	Case 2:17-at-00511 Document 1	Filed 05/16/17 Page 1 of 12	
1			
2	Victor Viramontes (State Bar No. 214158) Miranda Galindo (State Bar No. 308499)*		
3	MEXICAN AMERICAN LEGAL DEFENSE AND EDUCATIONAL FUND		
4	634 S. Spring St., 11 th Floor		
5	Los Angeles, CA 90014 Telephone: (213) 629-2512		
6	Facsimile: (213) 629-0266 Email: <u>vviramontes@maldef.org</u>		
7	mgalindo@maldef.org		
8	Attorneys for Plaintiffs *application for admission to E.D. Cal. forthe	coming	
9	UNITED STAT	ES DISTRICT COURT	
10	EASTERN DIST	RICT OF CALIFORNIA	
11			
12	JIMMY DAVID RAMIREZ- CASTELLANOS and FRANCISCO	Case No.	
13	JAVIER GOMEZ ESPINOZA,	COMPLAINT	
14	Plaintiffs,	DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL	
15	VS.		
16	NUGGET MARKET, INC. DBA NUGGET MARKETS and ONE STOP		
17	SERVICES DBA ONE STOP SOLUTION, and DOES 1-10,		
18	Defendants.		
19			
20	INTR	RODUCTION	
21	Plaintiffs allege as follows:		
22	1. This civil action challenges N	UGGET MARKET, INC.'s and ONE STOP	
23	SERVICES' ("Defendants") discrimination a	and retaliation against JIMMY DAVID RAMIREZ-	
24	CASTELLANOS and FRANCISCO JAVIER	R GOMEZ ESPINOZA ("Plaintiffs"), in the form of	
25	a hostile work environment, discrimination, 1	retaliation, and wrongful discharge. Plaintiffs allege	
26		e basis of Plaintiffs' Latino/Hispanic national origins	
27			
28	and also retaliated against them for complaining about discrimination. Defendants' unlawful		
		1 COMPLAINT	

	Case 2:17-at-00511 Document 1 Filed 05/16/17 Page 2 of 12
1	employment discrimination violated Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, 42 U.S.C. § 1981,
2	California's Fair Housing and Employment Act, and common law prohibitions on wrongful
3	discharge. 42 U.S.C. §§ 1981, 2000e et seq.; CAL. GOV'T CODE § 12940 et seq.
4	JURISDICTION AND VENUE
5	2. This Court has jurisdiction over this action under 28 U.S.C. §§ 1331, 1343(a), and
6 7	1367, as well as under 42 U.S.C. § 1988. Under 28 U.S.C. § 1391(b), venue is proper because
8	Defendants reside in the Eastern District of California and the events giving rise to the claims
9	occurred in this district.
10	PARTIES
11	Plaintiffs
12	3. Plaintiff JIMMY DAVID RAMIREZ-CASTELLANOS is an individual of
13	Latino/Hispanic national origin. He resides in the Eastern District of California and worked for
14	Defendants during the events alleged in this action.
15	4. Plaintiff FRANCISCO JAVIER GOMEZ ESPINOZA is an individual of
16 17	
17 18	Latino/Hispanic national origin. He resides in the Eastern District of California and worked for
10	Defendants during the events alleged in this action.
20	Defendants
21	5. Defendant NUGGET MARKET, INC. DBA Nugget Markets is a corporation
22	located in the Eastern District of California. Defendant Nugget Market, Inc. employed Plaintiffs
23	when it engaged in the conduct challenged in this action. Defendants Nugget Market, Inc. and
24	One Stop Services jointly employed Plaintiff Ramirez-Castellanos when they engaged in the
25	conduct alleged in this action.
26	6. Defendant ONE STOP SERVICES DBA One Stop Solution is a corporation
27	located in the Eastern District of California. Defendants One Stop Services and Nugget Market,
28	
	2 COMPLAINT

Inc. jointly employed Plaintiff Ramirez-Castellanos when they engaged in the conduct challenged 1 2 in this action.

3	7. The true names and capacities of and the true involvement of the Defendants sued
4	here are 1-10 inclusive are unknown to Plaintiff and who therefore sues these Defendants by
5	fictitious names and will amend this complaint to show the true names, capacities and
6 7	involvement when ascertained. Plaintiff is informed and believes and alleges that each of the
8	Defendants designated as a Doe is responsible in some manner for the events and happenings
9	referred to here, and that Plaintiffs' injuries and damages were proximately caused by these
10	Defendants.
11	FACTUAL ALLEGATIONS
12	8. On or around November of 2014, Defendant One Stop Services hired Plaintiff
13	
14	Ramirez-Castellanos, and assigned him to work at Defendant Nugget Market, Inc.'s grocery store
15	on Mace Boulevard in Davis, California ("Store"), as a floor cleaner.
16	9. Defendant Nugget Market, Inc. obtains floor cleaners for the Store though a
17	contract with Defendant One Stop Services.
18	10. Defendant Nugget Market, Inc. jointly employed Plaintiff Ramirez-Castellanos
19	because it retained control over the terms and conditions of his employment, including the power:
20	to cause his termination, to control his worksite, to supervise his work, and to change the way he
21	did his work.
22	11. Additionally, Defendant Nugget Market, Inc. interfered with Plaintiff Ramirez-
23 24	Castellanos' employment relationship with Defendant One Stop Services by having sufficient
24 25	
25 25	control over his job market and retaliating against him for complaining about workplace
26	discrimination by ordering his dismissal from the Store.
27 28	12. Beginning sometime in or around the spring of 2015, Nugget Market, Inc.
28	
	3 COMPLAINT

	Case 2:17-at-00511 Document 1 Filed 05/16/17 Page 4 of 12
1	subjected Plaintiff Ramirez-Castellanos to a hostile work environment because of his
2	Latino/Hispanic national origin.
3	13. Plaintiffs complained to Defendants' management and managers about workplace
4	discrimination.
5	14. On or around December 10, 2015, Defendants One Stop Services and Nugget
6 7	Market, Inc. terminated Plaintiff Ramirez-Castellanos because he complained about workplace
7 8	discrimination.
0 9	15. Defendant Nugget Market, Inc. hired Plaintiff Gomez-Espinoza on or around
10	November of 2011.
11	16. Beginning sometime in or around 2015, Nugget Market, Inc. subjected Plaintiff
12	Gomez-Espinoza to a hostile work environment because of his Hispanic/Latino national origin.
13	
14	17. Mr. Gomez-Espinoza complained to Nugget Market, Inc. about workplace
15	discrimination.
16	18. Following Plaintiffs' complaints, Nugget Market, Inc. continued to subject them to
17	a pattern of discriminatory harassment.
18	19. Plaintiffs believed that their work environment was hostile and abusive.
19 20	EXHAUSTION OF ADMINISTRATIVE REMEDIES
21	20. Plaintiffs re-allege and incorporate by reference the allegations set forth in all prior
22	paragraphs of this Complaint.
23	21. Plaintiffs timely exhausted their administrative remedies by filing complaints
24	against Defendants with the Economic Opportunity Employment Commission and the California
25	
26	Department of Fair Employment and Housing. Plaintiffs subsequently received right-to-sue
27	notices.
28	FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION
	4 COMPLAINT

	Case 2:17-at-00511 Document 1 Filed 05/16/17 Page 5 of 12	
1	Hostile Work Environment Title VII	
2	22. Plaintiffs re-allege and incorporate by reference the allegations set forth in all prior	
3 4	paragraphs of this Complaint.	
+ 5	23. Nugget Market, Inc. subjected Plaintiffs to a pattern of discriminatory harassment	
6	at the Store that was sufficiently severe or pervasive to alter the conditions of their employment.	
7	24. Nugget Market, Inc. directed anti-Latino/Hispanic insults, jokes, and comments to	
8	Plaintiffs because of Plaintiffs' national origins.	
9	25. Nugget Market, Inc. perpetrated a national-origin-motivated pattern of	
10		
11	discriminatory harassment against Plaintiffs that involved interfering with their work and	
12	unjustifiably harming their reputations among Nugget Market, Inc. employees, which made	
13	Plaintiffs' jobs harder.	
14 15	26. Nugget Market, Inc. subjected Plaintiff Ramirez-Castellanos to a pattern of	
15 16	discriminatory harassment lasting approximately 10 months.	
10	27. Nugget Market, Inc. subjected Plaintiff Gomez-Espinoza to a pattern of	
18	discriminatory harassment lasting approximately one year.	
19	28. Reasonable employees would have believed that Plaintiffs' work environment was	
20	abusive and/or hostile.	
21	29. Plaintiffs believed that their work environment was abusive and/or hostile.	
22	30. Defendants' management failed to undertake, or ineffectually undertook, prompt,	
23	effective remedial action reasonably calculated to end harassing conduct against Plaintiffs, which	
24 25	they had notice of.	
25 26	31. Plaintiffs complained to Defendants' management and managers about workplace	
20 27	discrimination.	
28	32. Defendant Nugget Market, Inc. jointly employed Plaintiff Ramirez-Castellanos,	
	5 COMPLAINT	

	Case 2:17-at-00511 Document 1 Filed 05/16/17 Page 6 of 12
1	and/or interfered with his employment relationship with One Stop Services.
2	33. As a result of Defendants' maintenance of a hostile work environment, Plaintiffs
3	suffered harm, including economic losses and emotional distress, in an amount to be determined
4	at trial.
5 6	SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION
7	Hostile Work Environment 42 U.S.C. § 1981
8	34. Plaintiffs re-allege and incorporate by reference the allegations set forth in all prior
9	paragraphs of this Complaint.
10	35. Nugget Market, Inc. subjected Plaintiffs to a pattern of discriminatory harassment
11	at the Store that was sufficiently severe or pervasive to alter the conditions of their employment.
12	36. Nugget Market, Inc. directed anti-Latino/Hispanic insults, jokes, and comments to
13 14	Plaintiffs because of Plaintiffs' national origins.
14 15	37. Nugget Market, Inc. perpetrated a national-origin-motivated pattern of
16	discriminatory harassment against Plaintiffs that involved interfering with their work and
17	unjustifiably harming their reputations among Nugget Market, Inc. employees, which made
18	Plaintiffs' jobs harder.
19	38. Nugget Market, Inc. subjected Plaintiff Ramirez-Castellanos to a pattern of
20	discriminatory harassment lasting approximately 10 months.
21 22	39. Nugget Market, Inc. subjected Plaintiff Gomez-Espinoza to a pattern of
22 23	discriminatory harassment lasting approximately one year.
23 24	40. Reasonable employees would have believed that Plaintiffs' work environment was
25	abusive and/or hostile.
26	41. Plaintiffs believed that their work environment was abusive and/or hostile.
27	42. Defendants' management failed to undertake, or ineffectually undertook, prompt,
28	
	6 COMPLAINT

	Case 2:17-at-00511 Document 1 Filed 05/16/17 Page 7 of 12
1	effective remedial action reasonably calculated to end harassing conduct against Plaintiffs, which
2	they had notice of.
3	43. Plaintiffs complained to Defendants' management and managers about workplace
4	discrimination.
5	44. Defendant Nugget Market, Inc. jointly employed Plaintiff Ramirez-Castellanos,
6 7	and/or interfered with his employment relationship with One Stop Services.
7 8	45. As a result of Defendants' maintenance of a hostile work environment, Plaintiffs
8 9	suffered harm, including economic losses and emotional distress, in an amount to be determined
10	at trial.
11	THIRD CAUSE OF ACTION
12	Hostile Work Environment CAL. GOV'T CODE § 12940 et seq.
13	
14	46. Plaintiffs re-allege and incorporate by reference the allegations set forth in all prior
15	paragraphs of this Complaint.
16	47. Nugget Market, Inc. subjected Plaintiffs to a pattern of discriminatory harassment
17	at the Store that was sufficiently severe or pervasive to alter the conditions of their employment.
18	48. Nugget Market, Inc. directed anti-Latino/Hispanic insults, jokes, and comments to
19	Plaintiffs because of Plaintiffs' national origins.
20 21	49. Nugget Market, Inc. perpetrated a national-origin-motivated pattern of
21	discriminatory harassment against Plaintiffs that involved interfering with their work and
23	unjustifiably harming their reputations among Nugget Market, Inc. employees, which made
24	Plaintiffs' jobs harder.
25	50. Nugget Market, Inc. subjected Plaintiff Ramirez-Castellanos to a pattern of
26	discriminatory harassment lasting approximately 10 months.
27	51. Nugget Market, Inc. subjected Plaintiff Gomez-Espinoza to a pattern of
28	
	7 COMPLAINT

н

Case 2:17-at-00511 Document 1 Filed 05/16/17 Page 8 of 12
discriminatory harassment lasting approximately one year.
52. Reasonable employees would have believed that Plaintiffs' work environment was
abusive and/or hostile.
53. Plaintiffs believed that their work environment was abusive and/or hostile.
54. Defendants' management failed to undertake, or ineffectually undertook, prompt,
effective remedial action reasonably calculated to end harassing conduct against Plaintiffs, which
they had notice of.
55. Plaintiffs complained to Defendants' management and managers about workplace
discrimination.
56. Defendant Nugget Market, Inc. jointly employed Plaintiff Ramirez-Castellanos,
and/or interfered with his employment relationship with One Stop Services.
57. As a result of Defendants' maintenance of a hostile work environment, Plaintiffs
suffered harm, including economic losses and emotional distress, in an amount to be determined
at trial.
FOURTH CAUSE OF ACTION Retaliation Title VII
58. Plaintiffs re-allege and incorporate by reference the allegations set forth in all price
paragraphs of this Complaint.
59. Defendants retaliated against Plaintiffs because they complained about workplace
discrimination.
60. Plaintiffs engaged in protected activities by complaining to Defendants'
management and managers about workplace discrimination.
61. As alleged above, Defendants had notice of Plaintiffs' discrimination complaints.
62. Defendants subjected Plaintiffs to adverse actions after Plaintiffs' discrimination

	Case 2:17-at-00511 Document 1 Filed 05/16/17 Page 9 of 12
1	complaints.
2	63. Defendant Nugget Market, Inc.'s participation in the termination Plaintiff
3	Ramirez-Castellanos the day after he complained about workplace discrimination was an adverse
4	employment action.
5	64. Defendant One Stop Services' termination of Plaintiff Ramirez-Castellanos was an
6 7	adverse employment action.
, 8	65. Additionally, Defendants subjected Plaintiffs to adverse actions including, but not
9	limited to, maintenance of a hostile work environment despite Plaintiffs' numerous complaints.
10	66. As a result of Defendants' retaliation, Plaintiffs suffered harm, including economic
11	losses and emotional distress, in an amount to be determined at trial.
12	FIFTH CAUSE OF ACTION
13	Retaliation 42 U.S.C. § 1981
14 15	
15 16	67. Plaintiffs re-allege and incorporate by reference the allegations set forth in all prior
17	paragraphs of this Complaint.
18	68. Defendants retaliated against Plaintiffs because they complained about workplace
19	discrimination.
20	69. Plaintiffs engaged in protected activities by complaining to Defendants'
21	management and managers about workplace discrimination.
22	70. As alleged above, Defendants had notice of Plaintiffs' discrimination complaints.
23	71. Defendants subjected Plaintiffs to adverse actions after Plaintiffs' discrimination
24 25	complaints.
25 26	72. Defendant Nugget Market, Inc.'s participation in the termination Plaintiff
27	Ramirez-Castellanos the day after he complained about workplace discrimination was an adverse
28	employment action.
	9 COMPLAINT

	Case 2	2:17-at-00511 Document 1 Filed 05/16/17 Page 10 of 12
1	73.	Defendant One Stop Services' termination of Plaintiff Ramirez-Castellanos was an
2	adverse empl	oyment action.
3	74.	Additionally, Defendants subjected Plaintiffs to adverse actions including, but not
4	limited to, m	aintenance of a hostile work environment despite Plaintiffs' numerous complaints.
5	75.	As a result of Defendants' retaliation, Plaintiffs suffered harm, including economic
6 7	losses and en	notional distress, in an amount to be determined at trial.
8		
9		SIXTH CAUSE OF ACTION Retaliation
10		CAL. GOV'T CODE § 12940 et seq.
11	76.	Plaintiffs re-allege and incorporate by reference the allegations set forth in all prior
12	paragraphs of	f this Complaint.
13	77.	Defendants retaliated against Plaintiffs because they complained about workplace
14	discriminatio	n.
15	78.	Plaintiffs engaged in protected activities by complaining to Defendants'
16	management	and managers about workplace discrimination.
17 18	79.	As alleged above, Defendants had notice of Plaintiffs' discrimination complaints.
10 19	80.	Defendants subjected Plaintiffs to adverse actions after Plaintiffs' discrimination
20	complaints.	
21	81.	Defendant Nugget Market, Inc.'s participation in the termination Plaintiff
22	Ramirez-Cas	tellanos the day after he complained about workplace discrimination was an adverse
23	employment	action.
24	82.	Defendant One Stop Services' termination of Plaintiff Ramirez-Castellanos was an
25 26	adverse empl	oyment action.
26 27	83.	Additionally, Defendants subjected Plaintiffs to adverse actions including, but not
27 28	limited to, m	aintenance of a hostile work environment despite Plaintiffs' numerous complaints.
		10 COMPLAINT

	Case 2	2:17-at-00511 Document 1 Filed 05/16/17 Page 11 of 12
1	84.	As a result of Defendants' retaliation, Plaintiffs suffered harm, including economic
2	losses and er	notional distress, in an amount to be determined at trial.
3		SEVENTH CAUSE OF ACTION
4		Common Law Wrongful Discharge California's Anti-Discrimination and Anti-Retaliation Public Policies
5	85.	Plaintiffs re-allege and incorporate by reference the allegations set forth in all prior
6 7	paragraphs o	f this Complaint.
, 8	86.	Defendants directly and/or jointly employed Plaintiff Ramirez-Castellanos.
9	87.	Defendant Nugget Market, Inc. caused Plaintiff Ramirez-Castellanos' discharge,
10	and Defenda	nt One Stop Services directly discharged Plaintiff Ramirez-Castellanos.
11	88.	Defendants discharged, and/or caused the discharge of, Plaintiff Ramirez-
12	Castellanos a	as retaliation for complaining about workplace discrimination, and/or as part of their
13	national-orig	in based discrimination against him; in violation of California's anti-retaliation and
14 15	anti-national	-origin discrimination policies.
16	89.	Defendants' discharge of Plaintiff Ramirez-Castellanos harmed him, including
17	economic los	ses and emotional distress, in amounts to be determined at trial.
18	90.	Defendants' actions were wilful, malicious, oppressive, and committed with the
19	wrongful int	ent to injure Plaintiff Ramirez-Castellanos, and in conscious disregard of his rights.
20		JURY DEMAND
21	91.	Plaintiffs demand a trial by jury.
22 23	//	
23 24	//	
25	//	
26	//	
27	//	
28	//	
		11 COMPLAINT

	Case 2:17-at-00511 Document 1 Filed 05/16/17 Page 12 of 12
1	PRAYER FOR RELIEF
2	WHEREFORE, Plaintiffs respectfully pray that this Court enter Judgment granting
3	Plaintiffs:
4	1. General damages, including compensatory damages according to proof;
5	2. Punitive damages according to proof;
6	3. The costs of the suit;
7	4. Reasonable attorneys' fees and expenses of this litigation, including under 42
8	U.S.C § 1988;
9	5. Interest at the maximum legal rate for all sums awarded; and
10	6. Such other and further relief as the Court may deem just and proper.
11	
12	Dated: May 16, 2017 Respectfully submitted,
13	MEXICAN AMERICAN LEGAL DEFENSE AND
14	EDUCATIONAL FUND
15	/s/ Victor Viramontes
16	Victor Viramontes
17	Miranda Galindo
18	Attorneys for Plaintiffs
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25 26	
26 27	
27	
28	
	12 COMPLAI