78. First, as described herein, Ms. LeGree is informed and believes and thereon alleges that Vice-President of Human Resources, Anita Corliss, had previously engaged in an affair with ONELEGACY's then-Chief Financial Officer, during which they embarked on expensive trips to Las Vegas resorts and casinos using and/or appropriating ONELEGACY funds.

Ms. LeGree is informed and believes and thereon alleges that Ms. Corliss was never disciplined in any way or suffered any type of adverse employment action for her alleged participation in the embezzlement and/or misuse and/or misappropriation of these funds and/or her benefiting personally from Mr. Graft's embezzlement and/or misuse and/or misappropriation of company assets for his own personal benefit.

- 79. Second, as described herein, Ms. LeGree is informed and believes and thereon alleges that David Graft, ONELEGACY's former Chief Financial Officer, was allowed to resign after his embezzlement and/or misuse and/or misappropriation of company assets for his own personal benefit, stay on ONELEGACY's website to help him secure other employment, and allow him to lie to potential employers about the circumstances of his separation with ONELEGACY. Glaringly, however, Ms. LeGree is informed and believes and thereon alleges that minority employees such as _______, who did absolutely nothing wrong, were fired for no reason other than complaining about discrimination and harassment. Likewise, Ms. LeGree, who did absolutely nothing wrong, was demoted for complaining about discrimination and harassment.
- 80. Third, Ms. LeGree is further informed and believes and thereon alleges that defendant Perley, since commencing her employment at ONELEGACY has not only violated the law by discriminating against and harassing Ms. LeGree and ______, but also by soliciting and hiring employees from her former employer, in violation of defendant Perley's non-solicitation agreement with her former employer. Ms. LeGree is further informed and believes and thereon alleges that such conduct, which could subject both ONELEGACY and defendant Perley to legal liability, is known of and condoned by ONELEGACY Chief Executive Officer Tom Mone.
- 81. ONELEGACY's decision to continue Ms. Corliss' and defendant Perley's employments is symptomatic of the Company's disparate treatment of non-African-American employees -i.e., if Ms. Corliss and/or defendant Perley had been African-American employees, they would have been fired.
- 82. Ms. LeGree has filed for and received her Right-To-Sue Letters from the California Department of Fair Employment and Housing.

FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION

RACE DISCRIMINATION IN VIOLATION OF THE CALIFORNIA FAIR EMPLOYMENT AND HOUSING ACT

(CALIFORNIA GOVERNMENT CODE § 12940(a))

- 83. Ms. LeGree re-alleges and incorporates by reference paragraphs 1 through 82, as though set forth in full.
- 84. At all times herein mentioned, the California Fair Employment and Housing Act ("FEHA"), Government Code § 12940 et seq., was in full force and effect and was binding upon Defendants OneLegacy, OneLegacy Foundation and Does 1-25 and each of them.
- 85. FEHA, Government Code § 12940(a), expressly provides that it is an unlawful employment practice for an "employer, because of the . . . race . . . of any person, to . . . discriminate against the person in compensation or in terms, conditions, or privileges of employment."
- 86. Defendants OneLegacy, OneLegacy Foundation and Does 1-25 each constitute an "employer" or "other entity covered by [FEHA]" as those terms are defined by FEHA.
 - 87. Ms. LeGree is an "employee" as that term is defined by FEHA.
 - 88. Ms. LeGree is African-American.
- 89. As described herein above, Defendants OneLegacy, OneLegacy Foundation and Does 1-25 discriminated against Ms. LeGree in compensation or in terms, conditions, or privileges of employment because of her race.
- 90. Defendants OneLegacy, OneLegacy Foundation and Does 1-25 discriminated against Ms. LeGree on the basis of her race via the disparate treatment, disparate impact, and pattern and practice theories of race discrimination.
- 91. As a direct, foreseeable, and legal result of the violations of FEHA by Defendants OneLegacy, OneLegacy Foundation and Does 1-25 as alleged herein, Ms. LeGree has suffered losses in earnings, attorney's fees and costs of suit and has suffered and continues to suffer

physical pain, humiliation, mental and emotional distress, depression, anxiety, insomnia, all to her damage in an amount in excess of the minimum jurisdiction of this Court, the precise amount of which will be proven at trial.

- 92. Ms. LeGree is informed and believes and thereon alleges that the Defendants OneLegacy, OneLegacy Foundation and Does 1-25, and each of them, by the acts of their managing agents, officers and/or directors in the aforementioned acts and/or ratifying such acts, engaged in willful, malicious, intentional, oppressive and despicable conduct, and acted with willful and conscious disregard of the rights, welfare and safety of Ms. LeGree, thereby justifying the award of punitive and exemplary damages, against Defendants OneLegacy, OneLegacy Foundation and Does 1-25, in an amount to be determined at trial.
- 93. As a result of the violations of FEHA by Defendants OneLegacy, OneLegacy Foundation and Does 1-25 as alleged herein, Ms. LeGree is entitled to reasonable attorneys' fees and costs of said suit as provided by California Government Code § 12965(b).

SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION

HARASSMENT BASED ON RACE

(CALIFORNIA GOVERNMENT CODE SECTION 12940(j))

(Against Defendants OneLegacy, OneLegacy Foundation, Cynthia Perley and Does 1-25)

- 94. Ms. LeGree re-alleges and incorporates by reference paragraphs 1 through 93, as though set forth in full.
- 95. As alleged herein and in violation of California Government Code Section 12940(j), defendants, and each of them, and/or their agents and employees, subjected Ms. LeGree to harassment based on race. Defendants, their agents, and supervisors, actively engaged in, facilitated, fostered, approved of, and knew or should have known of the unlawful harassing conduct, failed to take immediate and appropriate corrective action and otherwise failed to abide by their statutory duty to take all reasonable steps to prevent harassment from occurring.
- 96. The harassment was sufficiently pervasive or severe as to alter the conditions of Ms. LeGree's employment and to create a hostile, intimidating and/or abusive work

environment.

- 97. By the aforesaid acts and omissions of defendants, and each of them, Ms. LeGree has been directly and legally caused to suffer actual damages including, but not limited to, loss of earnings and future earning capacity, attorneys' fees, costs of suit and other pecuniary loss not presently ascertained.
- 98. As a further direct and legal result of the acts and conduct of respondents, and each of them, as aforesaid, Ms. LeGree has been caused to and did suffer and continues to suffer severe emotional and mental distress, anguish, humiliation, embarrassment, fright, shock, discomfort, anxiety, and related symptoms. The exact nature and extent of said injuries is presently unknown to Ms. LeGree. Ms. LeGree does not know at this time the exact duration or permanence of said injuries, but is informed and believes, and thereon alleges, that some if not all of the injuries are reasonably certain to be permanent in character.
- 99. Ms. LeGree is informed and believes, and thereon alleges, that the respondents, and each of them, by engaging in the aforementioned acts and/or in authorizing and/or ratifying such acts, engaged in wilful, malicious, intentional, oppressive and despicable conduct, and acted with wilful and conscious disregard of the rights, welfare and safety of Ms. LeGree, thereby justifying the award of punitive and exemplary damages in an amount to be determined at trial.
- 100. As a result of defendants' acts and conduct, as alleged herein, Ms. LeGree is entitled to reasonable attorneys' fees and costs of suit as provided in Section 12965(b) of the California Government Code.

23

24

25

26

27

28

THIRD CAUSE OF ACTION

UNLAWFUL RETALIATION IN VIOLATION OF THE CALIFORNIA FAIR EMPLOYMENT AND HOUSING ACT (CALIFORNIA GOVERNMENT CODE § 12940(h))

(Against Defendants OneLegacy, OneLegacy Foundation and Does 1-25)

Ms. LeGree hereby incorporates by reference Paragraphs 1 through 100 of this 101. Complaint as if fully set forth herein.

- 102. At all times herein mentioned, the California Fair Employment and Housing Act ("FEHA"), Government Code § 12940 *et seq.*, was in full force and effect and was binding upon Defendants and each of them.
- 103. FEHA, Government Code § 12940(h), expressly provides that it is an unlawful employment practice for an "employer or other entity covered by [FEHA] or person to discharge, expel, or otherwise discriminate against any person because the person has opposed any practices forbidden under [FEHA] or because the person has filed a complaint [under FEHA]."
- 104. Defendants OneLegacy, OneLegacy Foundation and Does 1-25 each constitute an "employer" or "other entity covered by [FEHA]" as those terms are defined by FEHA.
 - 105. Ms. LeGree is an "employee" as that term is defined by FEHA.
- 106. Ms. LeGree complained to Defendants OneLegacy, OneLegacy Foundation and Does 1-25 about and otherwise opposed and protested conduct that Ms. LeGree reasonably believed constituted: race discrimination, harassment, and retaliation against her complaining about race discrimination and harassment.
- 107. Defendants OneLegacy, OneLegacy Foundation and Does 1-25 retaliated against Ms. LeGree by, among other things, demoting her, banishing her from the workplace by placing her on an indefinite leave of absence, and taking away her office and relegating her to a cubicle.
- 108. As a direct, foreseeable, and legal result of the violations of FEHA by Defendants OneLegacy, OneLegacy Foundation and Does 1-25 as alleged herein, Ms. LeGree has suffered losses in earnings, attorney's fees and costs of suit and has suffered and continues to suffer physical pain, humiliation, mental and emotional distress, depression, anxiety, insomnia, all to his damage in an amount in excess of the minimum jurisdiction of this Court, the precise amount of which will be proven at trial.
- 109. Ms. LeGree is informed and believes and thereon alleges that Defendants OneLegacy, OneLegacy Foundation and Does 1-25, and each of them, by the acts of its managing agents, officers and/or directors in the aforementioned acts and/or ratifying such acts, engaged in willful, malicious, intentional, oppressive and despicable conduct, and acted with willful and conscious disregard of the rights, welfare and safety of Ms. LeGree, thereby

justifying the award of punitive and exemplary damages, against Defendants OneLegacy, OneLegacy Foundation and Does 1-25, in an amount to be determined at trial.

110. As a result of the violation of FEHA by Defendants OneLegacy, OneLegacy Foundation and Does 1-25 as alleged herein, Ms. LeGree is entitled to reasonable attorneys' fees and costs of said suit as provided by California Government Code § 12965(b).

FOURTH CAUSE OF ACTION

FAILURE TO PREVENT HARASSMENT

(CALIFORNIA GOVERNMENT CODE § 12940(k))

- 111. Ms. LeGree re-alleges and incorporates by reference paragraphs 1 through 110 as though set forth in full.
- 112. Pursuant to California Government Code Section 12940(k), Defendants owed to Ms. LeGree the duty to take all reasonable steps necessary to prevent harassment against Ms. LeGree based on her race and/or color.
- 113. As alleged herein and in violation of California Government Code Section 12940(k), Defendants violated the California Fair Employment and Housing Act by, among other things, failing to take all reasonable steps to prevent such harassment from occurring.
- 114. By the aforesaid acts and omissions of Defendants, Ms. LeGree has been directly and legally caused to suffer actual damages including, but not limited to, loss of earnings and future earning capacity, attorneys' fees, costs of suit and other pecuniary loss not presently ascertained.
- 115. As a further direct and legal result of the acts and conduct of Defendants as aforesaid, Ms. LeGree has been caused to and did suffer and continues to suffer severe emotional and mental distress, anguish, humiliation, embarrassment, insomnia, fright, shock, pain, discomfort and anxiety. The exact nature and extent of said injuries is presently unknown to Ms. LeGree. Ms. LeGree does not know at this time the exact duration or permanence of said injuries, but is informed and believes and thereon alleges that some if not all of the injuries are

reasonably certain to be permanent in character.

116. Ms. LeGree is informed and believes, and thereon alleges, that the Defendants, by engaging in the aforementioned acts and/or in authorizing and/or ratifying such acts, engaged in wilful, malicious, intentional, oppressive and despicable conduct, and acted with wilful and conscious disregard of the rights, welfare and safety of Ms. LeGree, thereby justifying the award of punitive and exemplary damages in an amount to be determined at trial.

117. As a result of Defendants' acts and conduct, as alleged herein, Ms. LeGree is entitled to reasonable attorneys' fees and costs of suit as provided in Section 12965(b) of the California Government Code.

FIFTH CAUSE OF ACTION

VIOLATION OF CALIFORNIA LABOR CODE SECTION 1102.5

- 118. Ms. LeGree realleges and incorporates by reference paragraphs 1 through 116 as though set forth in full.
- 119. As alleged herein and in violation of California Labor Code Section 1102.5, Defendants OneLegacy, OneLegacy Foundation and Does 1 25, and each of them, retaliated against Ms. LeGree for her disclosure of information that she had reasonable cause to believe disclosed a violation of Federal and California laws, rules and regulations to persons with authority over Ms. LeGree, and who had the authority to investigate, discover, and correct the complained of violations or non-compliance. Said activities would result in a violation of various Federal and California statutes and regulations such as the following: (1) Section 12940 of the California Government Code; (2) Section 12945.2 et seq. of the California Government Code (including for refusing to participate Ms. Corliss' illegal directive "build a case" against a OneLegacy employee who was on maternity leave); (3) various other California and Federal statutes, regulations and codes.
- 120. By the aforesaid acts and omissions of Defendants, and each of them, Ms. LeGree has been directly and legally caused to suffer actual damages including, but not limited to, loss of

earnings, reliance damages, costs of suit and other pecuniary loss in an amount not presently ascertained, but to be proven at trial.

- 121. As a further direct and legal result of the acts and conduct of Defendants, and each of them, as aforesaid, Ms. LeGree has been caused to and did suffer and continues to suffer severe emotional and mental distress, anguish, humiliation, shame, embarrassment, fright, shock, pain, discomfort and anxiety. Ms. LeGree does not know at this time the exact duration or permanence of said injuries, but is informed and believes, and thereon alleges, that some if not all of the injuries are reasonably certain to be permanent in character.
- 122. Ms. LeGree is informed and believes and thereon alleges that the Defendants, and each of them, by engaging in the aforementioned acts and/or in authorizing and/or ratifying such acts, engaged in wilful, malicious, fraudulent, intentional, oppressive and despicable conduct, and acted with wilful and conscious disregard of the rights, welfare and safety of Ms. LeGree, thereby justifying the award of punitive and exemplary damages in an amount to be determined at trial.
- 123. The aforesaid acts and omissions of Defendants, and each of them, justify the imposition of any and all civil penalties pursuant to Cal. Labor Code § 1102.5(f).
- 124. As a result of Defendants' conduct as alleged herein Ms. LeGree is entitled to reasonable attorneys' fees and costs of suit as provided in Section 1021.5 of the California Civil Procedure Code.

SIXTH CAUSE OF ACTION

WRONGFUL DEMOTION IN VIOLATION OF PUBLIC POLICY

- 125. Ms. LeGree re-alleges and incorporates by reference paragraphs 1 through 124 as though set forth in full.
- 126. As set forth herein, Defendants OneLegacy, OneLegacy Foundation and Does 1-25, and each of them, wrongfully demoted Ms. LeGree in violation of various fundamental public policies of the State of California. These fundamental public policies are embodied in:

- A. Section 12940(a) of the California Government Code;
- B. Section 12940(h) of the California Government Code;
- C. Article I, Section 8 of the California Constitution;
- D. Section 12945.2 et seq. of the California Government Code;
- E. Sections 17500 and 17200, *et seq.* of the California Business and Professions Code; and
- F. Various other California and Federal statutes and codes, including fundamental public policies that prohibit employers from, *inter alia*, discriminating against and/or retaliating against an employee on the basis of race, color, and/or taking family and medical leave, and/or complaining about violations of FEHA.
- 127. By the aforesaid acts and omissions of Defendants OneLegacy, OneLegacy
 Foundation and Does 1-25, and each of them, Ms. LeGree has been directly and legally caused to
 suffer actual damages including, but not limited to, loss of earnings and future earning capacity,
 attorneys' fees, costs of suit and other pecuniary loss not presently ascertained.
- 128. By the aforesaid acts and omissions of Defendants OneLegacy, OneLegacy
 Foundation and Does 1-25, and each of them, Ms. LeGree has been directly and legally caused to
 suffer actual damages including, but not limited to, loss of earnings, reliance damages, costs of
 suit and other pecuniary loss in an amount not presently ascertained, but to be proven at trial
- 129. As a further direct and legal result of the acts and conduct of Defendants

 OneLegacy, OneLegacy Foundation and Does 1-25, and each of them, as aforesaid, Ms. LeGree has been caused to and did suffer and continues to suffer severe emotional and mental distress, anguish, humiliation, embarrassment, insomnia, fright, shock, discomfort and anxiety. Ms. LeGree does not know at this time the exact duration or permanence of said injuries, but is informed and believes, and thereon alleges, that some if not all of the injuries are reasonably certain to be permanent in character.
- 130. Ms. LeGree is informed and believes and thereon alleges that Defendants OneLegacy, OneLegacy Foundation and Does 1-25, and each of them, by engaging in the aforementioned acts and/or in authorizing and/or ratifying such acts, engaged in willful,

malicious, fraudulent, intentional, oppressive and despicable conduct, and acted with willful and conscious disregard of the rights, welfare and safety of Ms. LeGree, thereby justifying the award of punitive and exemplary damages in an amount to be determined at trial.

131. As a result of the conduct of Defendants OneLegacy, OneLegacy Foundation and Does 1-25 as alleged herein, Ms. LeGree is entitled to reasonable attorneys fees and costs of suit as provided in Section 1021.5 of the California Civil Procedure Code.

SEVENTH CAUSE OF ACTION

RETALIATION FOR EXERCISING RIGHTS PURSUANT TO THE CALIFORNIA FAMILY RIGHTS ACT

(CALIFORNIA GOVERNMENT CODE § 12945.2, SUBDIVISION (I))

- 132. Ms. LeGree re-alleges and incorporates by reference paragraphs 1 through 131, as though set forth in full.
- 133. As alleged herein and in violation of California Government Code § 12945.2, subdivision (I), Defendants OneLegacy, OneLegacy Foundation and Does 1-25, and each of them, retaliated against, and otherwise discriminated against Ms. LeGree for exercising her right to family care and medical leave pursuant to the California Family Rights Act, including, among other things, forcing Ms. LeGree out of the workplace on a forced "administrative leave."
- 134. By the aforesaid acts and omissions of Defendants OneLegacy, OneLegacy
 Foundation and Does 1-25, and each of them, Ms. LeGree has been directly and legally caused to
 suffer actual damages including, but not limited to, loss of earnings and future earning capacity,
 attorneys' fees, costs of suit and other pecuniary loss not presently ascertained, for which Ms.

 LeGree will seek leave to amend when ascertained.
- 135. As a further direct and legal result of the acts and conduct of Defendants

 OneLegacy, OneLegacy Foundation and Does 1-25, and each of them, as aforesaid, Ms. LeGree
 has been caused to and did suffer and continues to suffer severe emotional and mental distress,
 anguish, humiliation, embarrassment, fright, shock, pain, discomfort and anxiety. The exact
 nature and extent of said injuries is presently unknown to Ms. LeGree. Ms. LeGree does not

know at this	time	the exact	auration	or	permanence	01	said	ınjuries,	but is	ınıorme	a ana	believ	es
and thereon	allege	es that so	me if not	all	of the injurie	es a	are re	asonably	certai	n to be	permai	nent i	n
character.													

- 136. Ms. LeGree is informed and believes and thereon alleges that Defendants OneLegacy, OneLegacy Foundation and Does 1-25, and each them, by engaging in the aforementioned acts and/or in authorizing and/or ratifying such acts, engaged in wilful, malicious, intentional, oppressive and despicable conduct, and acted with wilful and conscious disregard of the rights, welfare and safety of Ms. LeGree, thereby justifying the award of punitive and exemplary damages in an amount to be determined at trial.
- 137. As a result of the retaliatory and discriminatory acts by Defendants OneLegacy, OneLegacy Foundation and Does 1-25 as alleged herein, Ms. LeGree is entitled to reasonable attorneys' fees and costs of suit as provided in Section 12965(b) of the California Government Code.

EIGHTH CAUSE OF ACTION

NEGLIGENT SUPERVISION, TRAINING, AND RETENTION (Against Defendants OneLegacy, OneLegacy Foundation and Does 1-25)

- 138. Ms. LeGree hereby incorporates by reference Paragraphs 1 through 137 of this Complaint as if fully set forth herein.
- 139. Defendants OneLegacy, OneLegacy Foundation and Does 1-25 owed a duty of care to Ms. LeGree. Among other things, this duty arose from: (1) the fact that all persons are required to use due care in managing their activities and property [Civ. C. § 1714(a)]; and (2) an employer owes a duty to its employees to hire, supervise, train and retain employees in a manner to prevent the risk of harm caused by those employees to other employees.
- 140. Defendants OneLegacy, OneLegacy Foundation and Does 1-25 knew or should have known that, during the employment of Ms. LeGree, defendant Cynthia Perley posed a risk of engaging in unlawful harassment and retaliation.
 - 141. Defendants OneLegacy, OneLegacy Foundation and Does 1-25 breached their

duty to Ms. LeGree by failing to adequately supervise defendant Perley, failing to adequately train defendant Perley, and failing to take care to prevent defendant Perley from engaging unlawful retaliation and harassment.

142. Defendants OneLegacy, OneLegacy Foundation and Does 1-25, by breaching their duty to Ms. LeGree, caused her to suffer injury.

NINTH CAUSE OF ACTION

FAILURE TO PAY WAGES INCLUDING OVERTIME PREMIUM PAY

(CALIFORNIA LABOR CODE § 1194 et seq.)

- 143. Ms. LeGree re-alleges and incorporates by reference paragraphs 1 through 142 as though set forth in full.
- 144. By the aforesaid acts and omissions of Defendants, and each of them, Ms. LeGree was deprived of the wages to which she was entitled pursuant to the California Labor Code, the California Industrial Welfare Commission's ("IWC") Wage Orders and other wage and hour laws.
- 145. Defendants routinely required Ms. LeGree to work more than eight (8) hours per day, and/or forty (40) hours per week during her employment with Defendant
- 146. However, Defendants failed to fully compensate Ms. LeGree for all wages she earned, including overtime premium pay. As a result of Defendants' knowing and intentional policies and procedures, Ms. LeGree was not properly compensated for all hours she worked.
- 147. Ms. LeGree is informed and believes, and thereon alleges that the failure of Defendants to fully compensate her for all hours worked was willful, purposeful, unlawful per California Labor Code section 1194 *et seq.*, and done in accordance with the policies and practices of Defendants' operations.
- 148. As a direct and proximate cause of the aforementioned violations, Ms. LeGree has been damaged in an amount according to proof at time of trial, but in an amount in excess of the jurisdiction of this Court. Ms. LeGree is entitled to recover the unpaid balance of all wages

owed, penalties, reasonable attorney fees and costs of suit according to the mandate of California Labor Code Section 1194, et seg.

17

20

22

26

27

28

TENTH CAUSE OF ACTION

FAILURE TO PROVIDE REST PERIODS

- 149. Ms. LeGree re-alleges and incorporates by reference paragraphs 1 through 148 as though set forth in full.
- At all times herein set forth, California Labor Code § 218 authorizes employees to 150. sue directly for any wages or penalty due to them under the Labor Code.
- 151. At all times herein set forth, the Industrial Welfare Commission ("TWC") Wage Orders and California Labor Code §§ 226.7(a) and 512(a) were applicable to Defendants and their employees including Ms. LeGree.
- 152. At all times herein set forth, California Labor Code § 226.7(a) provides that no employer shall require an employee to work during any rest period mandated by an applicable order of the California Industrial Welfare Commission. At all times herein set forth, California Labor Code §226.7(b) provides that if an employer fails to provide an employee a rest period, the employer shall pay the employee one additional hour of pay at the employee's regular rate of compensation for each work day that the rest period is not provided.
- 153. At all times herein set forth, the relevant IWC Wage Order provides that every employer shall authorize and permit all employees to take rest periods, which shall be based on the total hours worked daily at the rate of ten (10) minutes net rest time per four (4) hours or major fraction thereof. Authorized rest period time shall be counted as hours worked for which there shall be no deduction from wages. If an employer fails to provide an employee a rest period in accordance with the applicable provisions of the wage order, the employer shall pay the employee one (1) hour of pay at the employee's regular rate of compensation for each workday that the rest period is not provided.

	154.	During	the relevant	time, I	Defenda	nts	knew	or shou	ld have	known	that	they	were
requirii	ng Ms.	LeGree	work more	than fou	r hours	in	a row	without	taking	an unint	terrup	oted	ten
(10) m	inute re	est period	i.										

- 155. During the relevant time, Defendants failed to pay Ms. LeGree one (1) hour of pay at the employees' regular rate of compensation for each workday that a meal and/or rest period was not provided.
- 156. Pursuant to the relevant IWC Wage Order and California Labor Code § 226.7(b), Ms. LeGree is entitled to recover from Defendants one (1) hour of pay at the employees' regular rate of compensation for each workday that a rest period was not provided.
- 157. Ms. LeGree is entitled to recover from Defendants an award of interest, costs and reasonable attorneys' fees pursuant to California Labor Code §§ 218.5 and 218.6 and California Code of Civil Procedure §1021.5.

ELEVENTH CAUSE OF ACTION

FAILURE TO PROVIDE ACCURATE ITEMIZED WAGE STATEMENTS (CALIFORNIA LABOR CODE § 226)

- 158. Ms. LeGree re-alleges and incorporates by reference paragraphs 1 through 157, as though set forth in full.
- 159. At all times herein set forth, California Labor Code § 218 authorizes employees to sue directly for any wages or penalty due to them under the California Labor Code.
- 160. Defendants have either recklessly or intentionally failed to either make, keep and preserve true, accurate, and complete records and/or furnish such records to its employees pursuant to the requirements of California Labor Code § 226(a).
- 161. Ms. LeGree is entitled to recover from Defendants the greater of her actual damages caused by Defendants' failure to comply with California Labor Code § 226(a) or an aggregate penalty not exceeding four thousand dollars (\$4,000.00), and an award of costs and

reasonable attorneys' fees pursuant to California Labor Code § 226(e) and California Code of Civil Procedure §1021.5.

20

21

23

24

25

26

27

28

TWELFTH CAUSE OF ACTION

NEGLIGENT INFLICTION OF EMOTIONAL DISTRESS

- Ms. LeGree re-alleges and incorporates by reference paragraphs 1 through 161, as 162. though set forth in full.
- 163. OneLegacy, OneLegacy Foundation and Does 1-25 breached their duty of care owed to Ms. LeGree to protect her from foreseeable harm. Their conduct, as alleged above, was done in a careless or negligent manner, without consideration for the effect of such conduct upon Ms. LeGree's emotional well-being.
- 164. By the aforesaid acts and omissions of OneLegacy, OneLegacy Foundation and Does 1-25, and each of them, Ms. LeGree has been directly and legally caused to suffer actual damages including, but not limited to, loss of earnings and future earning capacity, attorneys' fees, costs of suit and other pecuniary loss not presently ascertained.
- As a further direct and legal result of the acts and conduct of OneLegacy, OneLegacy Foundation and Does 1-25, and each of them, as aforesaid, Ms. LeGree has been caused to and did suffer and continues to suffer severe emotional and mental distress, anguish, humiliation, embarrassment, fright, shock, discomfort, anxiety, and related symptoms. The exact nature and extent of said injuries is presently unknown to Ms. LeGree. Ms. LeGree does not know at this time the exact duration or permanence of said injuries, but is informed and believes, and thereon alleges, that some if not all of the injuries are reasonably certain to be permanent in character.
- By the aforesaid acts and omissions of OneLegacy, OneLegacy Foundation and 166. Does 1-25, and each of them, Ms. LeGree has been directly and legally caused to suffer actual damages including, but not limited to, loss of earnings and future earning capacity, attorneys' fees, costs of suit and other pecuniary loss not presently ascertained.

5

6

10 11

12

13

14

15

16 17

18

19

20

22

21

23 24

26

25

27

28

As a further direct and legal result of the acts and conduct of OneLegacy, 167. OneLegacy Foundation and Does 1-25, and each of them, as aforesaid, Ms. LeGree has been caused to and did suffer and continues to suffer severe emotional and mental distress, anguish, humiliation, embarrassment, fright, shock, discomfort, anxiety, and related symptoms. The exact nature and extent of said injuries is presently unknown to Ms. LeGree. Ms. LeGree does not know at this time the exact duration or permanence of said injuries, but is informed and believes, and thereon alleges, that some if not all of the injuries are reasonably certain to be permanent in character.

THIRTEENTH CAUSE OF ACTION

INTENTIONAL INFLICTION OF EMOTIONAL DISTRESS

- 168. Ms. LeGree hereby incorporates by reference Paragraphs 1 through 167 of this Complaint as if fully set forth herein.
- 169. The actions of defendants OneLegacy, OneLegacy Foundation and Does 1-25 actions in retaliating against and demoting Ms. LeGree for the above-stated reasons were extreme and outrageous acts and taken with the intention of causing Ms. LeGree extreme emotional distress, humiliation, embarrassment and mental anguish. Such conduct exceeded the inherent risks of employment and was not the sort of conduct normally expected to occur in the workplace.
- 170. As a result of those extreme and outrageous acts, Ms. LeGree has suffered extreme emotional distress and incurred medical expenses for the treatment of said emotional distress, in an amount to be proved at the time of trial, but in any event sufficient to satisfy the jurisdictional limits of this Court.
- 171. The actions alleged herein were taken by managing agents and/or officers of OneLegacy, OneLegacy Foundation and Does 1-25 and/or ratified by managing agents and/or officers of OneLegacy, OneLegacy Foundation and Does 1-25. In so doing, said managing agents and/or officers of OneLegacy, OneLegacy Foundation and Does 1-25 acted with

1	II.	· ·
1	oppression, fra	aud and malice, as those terms are used in California Civil Code section 3294. As
2	such, Ms. LeC	Gree is entitled to an award of punitive damages.
3	\\\	
4		PRAYER FOR RELIEF
5		WHEREFORE, Ms. LeGree prays for a judgment against Defendants as follows:
6	a.	For general economic and non-economic damages according to proof,
7	b.	For special damages according to proof,
8	c.	For punitive damages where allowed by law;
9	d.	For prejudgment interest pursuant to California Civil Code section 3287 and/or
10		California Civil Code section 3288 and/or any other provision of law providing
11		for prejudgment interest;
12	e.	For attorneys' fees where allowed by law;
13	f.	For penalties;
14	g.	For injunctive relief,
15	h.	For costs of suit incurred herein; and
16	i.	For such other and further relief as this Court deems just and proper.
17	¥ N	Jean 17
18	DATED: Sept	rember 6, 2017 Respectfully submitted, HELMER FRIEDMAN, LLP
19		
20		Courtney Abrams Attorneys for Plaintiff dew H. Fr. com MELISSA LEGREE
21		MELISSA LEGREE
22	\\\	ν
23	\\\	
24	 	
25	///	
26	\\\	
27	\\\	
28	///	
	9	*