ANNA Y. PARK, SBN 164242 1 | CONNIE LIEM, TX SBN 791113 ELIZABETH ESPARZA-CERVANTES, SBN 205412 2 U.S. EOUAL EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITY COMMISSION 3 255 East Temple Street, 4th Floor Los Angeles, CA 90012 Telephone: (213) 894-1032 Facsimile: (213) 894-1301 4 5 Attorneys for Plaintiff EQUAL EMPLOYMENT 6 OPPORTUNITY COMMISSION UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA CASE NO .: EDCV 03-1118 LT/SGLx) **EQUAL EMPLOYMENT** 10 OPPORTUNITY COMMISSION. COMPLAINT- CIVIL RIGHTS 11 **EMPLOYMENT** 12 Plaintiff, DISCRIMINATION (42 U.S.C. §§ 2000e, et seq.) 13 V. JURY TRIAL DEMAND 14 CANYON LAKE PROPERTY OWNER'S ASSOCIATION d/b/a COUNTRY CLUB 15 RESTAURANT; DOES 1-6 16 Inclusive, 17 Defendant. 18 19 NATURE OF THE ACTION 20 This is an action under Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, as 21 amended, and Title I of the Civil Rights Act of 1991 to correct unlawful 22 employment practices on the basis of sex, female, and retaliation. Plaintiff United 23 24 States Equal Employment Opportunity Commission ("Commission") alleges that Defendant Canyon Lake Property Owner's Association and Does 1-6 25 26 ("Defendant") subjected Charging Party Dora Lemus ("Lemus") and at least another similarly situated individual to sex discrimination. The Commission 27 further alleges that Defendant retaliated against Lemus in violation of Section 28 ENTER ON ICMS

704(a) of Title VII for complaining about the sex discrimination and/or engaging in other protected activities.

JURISDICTION AND VENUE

- 1. Jurisdiction of this Court is invoked pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §§ 451, 1331, 1337, 1343 and 1345.
- 2. This action is authorized and instituted pursuant to Section 706(f)(1) and (3) of Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, as amended, 42 U.S.C. § 2000e-5(f)(1) and (3) ("Title VII") and Section 102 of Title I of the Civil Rights Act of 1991, 42 U.S.C. § 1981a.
- 3. The employment practices alleged to be unlawful were committed within the jurisdiction of the United States District Court for the Central District of California.

PARTIES

- 4. Plaintiff, Equal Employment Opportunity Commission, is the federal agency charged with the administration, interpretation and enforcement of Title VII, and is expressly authorized to bring this action by Section 706(f)(1) and (3) of Title VII, 42 U.S.C. § 2000e-5(f)(1) and (3).
- 5. At all relevant times, Defendant was and is a California corporation continuously doing business within the jurisdiction of the United States District Court for the Central District of California. At all relevant times, Defendant has continuously employed fifteen (15) or more persons.
- 6. At all relevant times, Defendant has continuously engaged in an industry affecting commerce within the meaning of Sections 701(b), (g) and (h) of Title VII, 42 U.S.C. §§ 2000e(b), (g) and (h).

STATEMENT OF CLAIMS

7. More than thirty days prior to the institution of this lawsuit, Lemus filed a charge with the Commission alleging violations of Title VII by Defendant. The Commission investigated and issued a Letter of Determination finding that

6

7

8

9

10

11 12

13 14

15 16

17 18

19 20

22

23

21

24 25

26 27 28

Lemus and at least another similarly situated individual were subjected to a hostile work environment on the basis of sex, female. The Commission also found that Lemus was subjected to a retaliatory discharge in violation of Title VII for complaining about sex discrimination and/or engaging in other protected activities. All conditions precedent to the institution of this lawsuit have been fulfilled.

- 8. Since at least July 2002, Defendant has engaged in unlawful employment practices at its Riverside County location, in violation of Section 703(a) of Title VII, 42 U.S.C. §2000e-2(a)(1) by subjecting Lemus and at least another similarly situated individual to a hostile work environment on the basis of their sex, female. The sexual harassment that Lemus and the other similarly situated individual were subjected to, includes but is not limited to, unwelcome derogatory comments and unwanted touching on the basis of sex, female.
- 9. Since at least September 2002, Defendant has engaged in unlawful employment practices at its Riverside County location, in violation of Section 704(a) of Title VII, 42 U.S.C. §2000e-3(a) by discharging Lemus in retaliation for having complained about, and otherwise opposed the sexual harassment.
- The effect of the practice(s) complained of in paragraphs 8 and 9 above has been to deprive Lemus and at least another similarly situated individual of equal employment opportunities and otherwise adversely affect their status as employees, because of their sex, female and/or because of having engaged in activity protected under Title VII.
- The unlawful employment practices complained of in paragraphs 8 11. and 9 above were intentional.
- The unlawful employment practices complained of in paragraphs 8 12. and 9 above were done with malice or with reckless indifference to the federally protected rights of Lemus and at least another similarly situated individual.

- 13. As a direct and proximate result of Defendant's aforesaid acts Lemus and at least another similarly situated individual have each suffered emotional pain, suffering, inconvenience, loss of enjoyment of life, humiliation and damages, according to proof.
- 14. As a direct and proximate result of Defendant's aforesaid acts, Lemus suffered a loss of earnings in an amount according to proof.

PRAYER FOR RELIEF

Wherefore, the Commission respectfully requests that this Court:

- A. Grant a permanent injunction enjoining Defendant, their respective officers, successors, assigns, agents, and all persons in active concert or participation with them, from engaging in any employment practice which discriminates on the basis of sex;
- B. Grant a permanent injunction enjoining Defendant, their respective officers, successors, assigns, agents, and all persons in active concert or participation with them, from retaliating against any employee who engages in any protected activity under Title VII;
- C. Order Defendant to institute and carry out policies, practices, and programs which provide equal employment opportunities and a non-hostile work environment for females, and which eradicate the effects of its past and present unlawful employment practices;
- D. Order Defendant to make whole Lemus by providing appropriate backpay with prejudgment interest, and front pay in amounts to be determined at trial, and/or other affirmative relief necessary to eradicate the effects of its unlawful employment practices;
- E. Order Defendant to make whole Lemus and at least one other similarly situated individual by providing compensation for past and future non-pecuniary losses resulting from the unlawful practices complained of in paragraphs 8 and 9 above, including, but not limited to emotional pain, suffering,

1	inconvenience, loss of enjoyment of life, and humiliation, in amounts to be	
2	determined at trial;	
3	F. Order Defendants to pay Lemus and at least one other similarly	
4	situated individual punitive damages for its malicious and reckless conduct	
5	described in paragraphs 8 and 9 above, in amounts to be determined at trial;	
6	G. Grant such further relief as the Court deems necessary and proper in	
7	the public interest; and	
8	H. Award the Commission its costs of this action.	
9	JURY TRIAL DEMAND	
10	The Commission requests a jury trial on all questions of fact raised by its	
11	complaint.	
12	Dated: September 29, 2003	Respectfully Submitted,
13		ERIC S. DREIBAND, General Counsel
14 15		JAMES LEE, Deputy General Counsel
16		GWENDOLYN YOUNG REAMS, Associate General Counsel
17		U.S. EQUAL EMPLOYMENT
18 19		OPPORTUNITY COMMISSION 1801 "L" Street, N.W. Washington, D.C. 20507
20		BY: M
21		
22		ANNA Y. PARK Regional Attorney
23		CONNIE LIEM Senior Trial Attorney
24		Schol Illal Adollicy
25		ELIZABETH ESPARZA- CERVANTES
26		Trial Attorney
27 28		U.S. EQUAL EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITY COMMISSION 255 E. Temple Street, 4th Floor Los Angeles, CA 90012