dr.

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

```
FILED
   Anna Park, Esquire, SBN 164242
    Gregory L. McClinton, Esquire, SBN 153553
    U.S. EQUAL EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITY COMMISSION SEP 26 PM 2: 52
    255 E. Temple Street, 4th Floor
 3
    Los Angeles, CA 90012
    Telephone: (213) 894-1053/Fax (213)894-130184
 4
   Attorneys for Plaintiff
 5
   U.S. EQUAL EMPLOYMENT
    OPPORTUNITY COMMISSION
6
7
8
                       UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
9
                              NEVADA DISTRICT
                                                 CV-N-01-0563-HDM-RAM
10
11
   U.S. EQUAL EMPLOYMENT
                                        CASE 1
   OPPORTUNITY COMMISSION,
12
                                        COMPLAINT -
                                        CIVIL RIGHTS
13
         Plaintiff,
                                        SEXUAL HARASSMENT; SEX BASED
                                        HARASSMENT; RETALIATION
14
                                        42 U.S.C. §§ 2000e et seq.
15
   ٧.
16
   JOHN BRENNAN, SERGE RIGISICH,
   d/b/a/ LITTLE WALDORF SALOON,
17
   A PARTNERSHIP; ROOKIES, INC.,
   A NEVADA CORPORATION; and
                                        DEMAND FOR TRIAL BY JURY
18
   DOES 1-10, Inclusive.
                  Defendant(s)
19
```

### NATURE OF THE ACTION

This is a sexual harassment, sex based harassment, and retaliation action brought by the United States Equal Employment Opportunity Commission (the "Commission") under Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, as amended, to correct unlawful employment practices on the basis of sex and to provide appropriate relief to the Charging Party's, Kimberlee Benson, Diana Smith and a class of similarly situated individuals who were adversely affected by such practices. The Commission

alleges Diana Benson and Kimberlee Benson and other similarly situated individuals who are women were sexually harassed and subjected to gender harassment during their employment with Defendants, Little Waldorf Saloon, A Partnership and Rookies, A Nevada Corporation hereafter referred to as ("Defendant Employers"), affecting the terms and conditions of their employment. Charging Parties, Benson, Smith, and other similarly situated individuals were subjected to a hostile work environment perpetuated by owners and supervisors.

The Commission also alleges that Benson, Smith and other similarly situated individuals who had complained of the harassment by owners and supervisors were subjected to retaliation in the form of demotion, loss of wages, further harassment, discipline and constructive discharge.

## JURISDICTION AND VENUE

- 1. Jurisdiction of this Court is invoked pursuant to 28 U.S.C. sections 451, 1331, 1337, 1343 and 1345. 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) and pursuant to § 102 of the Civil Rights Act of 1991, 42 U.S.C. §§1981A.
- 2. The employment practices alleged herein to be unlawful were committed within the jurisdiction of the United States

  District Court for the State of Nevada.
- 25 | ///

- 26 | ///
- 27 ///

PARTIES

28 |

3. Plaintiff Commission is an agency of the United States of America charged with the administration, interpretation and enforcement of Title VII, and is expressly authorized to bring this action under §§706(f)(1) and (3) of Title VII, 42 U.S.C., §§ 2000e-5(f)(1) and (3).

- 4. At all relevant times, "Defendant Employers," have continuously been and are now doing business in the State of Nevada and the Cities of Reno and Incline Village.
- 5. Plaintiff is ignorant of the true names and capacities of "Defendant Employers," sued as DOES 1 through 10, inclusively, and therefore Plaintiff sue said "Defendant Employers" by such fictitious names. Plaintiff reserves the right to amend the complaint to name the DOE "Defendant Employers" individually or corporately as they become known. Plaintiff alleges that each of the "Defendant Employers" named as DOES was in some manner responsible for the acts and omissions alleged herein and Plaintiff will amend the complaint to allege such responsibility when same shall have been ascertained by Plaintiff.
- 6. It is further alleged on information and belief that the named and unnamed defendants in the complaint are mere alter egos of the "Defendant Employer". The remaining defendants are properly named in the complaint.
- 7. All of the acts and failures to act alleged herein were duly performed by and attributable to "Defendant Employers", each acting as a successor, agent, employee or under the direction and control of the others, except as specifically alleged otherwise. Said acts and failures to act were within the scope of such

agency and/or employment, and each "Defendant Employers" participated in, approved and/or ratified the unlawful acts and omissions by other ""Defendant Employers" complained of herein. Whenever and wherever reference to any act in this Complaint to any act by a defendant employer or "Defendant Employers", such allegations and reference shall also be deemed to mean the acts and failures to act of each "Defendant Employers" acting individually, jointly and/or severally.

28 |

8. At all relevant times, "Defendant Employers" has continuously been an employer engaged in an industry affecting commerce within the meaning of §§ 701 (b), (g) and (h) of Title VII, 42 U.S.C., §§ 2000e-1(b), (g) and (h) and §§ 11(b), (g), and (h).

#### CONCILIATION

9. Prior to institution of this lawsuit, the Commission's representatives attempted to eliminate the unlawful employment practices alleged below and to effect voluntary compliance with Title VII through informal methods of conciliation, conference and persuasion within the meaning of section §§706(f)(1) and (3) of Title VII, 42 U.S. C., §§2000e-5(f)(1) and (3). All conditions precedent to the institution of this lawsuit have been fulfilled.

#### STATEMENT OF CLAIMS

10. Since on or about February 2000, "Defendant Employers" has engaged in unlawful employment practices at its facility in Reno, Nevada in violation of §§706(f)(1) and (3) of Title VII, 42 U.S. C., §§2000e-5(f)(1) and (3). The unlawful sexual harassment and sex based harassment in the form of verbal harassment

directed at Benson, Smith and other similarly situated individuals women impacted the terms and conditions of their employment and created a hostile working environment at "Defendant Employers." These practices also included the retaliation against constructive termination of the complaining parties and other similarly situated individuals for having complained about the work environment.

28 |

- 11. The impact of the aforementioned conduct deprived Benson, Smith and other similarly situated individuals of equal employment opportunities and to otherwise adversely impacted their employment status because of their sex and also in retaliation for engaging in a protected activity.
- 12. The unlawful employment practices complained of above were and are willful within the meaning of §§706(f)(1) and (3) of Title VII, 42 U.S. C., §§2000e-5(f)(1) and (3).
- 13. The unlawful employment practices complained of above were intentional and caused Benson, Smith and other similarly situated individuals to suffer emotional distress.
- 14. "Defendant Employers" has acted with malice or reckless indifference to the federally protected rights of Benson, Smith and other similarly situated individuals by subjecting them to harassment consisting of sexually charged conduct, derogatory statements, obscene and vulgar language. Women were openly called "bitches" "fucking cunts" and "unreliable piece(s) of shit," as well as subjected to other derogatory and obscene statements. When both Charging parties attempted to complain to the owners about the harassment they were threatened with termination. The Charging parties and other similarly situated

individuals were also subject to retaliation for engaging in a protected activity resulting in an adverse employment action.

# PRAYER FOR RELIEF

Wherefore, the Commission respectfully requests that this Court:

- A. Grant a permanent injunction enjoining "Defendant Employers", its officers, successors, assigns and all persons in active concert or participation with them, from engaging in any employment practices that discriminate on the basis of sex or from engaging in unlawful retaliation;
- B. Grant a permanent injunction enjoining "Defendant Employer," 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;
- C. Order "Defendant Employers" to institute and carry out policies, practices and programs which provide equal employment opportunities for females which eradicate the effects of their past and present unlawful employment practices;
- D. Grant a judgment requiring "Defendant Employers" to pay Benson, Smith and other similarly situated individuals appropriate back pay, front pay and benefits in an amount to be determined at trial including prejudgment interest;
- E. Order "Defendant Employers" to make Benson, Smith and other similarly situated individuals whole by providing affirmative relief necessary to eradicate the effects of its unlawful practices including, but not limited to, payment of compensatory damages to Benson, Smith and other similarly situated individuals and/or rightful place employment;