	il en		
1	WILLIAM R. TAMAYO, SBN 084965 DAVID F. OFFEN-BROWN, SBN 063321		
2	LINDA S. ORDONIO-DIXON, SBN 172830 U.S. EQUAL EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITY COMMISSION		
3	San Francisco District Office 350 The Embarcadero, Suite 500		
4	San Francisco, CA 94105-1260		
5	Telephone No. (415) 625-5658 Fax No. (415) 625-5657		
6	Attorneys for Plaintiff		
7			
8	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT		
9	EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA - FRESNO		
10			
11	EQUAL EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITY COMMISSION,	CIVIL ACTION NO.	
12	Plaintiff,	COMPLAINT- CIVIL RIGHTS	
13	V.	EMPLOYMENT DISCRIMINATION (42 U.S.C. §§ 2000e, et seq.)	
14	GRIMMWAY ENTERPRISES, INC. d/b/a GRIMMWAY FARMS;		
15	ESPARZA ENTERPRISES, INC.	JURY TRIAL DEMAND	
16	Defendant.		
17		_	
18			
19	<u>NATURE OF THE ACTION</u>		
20	This is an action under Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 (Title VII) and Title I of the		
	Civil Rights Act of 1991 to corre ct unlawful employment practices on the basis of sex, fe male, and		
21	to provide appropriate relief to Charging Party Ana-Berta Rubio and other similarly situated female		
22	employees who were adversely affected by such practices. As alleged below, defendants		
23	GRIMMWAY ENTERPRISES, INC. d/b/a GR IMMWAY FARMS (Grimmway) and ESPARZA		
24	ENTERPRISES, INC. (Esparza) subjected Ms. Rubio and similarly situated female employees to an		
25	unlawful hostile work environm ent based on their sex. In a ddition, defendants Grimmway and		
26	Esparza unlawfully retaliated against Ms Rubio by term inating her employment for engaging in		
27	protected activity.		
28	•		

COMPLAINT

**JURISDICTION AND VENUE** 2 1. Jurisdiction of this C ourt is invoked pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §§451, 1331, 1337, 1343, and 3 1345. This action is authorized and instituted pursuant to §706(f)(1) and (3) of Title VII of the Civil 4 Rights Act of 1964, as amended, 42 U.S.C. §2000e-5(f)(1) and (3), and §102 of the Civil Rights Act 5 of 1991, 42 U.S.C. §1981a. 6 2. The employment practices alleged to be unlawful were and are now being committed within 7 the state of California, County of Kern, which is within the jurisdiction of this court. 8 9 **PARTIES** 10 3. Plaintiff, the Equal Employm ent Opportunity Commission (EEOC), is the agency of the 11 United States of America charged with the administration, interpretation, and enforcement of Title 12 VII and is expressly au thorized to bring this action by §706(f)(1) and (3) of Title VII, 42 U.S.C. 13  $\S 2000e-5(f)(1)$  and (3). 14 4. At all relevant times, defendant Grimmway has been a California corporation, doing business 15 in the State of California, in the County of Kern, and has continuously had at least fifteen employees. 16 5. At all relevant times, defendant Esparza has been a California corporation, doing business in 17 the State of California, in the County of Kern, and has continuously had at least fifteen employees. 18 6. At all relevant times, defendant Grimmway has continuously been an em ployer engaged in 19 an industry affecting commerce within the meaning of §701(b), (g), and (h) of Title VII, 42 U.S.C. 20 §2000e-(b), (g), and (h). 21 7. At all relevant times, defendant Esparza has continuously been an employer engaged in an 22 industry affecting commerce within the m eaning of §701(b), (g), and (h) of Title VII, 42 U.S.C. 23 §2000e-(b), (g), and (h). 24 // 25 // 26

1

**COMPLAINT** 2.

//

//

27

28

## **STATEMENT OF CLAIMS**

## **Sexual Harassment**

- 8. More than thirty days prior to the institution of this lawsuit, Charging Party Ana-Berta Rubio filed a charge of discrimination with the EEOC alleging v iolations of Title VII by Defendants. All conditions precedent to the institution of this lawsuit have been fulfilled.
- 9. Since at least July 2003, defendants Grimmw ay and Esparza have engaged in unlawful employment practices at its Califo rnia facilities in viol ation of \$703(a)(1) of Title VII, 42 U.S .C. \$2000e-2(a). These practices include subjecting Ms. Rubio and similarly situated female employees to a sexually hostile, abusive, intimidating, and offensive work environment.
- 10. The effect of the practices complained of in paragraph 9 above has been to deprive Ms. Rubio and similarly situated female employees of equal employment opportunities and otherwise to adversely affect their status as employees because of their gender, female.
- 11. The unlawful em ployment practices com plained of in paragraph 9 above were and are intentional.
- 12. The unlawful employment practices complained of in paragraph 9 above were and are done with malice and/or reckless indifference to the federally protected rights of Ms. Rubio and similarly situated female employees.

## Retaliation

- 13. On or about Septem ber 24, 2003, defendant s Grimmway and Esparza engaged in the unlawful employment practice of retaliation at their California facilities, in violation of §704(a) of Title VII, 42 U.S.C. §2000e-3(a), by terminating Ms. Rubio for engaging in protected activity.
- 14. The effect of the practice complained of in paragraph 13 above has been to deprive Ms. Rubio of equal employment opportunities and otherwise to adversely affect her status as an employee because of her protected activity.
- 15. The unlawful employment practice complained of in paragraph 13 above was intentional.
- 16. The unlawful employment practice complained of in paragraph 13 was done with malice

COMPLAINT 3.

and/or reckless indifference to the federally protected rights of Ms. Rubio.

## **PRAYER FOR RELIEF**

WHEREFORE, the EEOC respectfully requests that this Court:

- A. Grant a per manent injunction en joining defendants Grimmway and Esparza, their officers, successors, assigns, and all persons in active concert or participation with them, from engaging in any employment practice which discriminates on the basis of sex and/or retaliation.
- B. Order defendants Grimmway an d Esparza to institute and carry out policies, practices, and programs which provide equal empl oyment opportunities for fe male employees and which eradicate the effects of its past and present unlawful employment practices.
- C. Order defendants to make whole Ms. Rubio and similarly situated female employees, by providing appropriate backpay with prejudgm ent interest, in amounts to be determined at trial, and other affirmative relief necessary to eradicate the effects of their unlawful employment practices, including but not limited to reinstatement.
- D. Order defendants Grimmway and Espar za to make whole Ms. Rubio and si milarly situated female employees by providing compensation for past and future pecuniary losses resulting from the unlawful employment practices described above, including medical expenses, with interest, in amounts to be determined at trial.
- E. Order defendants Grimmway and Espar za to make whole Ms. Rubio and si milarly situated female employees by providing compen sation for past and future non-pecuniary losses resulting from the above unlawful employment practices, including pain and suffering, emotional distress, indignity, loss of enjoyment of life, loss of self-esteem, and humiliation, in amounts to be determined at trial.
- F. Order defendants Grimmway and Esparza to pay Ms. Rubio and similarly situated female employees punitive damages for their malic ious and reckless conduct described above, in amounts to be determined at trial.
  - G. Grant such further relief as the Court deems proper.

COMPLAINT 4.

1	H. Award the EEOC its costs in this action.	
2	2	
3	JURY TRI	AL DEMAND
4		
5		
6	6	
7	7 Respectf	ully submitted,
8	8	
9	9	JAMES LEE Deputy General Counsel
10		U. S. EQUAL EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITY COMMISSION
11		1801 L Street, N.W.
12		Washington, D.C. 20507
13		
14		//s// WILLIAM R. TAMAYO
15		Regional Attorney
16		//s//
17 18		DAVID F. OFFEN-BROWN Supervisory Trial Attorney
19		Supervisory That Attorney
20		//s// LINDA ORDONIO-DIXON
21		Senior Trial Attorney
22		Attorneys for Plaintiff EEOC
23		U.S. EOUAL EMPLOYMENT
24		U. S. EQUAL EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITY COMMISSION San Francisco District Office
25		350 The Embarcadero, Suite 500 San Francisco, California 94105-1260
26		,
27		
28		
-		

COMPLAINT 5.