04-CV-00866-CMP

CC: TO JUDGE ___EM__

1 2

3

4 5

6 7

9

10

8

11 12

13

14 15

16

17 18

19

20

21 22

23

24 25

26

27

28

APR 29 2004

EQUAL EMPLOYMENT

OPPORTUNITY COMMISSION,

RECEIVED

APR 3 0 2004

IN SEALILE

THE HONORABLE MARSHA J. PECHMAN

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON AT SEATTLE

Plaintiff,	,	TERVENO: AMAGES
UNION PACIFIC RAILROAD COMPANY,)) 1.)	SEX DISCI SEXUAL E VIOLATIO CIVIL RIG
Defendant.	<i>)</i>)	U.S.C. § 20
JILL HARP, Plaintiff in Intervention, v.) 2.)	SEX DISCI SEXUAL E VIOLATIO
UNION PACIFIC RAILROAD COMPANY; RAIL TERMINAL SERVICES; FLETCHER JAMISON, individually and the marital community) thereof with JANE DOE JAMISON;)) 3.))))	RETALIAT TITLE VII ACT OF 19 SEQ.
ALAN MOENCH, individually and the marital community thereof with JANE DOE MOENCH; MARTIN HOWELL,) 4.)	RETALIAT RCW 49.60
individually and the marital community thereof with JANE DOE HOWELL, and DOES 1-10 inclusive,		NEGLIGE AND/OR I
	6.	MALICIO

)) INTERVENOR'S COMPLAINT FOR) DAMAGES

) CASE NO.: C04-866 MIP

- 1. SEX DISCRIMINATION AND
 SEXUAL HARASSMENT IN
 VIOLATION OF TITLE VII OF THE
 CIVIL RIGHTS ACT OF 1964, 42
 U.S.C. § 2000(e) <u>ET SEQ</u>.
 - 2. SEX DISCRIMINATION AND SEXUAL HARASSMENT IN VIOLATION OF RCW 49.60
 - 3. RETALIATION IN VIOLATION OF TITLE VII OF THE CIVIL RIGHTS ACT OF 1964, 42 U.S.C. § 2000(e) <u>ET SEQ</u>.
 - 4. RETALIATION IN VIOLATION OF RCW 49.60
 - 5. NEGLIGENT SUPERVISION AND/OR RETENTION
- 6. MALICIOUS HARASSMENT

Defendants in Intervention.)

INTERVENOR'S COMPLAINT FOR DAMAGES (CO4-886MJP) - 1 K:\6000 FILES\6200 Jill Harp v. Union Pacific RR\Complaint.doc

ORIGINAL

The Law Offices of CRANT & ASSOCIATES The Law Dome 3002 So. 47th Street Tacoma, Washington 98409 Telephone (253) 472-6213

7. ASSAULT AND BATTERY

8. TORT OF OUTRAGE

DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL

COMES NOW, Plaintiff in Intervention, JILL HARP, by and through her attorney of record, and alleges the following:

I. NATURE OF THE CASE

- 1. This case involves sex discrimination, sexual harassment, and retaliation by Defendants, UNION PACIFIC RAILROAD COMPANY (hereinafter "UPRR"), and RAIL TERMINAL SERVICES (hereinafter "RTS") and their agents. Plaintiff in Intervention (hereinafter "Plaintiff") alleges UPRR and RTS engage in a pattern and practice of overt sex discrimination and of ignoring and even condoning sexual harassment.
- 2. The nature of Plaintiff's employment requires that she work with both employees of UPRR and those of RTS. RTS is a company that shares employment location and buildings with UPRR. UPRR and RTS employees use the same break room as well. Plaintiff must interact with RTS employees and supervisors on a daily basis and is required to report to RTS supervisors if she will be absent from work. Additionally, RTS assigns Plaintiff her specific job duties for each work shift.
- 3. Plaintiff contends that she was gravely mistreated by male co-workers and managers. Plaintiff was (1) crudely and repeatedly touched and fondled in a sexual manner, (2) repeatedly subjected to vulgar and degrading comments, (3) repeatedly

INTERVENOR'S COMPLAINT FOR DAMAGES (CO4-886MJP) - 2 K:\6000 FILES\6200 Jill Harp v. Union Pacific RR\Complaint.doc

The Law Offices of GRANT & ASSOCIATES
The Law Dome
3002 So, 47th Street
Taconia, Washington 98409
Telephone (253) 472-6213

subjected to vulgar pornographic materials, (4) repeatedly subjected to sexually suggestive comments and acts, and (5) repeatedly subjected to the exposure of male genitalia.

- 4. Plaintiff asserts claims under federal and state anti-discrimination and civil rights laws. Plaintiff seeks legal redress for injuries inflicted upon her by the Defendants UPRR, its managerial employees, and DOES 1-10.
- 5. Plaintiff believes that as a result of the egregious and repetitive discriminatory acts, a sizeable punitive damage award may be required to punish individual Defendants for past discrimination and deter such behavior in the future.

II. JURISDICTION AND VENUE

- 6. Jurisdiction is proper pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1331 based upon a federal question under the laws of the United States. Specifically, this Court has jurisdiction over Plaintiff's claims under Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, as amended in 1991, 42 U.S.C. § 2000e <u>et seq</u>.
- 7. Supplemental jurisdiction exists pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1367(a) for state statutory claims under RCW § 49.60.010 et seq. and other torts.
- 8. Venue is proper under 28 U.S.C. § 1391(b)(1) and (2); and 42 U.S.C. § 2000e-5(f)(3).

//

27

•.

INTERVENOR'S COMPLAINT FOR DAMAGES (CO4-886MJP) - 4 K:\6000 FILES\6200 Jill Harp v. Union Pacific RR\Complaint.doc

9. Plaintiff in Intervention has an absolute right, under 42 USC §2000e-5(f)(1), to intervene in this action brought by the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission (hereinafter "EEOC").

- 10. On or about August 5, 2003, Plaintiff filed an EEOC Charge based on sex discrimination against Defendant UPRR, EEOC Charge No. 380-2003-02600.
- 11. On February 27, 2003, the EEOC issued a reasonable cause determination in the Charge of Discrimination Number 380-2003-02600. The EEOC found that UPRR violated Title VII by subjecting Plaintiff to a hostile work environment, which consisted of a highly sexualized, offensive work environment that Defendant UPRR failed to correct even after Plaintiff complained about the hostile work environment.
- 12. Since filing her EEOC Charge on August 5, 2003, Defendant UPRR retaliated against Plaintiff. Consequently, Plaintiff filed another EEOC charge based on retaliation, EEOC Charge No. 380-2004-02182. The EEOC Issued a Notice of Right to Sue for Plaintiff's Retaliation Charge on April 28, 2004.

IV. PARTIES

A. Plaintiff

13. At all times material hereto, Plaintiff has been a citizen of the United States and a resident of the State of Washington and has been entitled to protection under Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, as amended in 1991, 42 U.S.C. § 2000e *et seq.*, 42 U.S.C. § 13981, RCW chapter 49.60, and the common law of the State of Washington.

The Law Offices of GRANT & ASSOCIATES
The Law Done
3002 So. 47th Street
Tecoma, Washington 98409
Telephone (253) 472-6213

0

14. Defendant UPRR and DOES 1-5 have at all relevant times been an employer as defined by 42 U.S.C. § 2000e(b), in that they have employed fifteen (15) or more persons in each of twenty (20) or more calendar weeks in the current or preceding year.

- 15. Defendants UPRR and DOES 1-5 are employers under R.C.W. 49.60.040, in that they employs eight (8) or more persons.
- 16. Defendant RTS is a Delaware Corporation which conducts business in the State of Washington.

C. Named Individual Defendants

- 17. It is believed and is herein alleged that Defendant FLETCHER JAMISON (herein "Defendant JAMISON") is and has been a citizen of the United States and a resident of the State of Washington at all times material hereto.
- 18. Defendant JAMISON at all times material herein acted as an agent for Defendant UPRR in that he is a manager of Defendant UPRR. Defendant JAMISON was at all relevant times a managerial agent of Defendant UPRR.
- 19. On information and belief, Defendants JAMISON and JANE DOE JAMISON reside in the State of Washington, which is within this judicial district.
- 20. Defendant JAMISON is married to JANE DOE JAMISON and all acts done by him were done on behalf of or in furtherance of the interests of the marital community.

INTERVENOR'S COMPLAINT FOR DAMAGES (CO4-886MJP) - 5 K:\6000 FILES\6200 Jill Harp v. Union Pacific RR\Complaint.doc

The Law Offices of GRANT & ASSOCIATES The Law Dome 3002 So. 47th Street Tacoma, Washington 98409 Telephone (253) 472-6213

ff

21. It is believed and is herein alleged that Defendant ALAN MOENCH (herein "Defendant MOENCH") is and has been a citizen of the United States and a resident of the State of Washington at all times material hereto.

- 22. Defendant MOENCH at all times material herein acted as an agent for RTS in that he is an employee of RTS.
- 23. On information and belief, Defendants MOENCH and JANE DOE MOENCH reside in the State of Washington, which is within this judicial district.
- 24. Defendant MOENCH is married to JANE DOE MOENCH and all acts done by him were done on behalf of or in furtherance of the interests of the marital community.
- 25. It is believed and is herein alleged that Defendant MARTIN HOWELL (herein "Defendant HOWELL") is and has been a citizen of the United States and a resident of the State of Washington at all times material hereto.
- 26. Defendant HOWELL at all times material herein acted as an agent for Defendant UPRR in that he is an employee of Defendant UPRR.
- 27. On information and belief, Defendants HOWELL and JANE DOE HOWELL reside in the State of Washington, which is within this judicial district.
- 28. Defendant HOWELL is married to JANE DOE HOWELL and all acts done by him were done on behalf of or in furtherance of the interests of the marital community.

29. The true names and capacities, whether individual, corporate, associate, governmental or otherwise, of Defendants sued herein as DOES 1-5, inclusive, are currently unknown to Plaintiff, who therefore sue said Defendants by such fictitious names.

30. The true names and capacities of individual Defendants sued herein as DOES 6-10, inclusive are currently unknown to Plaintiff, who therefore sue said Defendants by such fictitious names.

31. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that each of the Defendants designated as a DOES 1-10 are legally responsible in some manner for the events, incidents, and happenings described herein, and caused injuries and damages to Plaintiff. Plaintiff will seek leave of court to amend this Complaint to substitute the true names and capacities for the Defendants designated herein as DOES 1-10 when the true names have been ascertained or in the alternative dismiss said DOES 1-10 if their identities cannot be ascertained.

32. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that at all times mentioned herein, Defendants DOES 1-10 allowed, aided, encouraged and incited others, including agents and employees of Defendant UPRR to engage in the acts of discrimination and retaliation alleged herein.

6

- 33. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges that at all relevant times the individual DOE Defendants *viz*, Does 6-10, are and have been residents of the United States and the State of Washington.
- 34. Defendants UPRR, JAMISON, and DOES 1-10 are hereinafter collectively referred to as "DEFENDANTS." Unless specified otherwise, whenever this Complaint refers to "Defendant" or "Defendants," such allegation shall be deemed to mean the acts of Defendants acting individually, jointly and/or severally as so designated.
- 35. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that at all times mentioned herein, each of the Defendants were the agents, servants and employees, co-venturers or co-conspirators of each of the remaining Defendants, and were acting within the course, scope, and purpose of their employment, joint venture or conspiracy, with the consent, knowledge, ratification and authorization of such agency, employment, joint venture or conspiracy.

V. GENERAL ALLEGATIONS

Plaintiff alleges the following:

- 36. On or about June 10, 2002, Plaintiff began working for Defendant UPRR as a Tie Down Loader. Her immediate supervisor at that time was Defendant JAMISON, Intermodal Manager.
- 37. Plaintiff first complained about the hostile work environment in or about September 2002 to Manager of Intermodel Opperations, Art Kielty. She complained about the offensive language used by other male employees.

INTERVENOR'S COMPLAINT FOR DAMAGES (CO4-886MJP) - 8
K:\6000 FILES\6200 Jill Harp v. Union Pacific RR\Complaint.doc

The Law Offices of GRANT & ASSOCIATES
The Law Dome
3002 So. 47th Street
Tacuma, Washington 98409
Telephone (253) 472-6213

38. Plaintiff was also subjected to unwanted touching by other male RTS employee, Defendant MOENCH. He would hug Plaintiff, rub her legs or arms, and grabs her. Plaintiff objected to the egregious behavior and immediately complained to Art Kielty, Defendant JAMISON, and Defendant RTS Supervisors, Donny Ross, and Jeremy Ross. Plaintiff alleges Defendants UPRR, RTS, JAMISON and DOES 1-10 failed to take prompt corrective action.

39. Defendant RTS Supervisors Jeremy Ross and Donny Ross made jokes about Plaintiff's complaints about Defendant MOENCH and when Plaintiff complained about RTS employees garbage unloading procedures, Defendant RTS Supervisors told Plaintiff that she had better stop complaining or they would "get Alan [Defendant MOENCH] to grope "Plaintiff again.

40. Plaintiff continued to work in a hostile work environment. She found pornographic materials at the workplace. Male employees constantly used sex-based profanity. Offensive graffiti was plastered all over the workplace. She was subjected to offensive comments from male employees, including but not limited to the following:

- "I am going to go home and let my dog lick my nuts.";
- "I have a huge penis.";
- "Do you want to touch my bald mouse?";
- "Look how huge my monster is.";
- "Are you on your period? Can I sniff your seat?";

- "Was Jill [Harp] driving that truck? Can I sniff the seat?";
- "I am fucking his [Art Kielty's] wife and her hole is tighter than his sisters";
- 41. Plaintiff was also referred to as a "Bitch", "Whore", and "Cunt", on multiple occasions. Plaintiff was offended by the egregious sex-based comments and behavior.
- 42. Defendant HOWELL also participated in the sexual banter. In or about September 2003, Defendant HOWELL exposed his genitals to Plaintiff. Defendant HOWELL placed a flashlight down his pants and yelled comments about the size of his penis and genitals. Defendant HOWELL repeatedly thrust his hips into the barrier in a sexual manner. Plaintiff objected to Defendant HOWELL'S offensive behavior and even felt threatened with Defendant HOWELL'S sexually aggressive behavior.
- 43. Plaintiff complained to Art Kielty and Defendant JAMISON on numerous occasions regarding the hostile work environment. In response to Plaintiff's complaints, Art Kielty told Plaintiff that she worked with males and needed to "toughen up." Art Kielty also told Plaintiff that he was the "ultimate power," and stated, "who are they gonna believe, you or me." Plaintiff alleges Defendants UPRR, JAMISON, and DOES 1-10 failed to take prompt corrective action as she continued to work in a hostile work environment.
- 44. After Plaintiff's constant complaints of the hostile work environment, Defendants UPRR, JAMISON, and DOES 1-10 retaliated against Plaintiff.
 - 45. Since Plaintiff filed her EEOC Charge based on sex discrimination on

August 5, 2003, Defendants retaliated against Plaintiff by removing her from her permanent position and placing her in a temporary position.

- 46. Plaintiff further alleges Defendants retaliated against her by removing her from her permanent position, placing her on temporary jobs, and repeatedly changing her shift, often without prior notice. On one occasion, Plaintiff was removed from her shift so her position on that shift could be given to a male employee returning from suspension for sexual harassment. Plaintiff's union advised her that UPRR could not place her in temporary shifts as they had been doing and Plaintiff's alternative was to go on unpaid FURLO leave and demand a permanent position. On at least two occasions, for a minimum of two weeks each time, Plaintiff was forced to take unpaid FURLO leave until UPRR provided her with a position.
- 47. Plaintiff further alleges she was under closer scrutiny because of her gender and for filing a EEOC Charge based on sex discrimination against Defendant UPRR.
- 48. As a direct and proximate result of the above mentioned discriminatory acts and omissions, Plaintiff's emotional well-being has been substantially injured. Plaintiff has suffered, and will continue to suffer pain and suffering, extreme mental anguish and emotional distress because of the above-described acts and omissions of Defendants.
- 49. Plaintiff has also suffered, and will continue to suffer, loss of earnings, and nonpecuniary losses as a result of the actions and omissions of Defendants.

|//

VI. <u>FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION</u> SEX DISCRIMINATION AND/OR HOSTILE WORK ENVIRONMENT

42 U.S.C. § 2000(e) ET SEQ. (AGAINST DEFENDANTS UPRR AND DOES 1-5)

Plaintiff realleges each and every allegation as set forth in the preceding paragraphs with the same force and effect as though fully set forth herein.

VIOLATION OF TITLE VII OF THE CIVIL RIGHTS ACT OF 1964,

- 50. Plaintiff was subjected to severe and pervasive sexual harassment, including but not limited to sex-based comments and unwanted touching.
- 51. Plaintiff repeatedly complained about the harassment to Defendants. Despite Defendants UPRR and DOES 1-5's knowledge of the sexual harassment, Defendants failed to take prompt corrective action.
- 52. The sexual harassment was so severe and pervasive, it adversely impacted Plaintiff's abilities to perform her work.
- 53. As a direct and proximate result of the above mentioned harassment and discriminatory acts and omissions by Defendants UPRR and Does 1-5, Plaintiff's emotional well-being has been substantially injured. Plaintiff has experienced, and continues to suffer, from sleepless nights, anxiety, trauma, headaches, and loss of enjoyment of life, and other emotional and stress-related problems, including distrust around men and loss of personal esteem.
- 54. Plaintiff has suffered, and will continue to suffer pain and suffering, extreme mental anguish and emotional distress because of the above-described acts and omissions of Defendants. Plaintiff has also suffered, and will continue to suffer, loss of earnings,

INTERVENOR'S COMPLAINT FOR DAMAGES (CO4-886MJP) - 12 K:\6000 FILES\6200 Jill Harp v. Union Pacific RR\Complaint.doc

The Law Offices of GRANT & ASSEXLATES
The Jaw Dome
3002 So. 47th Street
Tacoma, Washington 98409
Telephone (253) 472-4213

nonpecuniary losses and job opportunities as a result of the actions and omissions of Defendants.

VII. SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION SEX DISCRIMINATION AND SEXUAL HARASSMENT IN VIOLATION OF RCW 49.60 (AGAINST DEFENDANTS UPRR, JAMISON and DOES 1-10)

Plaintiff realleges each and every allegation herein set forth above in the preceding paragraphs with the same force and effect as though fully set forth herein.

- 55. Plaintiff alleges that a substantial factor in the above-referenced hostile working environment was because of Plaintiff's sex, female.
- 56. In taking the actions alleged herein, the individual Defendants DOES 6-10 aided, abetted, encouraged, and incited the above-referenced violations of RCW Chapter 49.60 and/or obstructed or attempted to obstruct others from complying with the provisions of Washington's Law Against Discrimination in violation of RCW 49.60.220.
 - 57. The above-referenced acts caused injury to Plaintiff.
- 58. The acts of Defendants and DOES 1-10 as described herein violate R.C.W. § 49.60 <u>et seq</u>, as they violate Plaintiffs' right to be free from sexual harassment and sex discrimination in employment.

VIII. THIRD CAUSE OF ACTION RETALIATION IN VIOLATION OF TITLE VII OF THE CIVIL RIGHTS ACT OF 1964, 42 U.S.C. § 2000(e) <u>ET SEQ</u>. (Against Defendants UPRR, JAMISON and DOES 1-10)

Plaintiff realleges the preceding paragraphs with the same force and effect, and incorporates the same as though fully set forth herein.

INTERVENOR'S COMPLAINT FOR DAMAGES (CO4-886MJP) - 13 K:\6000 FILES\6200 Jill Harp v. Union Pacific RR\Complaint.doc

The Law Offices of GRANT & ASSOCIATES
The Law Done
3002 So. 47th Street
Taconta, Washington 98409
Telephone (253) 472-6213

59. Plaintiff alleges she engaged in protected activity when she complained about the sexual harassment to Art Kielty and Defendants UPRR, JAMISON and DOES 1-10.

- 60. Plaintiff further alleges she engaged in protected activity when she filed her Charge of Discrimination alleging sexual harassment and discrimination with the EEOC.
- 61. As a result of complaining about the sexual harassment and filing an EEOC Charge of Discrimination, Plaintiff experienced adverse employment action. Defendants removed her from a permanent position and placed her in temporary positions. Defendants then repeatedly changed Plaintiff's temporary shifts. In accordance with her union guidelines Plaintiff took unpaid FURLO leave on at least two occasions for a minimum of two weeks at each time.
- 62. Plaintiff further alleges she has been placed on closer scrutiny. Since Plaintiff filed her EEOC Charge of Discrimination, Defendant JAMISON has repeatedly followed Plaintiff while she was working and disciplined Plaintiff for activities other male employees were not disciplined for. Additionally, on at least one occasion, she has observed a co-worker taking photographs of her while she was working. Plaintiff is not aware of this co-worker taking photographs of any other employees.
- 63. Plaintiff alleges that her opposition to the discrimination and/or hostile work environment was a substantial factor in the adverse employment actions
- 64. As a direct and proximate result of the retaliation referred to above, Plaintiff has suffered and will continue to suffer damages including, but not limited to, earnings and employment benefits, as well as physical, emotional, and mental distress

INTERVENOR'S COMPLAINT FOR DAMAGES (CO4-886MJP) - 14 K:\6000 FILES\6200 Jill Harp v. Union Pacific RR\Complaint.doc The Law Offices of GRANT & ASSOCIATES The Law Dome 3002 So. 47th Street Tacoma, Washington 98409 Telephone (253) 472-6713 Plaintiff realleges the preceding paragraphs with the same force and effect, and incorporates the same as though fully set forth herein.

- 65. Because of the above-referenced opposition activity, Defendants and their employees subjected Plaintiff to adverse employment actions.
- 66. Plaintiff alleges that in violation of RCW Chapter 49.60, her opposition activity was a substantial factor in the above-referenced adverse employment action.
- 67. As a direct and proximate result of the retaliation referred to above, Plaintiff has suffered and will continue to suffer damages including, but not limited to, earnings and employment benefits, as well as physical, emotional, and mental distress.

X. <u>FIFTH CAUSE OF ACTION</u> NEGLIGENT SUPERVISION and/or RETENTION (Against Defendants UPRR, RTS, and DOES 1-5)

Plaintiff realleges the preceding paragraphs with the same force and effect, and incorporate the same as though fully set forth herein.

68. As Plaintiff's employer, Defendants UPRR and DOES 1-5 owed and breached duties to Plaintiff including, but not limited to: 1) the duty not to employ or retain employees whom it knows or should know to be unfit or dangerous, 2) the duty to exercise care appropriate to the circumstances in supervising and/or retaining employees, 3) the duty to exercise due diligence to determine whether an employee is or has become unfit or dangerous.

INTERVENOR'S COMPLAINT FOR DAMAGES (CO4-886MJP) - 15 K:\6000 FILES\6200 Jill Harp v. Union Pacific RR\Complaint.doc

The Law Offices of GRANT & ASSOCIATES
The Law Dome
3002 So. 47th Street
Tacoma, Washingkon 98409
Telephone (353) 472-6213

69. Because Plaintiff was required to report to and work with Defendant RTS, it's employees and agents while at work, Defendant RTS owed and breached duties to Plaintiff including, but not limited to: 1) the duty not to employ or retain employees whom it knows or should know to be unfit or dangerous, 2) the duty to exercise care appropriate to the circumstances in supervising and/or retaining employees, 3) the duty to exercise due diligence to determine whether an employee is or has become unfit or dangerous.

- 70. Defendants UPRR, RTS and DOES 1-5 failed to exercise care appropriate to the circumstances in retaining its employees who subjected Plaintiff to sexual harassment.
- 71. Defendants UPRR, RTS and DOES 1-5 had actual, constructive and/or imputed notice and knowledge of the unfitness of employees and Defendants DOES 6-10, who have subjected Plaintiff to repeated sexual harassment, including but not limited to, sex-based comments and unwanted touching.
- 72. Such notice and knowledge made foreseeable the injuries these employees inflicted upon the Plaintiff.
- 73. Despite such notice and knowledge, Defendants UPRR, RTS and DOES 1-5 failed to exercise ordinary care to discipline its employees and/or Defendants DOES 6-10.
- 74. At all times material herein, Defendants UPRR, RTS and DOES 1-5 had the power, ability, authority, and duty to so intervene, monitor, review, evaluate, control,

INTERVENOR'S COMPLAINT FOR DAMAGES (CO4-886MJP) - 16 K:\6000 FILES\6200 Jill Harp v. Union Pacific RR\Complaint.doc

regulate, discipline, restrict, and/or penalize the conduct of themselves, their agents, and employees.

75. Despite said knowledge, power, and duty, Defendants UPRR, RTS and DOES 1-5 negligently failed to act so as to prevent, supervise, monitor, review, evaluate, control, regulate, discipline, and/or penalize such conduct, acts, and failures to act or to otherwise protect Plaintiff.

- 76. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that each of the Defendants UPRR, RTS and DOES 1-5 designated as a DOE is legally responsible in some manner for the events, incidents, and happenings described herein, and caused injury and damage to Plaintiff.
- 77. As a direct and proximate result of the failure of Defendants UPRR, RTS and DOES 1-5 to protect Plaintiff and to adequately monitor, review, evaluate, control, regulate, discipline, and/or otherwise penalize the conduct, acts, and failures to act by Defendant themselves, their agents, and employees, as alleged herein, said conduct, acts, and failures to act were perceived by said Defendants, its agents, and employees as, and in fact had the effect of, ratifying, encouraging, condoning, exacerbating, increasing, and/or worsening said conduct, acts, and failures to act, thereby causing reasonably foreseeable injury.
- 78. Defendants UPRR, RTS and DOES 1-5 are responsible for the acts of their employees alleged herein.
 - 79. Defendants UPRR, RTS and DOES 1-5 failure to exercise ordinary care

INTERVENOR'S COMPLAINT FOR DAMAGES (CO4-886MJP) - 17 K:\6000 FILES\6200 Jill Harp v. Union Pacific RR\Complaint.doc

The Law Offices of GRANT & ASSOCIATES
The Law Dome
3002 So. 47th Street
Tactomia, Washington 98409
Teleptonic (253) 472-6213

breached the above-referenced duties of care, proximately causing the injury and damages to Plaintiff referenced herein.

- 80. As a direct and proximate result of Defendants UPRR, RTS and DOES 1-5 breach of the duties owed to Plaintiff, Plaintiff suffered substantial emotional injuries in an amount to be proven at trial.
- 81. As a further direct and proximate result of Defendants UPRR, RTS and DOES 1-5 actions and omissions, Plaintiff has suffered and will continue to suffer mental anguish and severe emotional distress.
- 82. Therefore, Plaintiff is entitled to general and compensatory damages for her emotional injuries in an amount to be proven at trial.

XI. SIXTH CAUSE OF ACTION MALICIOUS HARASSMENT (Against Defendants HOWELL and DOES 6-10)

Plaintiff realleges the preceding paragraphs with the same force and effect, and incorporate the same as though fully set forth herein.

- 83. Defendants HOWELL, and DOES 6-10 exhibited sexually aggressive behavior towards Plaintiff.
- 84. Defendant HOWELL constantly talked about his penis size and even wanted to sniff Plaintiff's seat when he thought she was menstruating. Defendant also flashed his penis to Plaintiff. Plaintiff was in reasonable fear of her safety, as she was afraid of being raped by Defendant HOWELL.
 - 85. Additionally, the above-referenced acts caused injury to Plaintiff, including

INTERVENOR'S COMPLAINT FOR DAMAGES (CO4-886MJP) - 18
K:\6000 FILES\6200 Jill.Harp v. Union Pacific RR\Complaint.doc

The Law Offices of GRANT & ASSECTIATES

The Law Dome
3002 So. 47th Street
Taconta, Washington 98409
Telephone (253) 472-6213

but is not limited to those injuries described herein.

XII. <u>SEVENTH CAUSE OF ACTION</u> ASSAULT AND BATTERY (Against Defendants MOENCH and DOES 6-10)

Plaintiff realleges the preceding paragraphs with the same force and effect, and incorporate the same as though fully set forth herein.

- 86. Defendant MOENCH knowingly and intentionally touched Plaintiff in a harmful manner, causing serious injury. Defendant MOENCH rubbed Plaintiff's legs and arms. He has groped her two to three times a week from the start of Plaintiff's employment with UPRR through the present. Plaintiff was afraid of Defendant MOENCH'S sexually aggressive behavior.
- 87. Defendant MOENCH knowingly and intentionally placed Plaintiff in reasonable fear of imminent harm.

XIII. <u>EIGTH CAUSE OF ACTION</u> TORT OF OUTRAGE (Against Defendants MOENCH, HOWELL, and DOES 6-10)

Plaintiff realleges the preceding paragraphs with the same force and effect, and incorporate the same as though fully set forth herein.

- 88. Plaintiff alleges Defendants MOENCH, HOWELL, and DOES 6 -10 engaged in extreme and outrageous conduct, including but not limited to unwanted touching and egregious sex-based comments.
- 89. Defendant MOENCH groped Plaintiff two to three times a week. He hugged Plaintiff without her permission. He rubbed her legs and arms without her permission.

INTERVENOR'S COMPLAINT FOR DAMAGES (CO4-886MJP) - 19 K:\6000 FILES\6200 Jill Harp v. Union Pacific RR\Complaint.doc The Law Offices of GRANT & ASSOCIATES
The Law Dome
3002 So. 47th Street
Tacoma, Washington 98409
Telephone (253) 472-6213

As a result of Defendant MOENCH'S actions, Plaintiff has suffered severe emotional distress.

- 90. Defendant HOWELL made repeated comments about his penis size to Plaintiff and asked Plaintiff to touch his "bald mouse." He asked Plaintiff if she was menstruating and if he could "sniff" her seat. He constantly subjected Plaintiff to his sexually aggressive behavior. As a result of Defendant HOWELL'S actions, Plaintiff has suffered severe emotional distress.
- 91. Defendants MOENCH, HOWELL, and DOES 6 10 intentionally or recklessly caused Plaintiff to suffer severe emotional distress.

XIV. PRAYER FOR RELIEF

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff pray that judgment be entered in her favor and against Defendants as specified in all causes of action as follows:

- That all Defendants be ordered to pay Plaintiff all actual, compensatory, general and punitive damages according to proof at trial and as allowable by law;
- 2. That Plaintiff be awarded her costs of suit including reasonable attorneys' fees;
- 3. That Plaintiff be awarded prejudgment interest; and

INTERVENOR'S COMPLAINT FOR DAMAGES (CO4-886MJP) - 20 K:\6000 FILES\6200 Jill Harp v. Union Pacific RR\Complaint.doc

The Law Offices of GRANT & ASSOCIATES
The Law Dome
3002 So, 47th Street
Tacona, Washington 98404
Telephone (253) 472-6213

4. That this Court award such further relief as the Court deems just and proper.

DATED this 29th day of April, 2004

Law Offices of GRANT & ASSOCIATES

Artis C. Grant, Jr., WSBA No. 26204 Heather L. Hardyns, WSBA No. 32979 Attorneys for Jill Harp

INTERVENOR'S COMPLAINT FOR DAMAGES (CO4-886MJP) - 21 K:\6000 FILES\6200 Jill Harp v. Union Pacific RR\Complaint.doc

The Law Offices of GRANT & ASSOCIATES
The Law Doine
3002 So. 47th Street
Tacoma, Washington 98409
Telephone (253) 472-6213