Assigned for all purposes to: Stanley Mosk Courthouse, Judicial Officer: Michael Stern

1 JAY S. ROTHMAN (SBN 49739) O. DAVID NATANZI (SBN 199983) 2 JAY S. ROTHMAN & ASSOCIATES 3 21900 Burbank Boulevard, Suite 210 Woodland Hills, California 91367 Telephone: (818) 986-7870 4 Facsimile: (818) 990-3019 lawyers@jayrothmanlaw.com 5 dnatanzi@jayrothmanlaw.com 6 Attorneys for Plaintiff LANCE PAYNE 7 8 SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA 9 FOR THE COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES 10 11 LANCE PAYNE, an individual, 12 Plaintiff. PLAINTIFF LANCE PAYNE'S 13 COMPLAINT FOR DAMAGES AND **DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL** VS. 14 1. Wrongful Termination in Violation of KAISER FOUNDATION HOSPITALS, a 15 Public Policy (Government Code §12940, California Corporation; KAISER et seq.); FOUNDATION HEALTH PLAN, INC., a 16 2. Discrimination Based Upon Disability California Corporation; THE PERMANENTE (Government Code §12940, et seq.); MEDICAL GROUP, INC., a California 17 3. Failure to Accommodate Disability Corporation; and DQES 1 through 50, (Government Code §12940(k) and (m)); inclusive, 4. Failure to Engage in the Interactive 18 Process (Government Code §12926.1(e)); 19 5. Retaliation in Violation of Public Policy Defendants. 6. Failure to Take All Reasonable Steps to 20 Prevent Discrimination, Harassment and Retaliation (Government Code §12940, et 21 7. Violation of California Family Rights Act; 22 8. Intentional Infliction of Emotional **Distress** 23 24 25 26 27 28

COMES NOW Plaintiff LANCE PAYNE and alleges as follows:

GENERAL ALLEGATIONS

- 1. At all relevant times, Plaintiff LANCE PAYNE (hereinafter "Plaintiff") was and now is an individual residing in the County of LOS ANGELES, State of California.
- 2. That the true name and capacities, whether individual, corporate, or associate, or otherwise of Defendants named herein DOES 1 through 50, inclusive, each of the them are unknown to Plaintiff who therefore sues said Defendants by such fictitious names, and Plaintiff will amend this complaint to state the true names and capacities when the same have been ascertained. Plaintiff is informed and believes and based thereon alleges that each fictitions Defendant designated herein as a DOE was responsible, negligently or in some other actionable manner for the events and happenings referred to herein which proximately caused injury to Plaintiff as hereinafter alleged.
- 3. At all times herein mentioned, Defendant KAISER FOUNDATION HOSPITALS (hereinafter referred to as "KAISER HOSPITALS") is and was a California Corporation doing business in the state of California at 8120 Woodman Avenue, Panorama City, California, 91402 and, at all relevant times herein, was Plaintan's employer. Kaiser Foundation is an "employer" as defined by California Government Code Sections 12926(d), 12940(a) and 12940(j)(4)(A) and employs more than five (5) individuals.
- 4. At all times herein mentioned, Defendant KAISER FOUNDATION HEALTH PLAN, INC. (hereinafter referred to as "KAISER HEALTH PLAN") is and was a California Corporation doing business in the state of California at 8120 Woodman Avenue, Panorama City, California, 91402 and, at all relevant times herein, was Plaintiff's employer. Kaiser Health Plan is an "employer" as defined by California Government Code Sections 12926(d), 12940(a) and 12940(j)(4)(A) and employs more than five (5) individuals.
- 5. At all times herein mentioned, Defendant THE PERMANENTE MEDICAL GROUP, INC (hereinafter referred to as "PERMANENTE MEDICAL") is and was a California Corporation doing business in the state of California at 8120 Woodman Avenue, Panorama City, California, 91402 and, at all relevant times herein, was Plaintiff's employer. Permanente Medical is an "employer" as defined by California Government Code Sections 12926(d), 12940(a) and 12940(j)(4)(A) and employs

more than five (5) individuals.

- 6. Based on information and believe, Plaintiff contends that Defendant KAISER HOSPITALS, Defendant KAISER HEALTH PLAN and Defendant PERMANENTE MEDICAL are inter-related entities, subsidiaries, or parent companies of one another and at all times were Plaintiff's employer (all three corporate Defendants will be referred to collectively as "Defendants" unless referred to individually).
- 7. Plaintiff further alleges that the employment relationship that gave rise to the allegations set forth herein was entered into in the state of California, and that the subject of said employment relationship was performed in Panorama City and County of Los Angeles. Furthermore, the acts and omissions of Defendants alleged herein occurred in the County of Los Angeles, State of California. As such, venue is proper pursuant to California Code of Civil Procedure section 395. Plaintiff's injuries were incurred within this jurisdiction, and the actions that give rise to this Complaint arose within this jurisdiction. As such, the proper venue is this judicial district.
- 8. Plaintiff is informed and believes and thereon alleges that at all times herein mentioned each of the Defendants were the agents, managers, supervisors and employee of each of the remaining Defendants, and in doing the things hereinafter alleged, were acting within the course and scope of such agency and employment. Plaintiff is informed and believes and based thereon alleges that said unknown Defendants, and each of them, individually and collectively, are responsible for the wrongful acts alleged herein and, therefore, are liable to Plaintiff as alleged herein. Unless otherwise indicated, each Defendant was acting within the course and scope of said agency and/or employment, with the knowledge and/or consent of said co-Defendant.

I.

JURISDICTION AND VENUE

- 9. Jurisdiction and venue are proper in this Court because some or all of the claims alleged herein arose in Los Angeles County and some or all of the parties were and/or are residents of Los Angeles County or are doing or did business in Los Angeles County at all times relevant herein.
- 10. The amount in controversy in this matter exceeds the sum of \$25,000.00, exclusive of interest and costs.

PARTIES

PLAINTIFF:

11. Plaintiff was employed by Defendants from on or about December 2015 until January 18, 2019, when he was wrongfully terminated from his position.

12. During the entirety of his employment with Defendants, Plaintiff fully and satisfactorily performed the duties of Information Technology Project Manager Lead III which is the position he held at the time of his termination. Plaintiff worked at different facilities owned by Defendants included facilities located in Pasadena, Panorama City and Woodland Hills.

CORPORATE DEFENDANTS:

13. Plaintiff is informed and believes and thereon alleges that the corporate Defendants are and at all times mentioned in this complaint, were authorized to operate by the State of California and the United States Government and authorized and qualified to do business in the County of Los Angeles. The Corporate Defendant's primary place of business is One Kaiser Plaza, Oakland California, 94612.

DOE DEFENDANTS:

Defendants 1-50, inclusive, are unknown to Plaintiff and, therefore, Plaintiff sues these Doe Defendants by such fictitious names. Plaintiff will seek leave of this Court to amend this Complaint to allege such names and capacities as soon as they are ascertained. Plaintiff is informed and believes and thereon alleges that each of these fictitiously named Defendants is responsible in some manner for the occurrences alleged herein, and that Plaintiff's injuries and damages as alleged and set forth herein were proximately caused by such fictitiously named Defendants.

AGENCY/CO-CONSPIRATOR STATUS OF EACH DEFENDANT:

- 15. Each of the individual Defendants is sued individually and in his or her capacity as an agent, representative, manager, supervisor, independent contractor and/or employee of Defendants.
- 16. Plaintiff is informed and believes and thereon alleges that at all times relevant herein, each and every Defendant, including the Doe Defendants, acted in concert and in furtherance of each

other's interest. The acts of the individually named Defendants, as described herein, were known to and ratified by Defendants. The acts and conducts of each and every Defendant as described herein, which were intentional, harassing, and discriminatory were not a normal part of Plaintiff's employment and were not the result of a legitimate business necessity.

III.

FACTS COMMON TO ALL CAUSES OF ACTION

- 16. Plaintiff LANCE PAYNE, an individual (hereinafter "Plaintiff"), was employed by Defendant KAISER FOUNDATION HOSPITALS, Defendant KAISER FOUNDATION HEALTH PLAN, INC. and Defendant KAISER FOUNDATION HOSPITALS and DOES 1 through 50, inclusive.
- 17. Plaintiff started his employment with Defendants on or around December 2015 when he was placed there through a staffing agency under contract with Defendants. Plaintiff was initially hired as an Information Technology Project Manager Lead II.
- 18. On or about September 2016, Plaintiff was hired directly by Defendants and promoted to serve as an Information Technology Project Manager Lave III. Plaintiff was promoted to this position over other, longer tenured individuals then employed by Defendants and because of his exceptional knowledge of the matter and his managerial skills.
- 19. During his employment Plaintiff regularly worked 60-70 hour workweeks where he oversaw and managed over 100 different projects at various medical centers owned and operated by Defendants.
- During his employment with Defendants, Plaintiff fully and satisfactorily performed the duties of his positions. Plaintiff received exemplary reviews for his performance and received a promotion, increase in salary, additional responsibilities and praise for his work.
- 21. Upon his initial hiring, Plaintiff notified Defendants that he suffered from a degenerative disc disease in his back that sometime caused debilitating back pain. Plaintiff provided his supervisors documentation of his disability and request for accommodation.
- 22. Plaintiff's accommodation was nothing more than a request for an ergonomic office chair that could enable Plaintiff to perform his duties without the aggravating back pain associated

with his disability. It took a couple months for this request, but Defendant provided Plaintiff with an ergonomic chair and height-adjustable desk. However, after Plaintiff relocated from Pasadena to the Panorama City Medical Center, it took Defendants six months to provide him with the same ergonomic chair and height-adjustable desk.

- 23. Additionally, Plaintiff requested that he be permitted to sit for 10 to 15 minutes after standing for an hour or more. Plaintiff also requested that he be allowed to stand and stretch his back after prolonged periods of sitting. Defendants initially resisted Plaintiff requests for these accommodations but eventually conceded.
- 24. Beginning in approximately October 2017, Defendants started reprimanding Plaintiff and writing him up for issues that were unsubstantiated or unwarranted.
- 25. On or about January 2018, Irv Hoff, was assigned to be Plaintiff's new supervisor. Once Mr. Hoff became Plaintiff's supervisor, the hardsment and retaliatory conduct grew worse. Mr. Hoff overwhelmed Plaintiff with projects but failed to provide him the necessary assistance and manpower to carry out his assignments all in an effort to force Plaintiff's resignation.
- 26. On or about March 2018, Mr. Hoff relocated Plaintiff's workstation to the other end of the hospital campus away from other team project members Plaintiff had to work with regularly on a daily and continuous basis. Plaintiff complained to Mr. Hoff that the move made it more difficult for Plaintiff to work alongside team members and how detrimental it was to his disc disease. Mr. Hoff did not care or take any corrective action in response to Plaintiff's complaints.
- 27. After Plaintiff was moved to the new work area, Plaintiff would have to take a 10-minute walk to his former workstation simply to oversee and manage the employees he was tasked with supervising. Plaintiff made this walk no less than three to four times a day which exacerbated his existing back pain and issues associated with his Adjustment Disorder.
- 28. On or about September 2018, Plaintiff ordered to undergo a three months Performance Improvement Plan ("PIP") despite the fact Defendants' policy requires employees such as Plaintiff to initially undergo a Corrective Action Plan ("CAP") before subjecting them to a PIP. This did not occur in Plaintiff's situation.
 - 29. Plaintiff completed the improvement plan and returned to work. Upon his return to

work, the harassment grew even more hostile than before. Several projects Plaintiff had been working on were removed from his team and assigned to other individuals who were not as experienced or knowledgeable as Plaintiff.

- 30. While Plaintiff was in the process of compliance with his PIP, he was diagnosed with Adjustment Disorder. This condition results in debilitating pain in limbs and an inability to function due to the associated anxiety. Plaintiff notified Defendants of this disability and explained how it could affect him physically and emotionally at work. Plaintiff further explained how stressful conditions including irrational and irresponsible expectations placed upon him could trigger these episodes.
- 31. While still completing his PIP, Plaintiff was subjected to such a barrage of harassment and retaliatory conduct that as a result, symptoms associated with Plaintiff's Adjustment Disorder became so incapacitating that he went on medical teach beginning on October 5, 2018.
- 32. Plaintiff was released to return to work on December 26, 2018. However, on his first day back to work, Plaintiff was sent home and told he was being placed on administrative leave because of his failure to complete the PIP while he had been on approved medical leave.
- 33. On January 18, 2019, Plaintiff received a letter from Defendants notifying him of his termination for alleged performance related issues. However, this excuse was a pretext for discrimination and retaliation. The true reason Plaintiff was terminated was due to his disability, because of his request for an accommodation, because he went on medical leave and because he complained of discrimination and retaliation in the workplace. Defendants also terminated Plaintiff in order to avoid engaging in the interactive process and to avoid Plaintiff with an accommodation pursuant to the Fair Employment and Housing Act.
- 34. At all times during his employment, Plaintiff informed Defendants of his disability and provided them with the requisite doctors' notes. When Defendants took the actions they did, Plaintiff was discriminated against due to his disability and Defendants' failure and/or refusal to accommodate his disability.
- 35. Plaintiff filed a claim with the California Department of Fair Employment and Housing ("DFEH"), pursuant to California *Government Code* section 12965(b) and the California Fair

Employment and Housing Act ("FEHA"). Plaintiff filed such a claim in a timely fashion and received a "right-to-sue" letter. Attached as Exhibit "A" and incorporated herein by reference is a true and correct copy of the claim against defendants. Plaintiff has thus exhausted all his administrative remedies.

FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION

WRONGFUL TERMINATION IN VIOLATION OF PUBLIC POLICY

(Government Code §12940, et seq.)

(Against Defendants All Defendants and DOES1-50)

- 36. The allegations of the preceding paragraphs are realleged and incorporated herein by reference except where to do so would be inconsistent with pleading a cause of action for Wrongful Termination in Violation of Public Policy.
- 37. At all times relevant herein, Defendants were employers as that term is defined in California Government Code section 12926, et seq., and as such, were barred from discriminating in employment decisions.
- 38. Plaintiff alleges that the terms and conditions of his employment and his termination was in violation of the public policy of the State of California which specifically prohibits Defendants from discriminating against Plaintiff on the basis of his disability. Plaintiff was disabled as that term is defined by the Government Code and a protected person. Defendants did discriminate against Plaintiff on the basis of his disability.
- 39. Defendants violated that public policy by discriminating against and terminating Plaintiff on the basis of his disability.
- 40. The above acts of Defendants constituted a wrongful termination of Plaintiff and was in violation of public policy as described above. Such termination was a substantial factor in causing damage and injury to Plaintiff as set forth below.
- 41. As a proximate result of the aforesaid acts of Defendants, Plaintiff has foreseeably suffered and continues to suffer substantial loss of earnings and employment benefits in an amount according to proof at the time of trial. Plaintiff claims such amount as damages together with prejudgment interest pursuant to Government Code section 12940, et seq., and/or any other provision

of law providing for prejudgment interest.

- 42. Plaintiff further has incurred additional expenses in his efforts to regain employment, all to his damage in an amount according to proof at the time of trial.
- 43. As a direct and proximate result of the aforementioned wrongful conduct of Defendants, Plaintiff will suffer additional loss of earnings, reduced earning capacity in the future, and other incidental and consequential damages in an amount according to proof at the time of trial.
- 44. Plaintiff incurred expenses herein for necessary and reasonable attorneys' fees in order to enforce his rights and to obtain benefits due him, all to his further damage in an amount according to proof.
- 45. As a proximate result of the conduct complained of herein, Plaintiff suffered and continues to suffer embarrassment, humiliation, emotional distress, mental anguish and severe shock to his nervous system, and thereby sustained serious injuries to his physical and mental health, strength and activity, causing him extreme physical and emotional pain, all to his general damage in such amount as may be proven. Said amount is within the jurisdiction of the Superior Court of the State of California.
- 46. As a direct and proximate result of the aforementioned wrongful conduct of Defendants, Plaintiff incurred medical expenses, the exact nature and extent of which are unknown to Plaintiff at this time and Plaintiff will ask leave of court to amend this complaint in this regard when the same have been ascertained.
- As a direct and proximate result of the aforementioned wrongful conduct of Defendants, Plaintiff will be required to incur additional future medical expenses all to his further damage in an amount to be proven at trial.
- 48. Because the acts taken toward Plaintiff were carried out in a deliberate, cold, callous and intentional manner in order to injure and damage Plaintiff, Plaintiff requests the assessment of punitive damages against Defendants in an amount appropriate to punish and make an example of Defendants.

2

4

56

7

8

1011

12

13

14 15

16

1718

19

2021

2223

2425

2627

28

SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION

DISCRIMINATION BASED UPON DISABILITY

(Government Code §12940, et seq.)

- 49. The allegations of the preceding paragraphs are realleged and incorporated herein by reference except where to do so would be inconsistent with pleading a cause of action for Discrimination Based Upon Disability.
- 50. FEHA prohibits disability discrimination in employment. FEHA additionally requires an employer which learns about discrimination to conduct an immediate and effective investigation and to provide remedies if needed.
- 51. Plaintiff suffered from a disability and, as such, is a member of a class protected from disability discrimination under California law.
- 52. When Defendants engaged in the acts of discrimination alleged in this Complaint, they treated Plaintiff adversely because of his disability.
- 53. In doing the acts referenced above, Defendants failed to accommodate Plaintiff's disability and in doing so Defendants violated their affirmative duty to Plaintiff.
- 54. As a proximate result of the aforesaid acts of Defendants, Plaintiff has foreseeably suffered and continues to suffer substantial loss of earnings and employment benefits in an amount according to proof at the time of trial. Plaintiff claims such amount as damages together with prejudgment interest pursuant to Government Code section 12945, et seq., and/or any other provision of law providing for prejudgment interest.
- 55. Plaintiff further has incurred additional expenses in his efforts to regain employment, all to his damage in an amount according to proof at the time of trial.
- 56. As a direct and proximate result of the aforementioned wrongful conduct of Defendants, Plaintiff will suffer additional loss of earnings, reduced earning capacity in the future, and other incidental and consequential damages in an amount according to proof at the time of trial.
- 57. Plaintiff incurred expenses herein for necessary and reasonable attorneys' fees in order to enforce his rights and to obtain benefits due him, all to his further damage in an amount according

to proof.

- 58. As a proximate result of the conduct complained of herein, Plaintiff suffered and continues to suffer embarrassment, humiliation, emotional distress, mental anguish and severe shock to his nervous system, and thereby sustained serious injuries to his physical and mental health, strength and activity, causing him extreme physical and emotional pain, all to his general damage in such amount as may be proven. Said amount is within the jurisdiction of the Superior Court of the State of California.
- 59. As a direct and proximate result of the aforementioned wrongful conduct of Defendants, Plaintiff incurred medical expenses, the exact nature and extent of which are unknown to Plaintiff at this time and Plaintiff will ask leave of court to amend this complaint in this regard when the same have been ascertained.
- 60. As a direct and proximate result of the aforementioned wrongful conduct of Defendants, Plaintiff will be required to incut additional future medical expenses all to his further damage in an amount to be proven at trial.
- 61. Because the acts taken toward Plaintiff were carried out in a deliberate, cold, callous and intentional manner in order to injure and damage Plaintiff, Plaintiff requests the assessment of punitive damages against Defendants in an amount appropriate to punish and make an example of Defendants.

THIRD CAUSE OF ACTION

FAILURE TO ACCOMMODATE DISABILITY

(Government Code §12940(k) and (m))

- 62. The allegations of the preceding paragraphs are realleged and incorporated herein by reference except where to do so would be inconsistent with pleading a cause of action for Failure to Accommodate Disability.
- 63. Government Code sections 12940(k) and (m) require an employer to provide reasonable accommodations to employees with known physical disabilities. An employer also has an affirmative duty to inform disabled individuals of other job opportunities, and ascertain whether the

employee is interested in, or qualified for said positions.

- 64. Defendants independently violated the FEHA by refusing to accommodate Plaintiff's disability or perceived disability, by repeatedly not adhering to requested accommodations, by refusing to respond to Plaintiff's requests, and by other conduct according to proof.
- 65. In doing the acts referenced above, Defendants failed to accommodate Plaintiff's disability and in doing so Defendants violated their affirmative duty to Plaintiff.
- 66. As a proximate result of the aforesaid acts of Defendants, Plaintiff has foreseeably suffered and continues to suffer substantial loss of earnings and employment benefits in an amount according to proof at the time of trial. Plaintiff claims such amount as damages together with prejudgment interest pursuant to Government Code section 12945, et seq., and/or any other provision of law providing for prejudgment interest.
- 67. Plaintiff further has incurred additional expenses in his efforts to regain employment, all to his damage in an amount according to proof at the time of trial.
- 68. As a direct and proximate result of the aforementioned wrongful conduct of Defendants, Plaintiff will suffer additional loss of earnings, reduced earning capacity in the future, and other incidental and consequential damages in an amount according to proof at the time of trial.
- 69. Plaintiff incurred expenses herein for necessary and reasonable attorneys' fees in order to enforce his rights and to obtain benefits due him, all to his further damage in an amount according to proof.
- As a proximate result of the conduct complained of herein, Plaintiff suffered and continues to suffer embarrassment, humiliation, emotional distress, mental anguish and severe shock to his nervous system, and thereby sustained serious injuries to his physical and mental health, strength and activity, causing him extreme physical and emotional pain, all to his general damage in such amount as may be proven. Said amount is within the jurisdiction of the Superior Court of the State of California.
- 71. As a direct and proximate result of the aforementioned wrongful conduct of Defendants, Plaintiff incurred medical expenses, the exact nature and extent of which are unknown to Plaintiff at this time and Plaintiff will ask leave of court to amend this complaint in this regard when

10

9

11

12 13

14 15

16 17

18 19

20 21

22 23

24

25 26

27 28 the same have been ascertained.

- 72. As a direct and proximate result of the aforementioned wrongful conduct of Defendants, Plaintiff will be required to incur additional future medical expenses all to his further damage in an amount to be proven at trial.
- 73. Because the acts taken toward Plaintiff were carried out in a deliberate, cold, callous and intentional manner in order to injure and damage Plaintiff, Plaintiff requests the assessment of punitive damages against Defendants in an amount appropriate to punish and make an example of Defendants.

FOURTH CAUSE OF ACTION

FAILURE TO ENGAGE IN THE INTERACTIVE PROCESS

(Government Code §12926.1(e))

- 74. The allegations of the preceding paragraphs are realleged and incorporated herein by reference except where to do so would be inconsistent with pleading a cause of action for Failure to Engage in the Interactive Process.
- 75. Government Code sections 12940(n) and 12926.1(e) require an employer to engage in a timely, good faith, interactive process with the employee to determine effective reasonable accommodations, if any, in response to a request for reasonable accommodation by an employee with a known physical or mental disability or know medical condition. It is a violation of FEHA to fail to engage in a timely, good faith interactive process.
- Defendants independently violated the FEHA by refusing to engage in the interactive process, by refusing to accommodate Plaintiff's disability or perceived disability, by repeatedly not adhering to requested accommodations, by refusing to respond to Plaintiff's requests, and by other conduct according to proof.
- 77. In doing the acts referenced above, Defendants failed to accommodate Plaintiff's disability and in doing so Defendants violated their affirmative duty to Plaintiff.
- 78. As a proximate result of the aforesaid acts of Defendants, Plaintiff has foreseeably suffered and continues to suffer substantial loss of earnings and employment benefits in an amount

according to proof at the time of trial. Plaintiff claims such amount as damages together with prejudgment interest pursuant to Government Code section 12945, et seq., and/or any other provision of law providing for prejudgment interest.

- 79. Plaintiff further has incurred additional expenses in his efforts to regain employment, all to his damage in an amount according to proof at the time of trial.
- 80. As a direct and proximate result of the aforementioned wrongful conduct of Defendants, Plaintiff will suffer additional loss of earnings, reduced earning capacity in the future, and other incidental and consequential damages in an amount according to proof at the time of trial.
- 81. Plaintiff incurred expenses herein for necessary and reasonable attorneys' fees in order to enforce his rights and to obtain benefits due him, all to his further damage in an amount according to proof.
- 82. As a proximate result of the conduct complained of herein, Plaintiff suffered and continues to suffer embarrassment, humiliation emotional distress, mental anguish and severe shock to his nervous system, and thereby sustained serious injuries to his physical and mental health, strength and activity, causing him extreme physical and emotional pain, all to his general damage in such amount as may be proven. Said amount is within the jurisdiction of the Superior Court of the State of California.
- 83. As a direct and proximate result of the aforementioned wrongful conduct of Defendants, Plaintiff incurred medical expenses, the exact nature and extent of which are unknown to Plaintiff at this time and Plaintiff will ask leave of court to amend this complaint in this regard when the same have been ascertained.
- 84. As a direct and proximate result of the aforementioned wrongful conduct of Defendants, Plaintiff will be required to incur additional future medical expenses all to his further damage in an amount to be proven at trial.
- 85. Because the acts taken toward Plaintiff were carried out in a deliberate, cold, callous and intentional manner in order to injure and damage Plaintiff, Plaintiff requests the assessment of punitive damages against Defendants in an amount appropriate to punish and make an example of Defendants.

FIFTH CAUSE OF ACTION

RETALIATION

(Government Code §12940, et seq.)

- 86. The allegations of the preceding paragraphs are realleged and incorporated herein by reference except where to do so would be inconsistent with pleading a cause of action for Retaliation.
- 87. At all times relevant herein, Defendants, and each of them, were employers as that term is defined in California Government Code section 12926, et seq., and as such, were barred from retaliating in employment decisions.
- 88. Plaintiff rejected illegal activity, i.e., discrimination and harassment. When Plaintiff rejected the discrimination, he was engaged in a protected activity. Furthermore, Plaintiff complained to his supervisors about Defendants' retaliatory conduct, failure to accommodate him or comply with his workplace restrictions Plaintiff was engaged in a protected activity. Additionally, Plaintiff requested and exercised his right to leave pursuant to the CFRA and was subsequently punished for exercising his right to medical leave. Therefore, Plaintiff was engaged in a protected activity when he complained about the mistreatment and other illegal conduct.
- 89. After engaging in this protected activity, Defendants, and each of them, engaged in acts of retaliation as alleged in this complaint, including, but not limited to, terminating Plaintiff.
- 90. In doing the acts referenced above, Defendants violated their affirmative duty to
- The above acts of Defendants and each of them caused Plaintiff severe emotional distress, anxiety, sleeplessness, and were outrageous and beyond the scope of his employment. As a direct, proximate and foreseeable result of the aforesaid conduct of the Defendants, and each of them, Plaintiff has suffered damages and injuries set forth below.
- 92. As a result of the aforesaid acts of Defendants, Plaintiff has become mentally upset, distressed and aggravated. Plaintiff claims general damages for such mental distress and aggravation in an amount of which will be proven at time of trial.
 - 93. Plaintiff incurred expenses herein for necessary and reasonable attorneys' fees in order

to enforce his rights and to obtain benefits due him, all to his further damage in an amount according to proof.

- 94. As a proximate result of the conduct complained of herein, Plaintiff suffered and continues to suffer embarrassment, humiliation, emotional distress, mental anguish and severe shock to his nervous system, and thereby sustained serious injuries to his physical and mental health, strength and activity, causing him extreme physical and emotional pain, all to his general damage in such amount as may be proven. Said amount is within the jurisdiction of the Superior Court of the State of California.
- 95. As a direct and proximate result of the aforementioned wrongful conduct of Defendants, and each of them, Plaintiff incurred medical expenses, the exact nature and extent of which are unknown to Plaintiff at this time and Plaintiff will ask leave of court to amend this complaint in this regard when the same have been ascertained.
- 96. As a direct and proximate result of the aforementioned wrongful conduct of Defendants, and each of them, Plaintiff will be required to incur additional future medical expenses all to his further damage in an amount to be proven at trial.
- 97. Because the acts taken toward Plaintiff were carried out in a deliberate, cold, callous and intentional manner in order to injure and damage Plaintiff, Plaintiff requests the assessment of punitive damages against Defendants, and each of them, in an amount appropriate to punish and make an example of Defendants.

SIXTH CAUSE OF ACTION

FAILURE TO TAKE ALL REASONABLE STEPS

TO PREVENT DISCRIMINATION, HARASSMENT AND RETALIATION

(Government Code §12940, et seq.)

- 98. The allegations of the preceding paragraphs are realleged and incorporated herein by reference except where to do so would be inconsistent with pleading a cause of action for Failure to Take All Reasonable Steps to Prevent Discrimination, Harassment and Retaliation.
 - 99. Government Code section 12940 et seq., including but not limited to Government Code

section 12940(j)(1), provides that it is an unlawful employment practice for an employer, because of the person's disability, to discriminate against an employee and retaliate against him or her. An entity shall take all reasonable steps to prevent the discrimination and retaliation from occurring.

100. The facts alleged above constitute violations of FEHA in that Defendants, and each of

- 100. The facts alleged above constitute violations of FEHA in that Defendants, and each of them, subjected Plaintiff to discrimination. Plaintiff alleges that Defendants' discrimination against Plaintiff and ongoing harassment was an unlawful employment practice. Defendants also engaged in acts of retaliation as alleged in this complaint. Defendants, and each of them, failed to take all reasonable steps necessary to prevent discrimination, harassment and retaliation from occurring in violation of Government Code section 12940(j)(1) of the Fair Employment and Housing Act.
- 101. As a proximate result of the aforesaid acts of Defendants, Plaintiff has foreseeably suffered and continues to suffer substantial loss of earnings and employment benefits in an amount according to proof at the time of trial. Plaintiff claims such amount as damages together with prejudgment interest pursuant to Government Code section 12945, et seq. and/or any other provision of law providing for prejudgment interest.
- 102. Plaintiff further has incurred additional expenses in his efforts to regain employment, all to his damage in an amount according to proof at the time of trial.
- 103. As a direct and proximate result of the aforementioned wrongful conduct of Defendants, and each of them, Plaintiff will suffer additional loss of earnings, reduced earning capacity in the future, and other incidental and consequential damages in an amount according to proof at the time of trial.
- Plaintiff incurred expenses herein for necessary and reasonable attorneys' fees in order to enforce his rights and to obtain benefits due him, all to his further damage in an amount according to proof.
- 105. As a proximate result of the conduct complained of herein, Plaintiff suffered and continues to suffer embarrassment, humiliation, emotional distress, mental anguish and severe shock to his nervous system, and thereby sustained serious injuries to his physical and mental health, strength and activity, causing him extreme physical and emotional pain, all to his general damage in such amount as may be proven. Said amount is within the jurisdiction of the Superior Court of the State of

California.

- 106. As a direct and proximate result of the aforementioned wrongful conduct of Defendants, and each of them, Plaintiff incurred medical expenses, the exact nature and extent of which are unknown to Plaintiff at this time and Plaintiff will ask leave of court to amend this complaint in this regard when the same have been ascertained.
- 107. As a direct and proximate result of the aforementioned wrongful conduct of Defendants, and each of them, Plaintiff will be required to incur additional future medical expenses all to his further damage in an amount to be proven at trial.
- 108. Because the acts taken toward Plaintiff were carried out in a deliberate, cold, callous and intentional manner in order to injure and damage Plaintiff requests the assessment of punitive damages against Defendants, and each of them, in an amount appropriate to punish and make an example of Defendants.

SEVENTH CAUSE OF ACTION

VIOLATION OF CALIFORNIA FAMILY RIGHTS ACT

- 109. The allegations of the Statement of Facts and preceding paragraphs are realleged and incorporated herein by reference except where to do so would be inconsistent with pleading a cause of action for Violation of California Family Rights Act.
- 110. The California Family Rights Act ("CFRA") was established to ensure secure leave rights for the following: (a) birth of a child for purposes of bonding; (b) placement of a child in the employee's family for adoption or foster care; (c) for the serious health condition of the employee's child, parent or spouse; (d) or for the employee's own serious health condition.
- 111. At all times mentioned herein, Defendants were covered employers as that term is defined by law within the CFRA.
- 112. At all times mentioned herein, Plaintiff was an eligible employee as that term is defined by law within the CFRA.
 - 113. At all times mentioned herein, Plaintiff suffered from a serious health condition.
 - 114. At all times mentioned herein, Plaintiff qualified for leave under the CFRA for his 18

medical condition. After requesting such leave, Defendants retaliated against Plaintiff and terminated him.

- 115. Defendants' actions constituted a violation of the CFRA.
- 116. The above acts of Defendants caused Plaintiff severe emotional distress, anxiety, sleeplessness, and were outrageous and beyond the scope of his employment. As a direct, proximate and foreseeable result of the aforesaid conduct of the defendants, Plaintiff has suffered damages and injuries set forth below.
- 117. As a result of the aforesaid acts of defendants, Plaintiff has become mentally upset, distressed and aggravated. Plaintiff claims general damages for such mental distress and aggravation in an amount of which will be proven at time of trial.
- 118. As a proximate result of the aforesaid acts of Defendants, Plaintiff has foreseeably suffered and continues to suffer substantial loss of earnings and employment benefits in an amount according to proof at the time of trial. Plaintiff claims such amount as damages together with prejudgment interest.
- 119. Plaintiff further has incorred additional expenses in his efforts to regain employment, all to his damage in an amount according to proof at the time of trial.
- 120. As a direct and proximate result of the aforementioned wrongful conduct of Defendants, and each of them, Plaintiff will suffer additional loss of earnings, reduced earning capacity in the future, and other incidental and consequential damages in an amount according to proof at the time of trial.
- Plaintiff incurred expenses herein for necessary and reasonable attorneys' fees in order to enforce his rights and to obtain benefits due him, all to his further damage in an amount according to proof.
- 122. As a proximate result of the conduct complained of herein, Plaintiff suffered and continues to suffer embarrassment, humiliation, emotional distress, mental anguish and severe shock to his nervous system, and thereby sustained serious injuries to his physical and mental health, strength and activity, causing him extreme physical and emotional pain, all to his general damage in such amount as may be proven. Said amount is within the jurisdiction of the Superior Court of the State of

123. As a direct and proximate result of the aforementioned wrongful conduct of Defendants, and each of them, Plaintiff incurred medical expenses, the exact nature and extent of which are unknown to Plaintiff at this time and plaintiff will ask leave of court to amend this complaint in this regard when the same have been ascertained.

- 124. As a direct and proximate result of the aforementioned wrongful conduct of Defendants, and each of them, Plaintiff will be required to incur additional future medical expenses all to his further damage in an amount to be proven at trial.
- 125. Because the acts taken toward Plaintiff were carried out in a deliberate, cold, callous and intentional manner in order to injure and damage Plaintiff requests the assessment of punitive damages against Defendants, and each of them, in an amount appropriate to punish and make an example of Defendants.

EIGHTH CAUSE OF ACTION

INTENTIONAL INFLICTION OF EMOTIONAL DISTRESS

- 126. The allegations of the preceding paragraphs are realleged and incorporated herein by reference except where to do so would be inconsistent with pleading a cause of action for Intentional Infliction of Emotional Distress.
- 127. When Defendants did the acts described in this complaint, they engaged in extreme and outrageous conduct. They did such acts deliberately, intentionally and recklessly so as to cause Plaintiff severe emotional distress. Defendants' conduct in confirming and ratifying that conduct was done with knowledge that Plaintiff's distress would thereby increase and was done with wanton and reckless disregard of the consequences to Plaintiff.
- 128. The above acts of Defendants caused Plaintiff severe emotional distress, anxiety, sleeplessness, and were outrageous and beyond the scope of his employment. As a direct, proximate and foreseeable result of the aforesaid conduct of the Defendants, Plaintiff has suffered damages and injuries set forth below.
 - 129. As a result of the aforesaid acts of Defendants, Plaintiff has become mentally upset, 20

distressed and aggravated. Plaintiff claims general damages for such mental distress and aggravation in an amount of which will be proven at time of trial.

- 130. As a proximate result of the aforesaid acts of Defendants, Plaintiff has foreseeably suffered and continues to suffer substantial loss of earnings and employment benefits in an amount according to proof at the time of trial. Plaintiff claims such amount as damages together with prejudgment interest.
- 131. Plaintiff further has incurred additional expenses in his efforts to regain employment, all to his damage in an amount according to proof at the time of trial.
- 132. As a direct and proximate result of the aforementioned wrongful conduct of Defendants, and each of them, Plaintiff will suffer additional loss of earnings, reduced earning capacity in the future, and other incidental and consequential damages in an amount according to proof at the time of trial.
- 133. As a proximate result of the conduct complained of herein, Plaintiff suffered and continues to suffer embarrassment, humiliation, emotional distress, mental anguish and shock to his nervous system, and thereby sustained serious injuries to his physical and mental health, causing him extreme physical and emotional pain, all to his general damage in such amount as may be proven. Said amount is within the jurisdiction of the Superior Court of the State of California.
- 134. As a direct and proximate result of the aforementioned wrongful conduct of Defendants, and each of them, Plaintiff incurred medical expenses, the exact nature and extent of which are unknown to Plaintiff at this time and Plaintiff will ask leave of court to amend this complaint in this regard when the same have been ascertained
- 135. As a direct and proximate result of the aforementioned wrongful conduct of Defendants, and each of them, Plaintiff will be required to incur additional future medical expenses all to his further damage in an amount to be proven at trial.
- 136. Because the acts taken toward Plaintiff were carried out in a deliberate, cold, callous and intentional manner in order to injure and damage Plaintiff, Plaintiff requests the assessment of punitive damages against Defendants, and each of them, in an amount appropriate to punish and make an example of Defendants.

EXHIBIT A



DEPARTMENT OF FAIR EMPLOYMENT & HOUSING

2218 Kausen Drive, Suite 100 I Elk Grove I CA I 95758 (800) 884-1684 (Voice) I (800) 700-2320 (TTY) | California's Relay Service at 711 http://www.dfeh.ca.gov I Email: contact.center@dfeh.ca.gov

May 20, 2019

O. David Natanzi 21900 Burbank Blvd. 210 Woodland Hills, California 91367

RE: Notice to Complainant's Attorney

DFEH Matter Number: 201905-06012502

Right to Sue: Payne / Kaiser Foundation Health Plan, Inc.

Dear O. David Natanzi:

Attached is a copy of your **amended** complaint of discrimination filed with the Department of Fair Employment and Housing (DFEH) pursuant to the California Fair Employment and Housing Act, Government Code section 12900 et seq.

Pursuant to Government Code section 12962, DFE will not serve these documents on the employer. You or your client must serve the complaint.

The amended complaint is deemed to have the same filing date of the original complaint. This is not a new Right to Sue letter. The original Notice of Case Closure and Right to Sue issued in this case remains the only such notice provided by the DFEH. (Cal. Code Regs., tit. 2, § 10022.)

Be advised that the DFEH does not review or edit the complaint form to ensure that it meets procedural or statutory requirements.

Sincerely,

Department of Fair Employment and Housing

1

COMPLAINT OF EMPLOYMENT DISCRIMINATION BEFORE THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

DEPARTMENT OF FAIR EMPLOYMENT AND HOUSING **Under the California Fair Employment and Housing Act** (Gov. Code, § 12900 et seq.) In the Matter of the Complaint of Lance Payne DFEH No. 201905-06012502 Complainant, VS. Kaiser Foundation Health Plan, Inc. 393 East Walnut Street Pasadena, California 91188 Southern California Permanente Medial Group, 393 East Walnut Street Pasadena, California 91188 The Permanente Medical Group, Inc. 393 East Walnut Street Pasadena, California 91188 Kaiser Foundation Hospitals One Kaiser Plaza Oakland, California 94612 Respondents 1. Respondent Kaiser Foundation Health Plan, Inc. is an employer subject to suit under the California Fair Employment and Housing Act (FEHA) (Gov. Code, § 12900 et seq.). 2. Complainant Lance Payne, resides in the City of North Hollywood State of California. 3. Complainant alleges that on or about **January 18, 2019**, respondent took the following adverse actions:

Complaint - DFEH No. 201905-06012502

28 Date Filed: May 3, 2019 Date Amended: May 20, 2019

Complainant was harassed because of complainant's family care or medical leave (cfra) (employers of 50 or more people), disability (physical or mental), medical 2 condition (cancer or genetic characteristic), other. 3 Complainant was discriminated against because of complainant's family care or medical leave (cfra) (employers of 50 or more people), disability (physical or mental), medical condition (cancer or genetic characteristic) and as a result of the 5 discrimination was terminated, reprimanded, suspended, denied a work environment free of discrimination and/or retaliation, denied reasonable accommodation for a 6 disability, other, denied work opportunities or assignments. 7 Complainant experienced retaliation because complainant reported or resisted any form of discrimination or harassment, requested or used a disability related accommodation, requested or used leave under the california family rights act or fmla (employers of 50 or more people) and as a result was terminated, reprimanded, suspended, denied a work environment free of discrimination and/or retaliation, 10 denied reasonable accommodation for a disability, other 11 Additional Complaint Details: Complainant Lance Payne started his employment 12 with Respondents on or about December 2015 complainant was initially hired on a 13 contract basis through a third party vendor and then hired directly in September 2016 by Respondents. Mr. Payne was an IT Project Manager Level 3 at the time of 14 his termination on January 18, 2019. 15 Shortly after he was hired, Mr. Payne notified Respondents that he suffered from a degenerative disc disease in his back that would require an accommodation. 16 Additionally, Mr. Payne has been diagnosed with Adjustment Disorder which results 17 in debilitating pain in limbs and an inability to function due to the associated anxiety. Respondents were aware of this disability as well. 18 Complainant provided documentation of his disability and requests for 19 accommodation. Respondents initially balked at his request for accommodation but 20 eventually provided him with his requested accommodations. 21 Beginning in approximately October 2017, Respondents started reprimanding Complainant and writing him for reasons that were unsubstantiated or unwarranted. 22 Around that same time period, Irv Hoff, was assigned to be Mr. Payne's new supervisor. Once Mr. Hoff became his new supervisor, the harassment and 23 retaliatory conduct grew worse. 24 In September 2018, Mr. Payne was ordered to undergo a three week improvement performance plan. Mr. Payne completed the improvement plan and returned to 25 work. However, the harassment grew even more hostile than before. As a result, 26 27 Complaint – DFEH No. 201905-06012502

28

Date Filed: May 3, 2019 Date Amended: May 20, 2019

symptoms associated with Mr. Payne's adjustment disorder became so incapacitating that he went on medical leave beginning on October 5, 2018.

Mr. Payne was released to return to work on December 26, 2018. He went back to work and on his first day back he was sent home and told he was being placed on administrative leave. On January 18, 2019, Mr. Payne received a letter indicating he was terminated due to poor performance.

VERIFICATION

I, O. David Natanzi, am the Attorney in the above-entitled complaint. I have read the foregoing complaint and know the contents thereof. The matters alleged are based on information and belief, which I believe to be true.

On May 20, 2019, I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of Woodla.

Solution like a like the second and the se California that the foregoing is true and correct.

Woodland Hills, CA

Complaint – DFEH No. 201905-06012502

Date Filed: May 3, 2019 Date Amended: May 20, 2019