

WILLIAMS, GRAFFEO & STERN, LLC

Brian P. Graffeo, Esq.
Courthouse Plaza
60 Washington Street, Suite 204
Morristown, New Jersey
(973) 200-6350
Attorneys for Plaintiff Debra Fahey

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF NEW JERSEY**

<p>DEBRA FAHEY,</p> <p>Plaintiff,</p> <p>vs.</p> <p>OPERA SOLUTIONS OPCO, LLC d/b/a ELECTRIFAI; ELECTRIFAI, LLC; WHITE OAK FINANCIAL, LLC; WHITE OAK GLOBAL ADVISORS, LLC; EDWARD SCOTT; and GREGG McNULTY,</p> <p>Defendants.</p>	<p>Civil Action No.</p> <p><u>COMPLAINT AND JURY DEMAND</u></p>
--	--

COMPLAINT

Plaintiff Debra Fahey (“Fahey” or “Plaintiff”), by and through her attorneys Williams, Graffeo & Stern, LLC, complains of (1) Defendants Opera Solutions OPCO, LLC d/b/a ElectrifiAi; and ElectrifiAi, LLC (collectively referred to herein as “ElectrifiAI”); (2) White Oak Financial, LLC and White Oak Global Advisors, LLC (White Oak entities collectively referred to herein as “White Oak”) (Opera, ElectrifiAi, and White Oak entities collectively referred to herein as “Corporate Defendants”); and (3) individual defendants Edward Scott (“Scott”) and Gregg McNulty (“McNulty”), (Corporate Defendants, Scott, and McNulty collectively, referred to herein as “Defendants”) as follows:

NATURE OF ACTION

1. This is an action to remedy the unlawful sexual harassment, hostile work environment, wrongful termination, discrimination based on the basis of Plaintiff's sex and disability, violations of the Conscientious Employees Protection Act, Americans with Disabilities Act, and Family Medical Leave Act, and intentional infliction of emotional distress.

2. Plaintiff was hired by ElectrifiAi on October 21, 2019 following a series of interviews with over ten (10) ElectrifiAi employees, including but not limited to Diane Clark as both General Counsel and the sole human resource representative for ElectrifiAi, and; Chief Executive Officer, Edward Scott. During these interviews Ms. Fahey specifically asked the aforementioned ElectrifiAi executives of the environment and culture of ElectrifiAi and its views on women specifically. Ms. Fahey was informed by both Defendant Scott and Diane Clark of ElectrifiAi's culture of promoting women. Following being informed that she was the only candidate to receive a unanimous decision by all thirteen (13) executives and relying upon Defendant Scott and Ms. Clark's representations, Ms. Fahey executed ElectrifiAi's Offer Letter on October 1, 2019.

3. Ms. Fahey left her employment as a well-established senior leader to join the executive team of ElectrifiAi. Unbeknownst to Ms. Fahey, prior to her commencing work, Defendant Scott decimated the human resources and marketing departments and began to control all aspects of ElectrifiAi with the blessing of White Oak Defendants.

4. Shortly following her first day of employment, Ms. Fahey was introduced to a horrid and unlawful working environment, encompassing discriminatory actions, sexual harassment, hostile work environment, retaliation, and wrongful termination.

PARTIES, JURISDICTION, AND VENUE

5. Plaintiff Debra Fahey is an individual with a home address of 403 Martello Road, Franklin, Massachusetts 02038.

6. Plaintiff is a senior leader with decades of experience who was hired away from her previous position by Defendants under promises of a professional, pro-women workplace that were immediately proven to be false.

7. Upon information and belief, Defendant Opera Solutions OpCo LLC d/b/a/ ElectrifiAi and its related entities are limited liability corporations formed under the laws of the state of Delaware and headquartered in the state of New Jersey.

8. ElectrifiAi provides business intelligence services to private and public companies using data analytics and machine learning.

9. Defendants White Oak Financial, LLC and White Oak Global Advisors, LLC are limited liability companies formed under the laws of Delaware and performed services in as an investment advisor and alternative investment fund specializing in private debt investment and providing secured loans to small and medium-sized businesses in New Jersey, including ElectrifiAi. White Oak is the ultimate owner of the Opera and ElectrifiAI entities.

10. Defendant Edward Scott is the current Chief Executive Officer (“CEO”) of ElectrifiAi. Scott also was a Partner and Managing Director at White Oak Global Advisors. Upon information and belief, when Scott initially served on the Company’s Board, he was a Managing Director employed by White Oak Global Advisors. When Scott transitioned to become CEO of ElectrifiAi, he remained a senior employee of White Oak Global Advisors until early 2020.

11. Defendant Greg McNulty is an employee of ElectrifiAi and currently holds the title of Chief Information Officer for ElectrifiAi and board member of White Oak. Mr. McNulty was not only

the very individual who sexually harassed Plaintiff but also serve directly and indirectly, as Plaintiff's manager and supervised her work.

12. This Court has jurisdiction over Plaintiff's Title VII, ADA, and FMLA claims as those claims arise under federal law. This Court has supplemental jurisdiction over Plaintiff's NJLAD claims pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1367 because these claims relate closely to the Title VII claims, having arisen from a common nucleus of operative fact such that all claims form part of the same case or controversy.

13. Venue is proper in this District pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1391(b), because Corporate Defendants do business in Jersey City, New Jersey and some of the acts of discrimination and retaliation occurred in New Jersey.

FACTS COMMON TO ALL COUNTS

14. Upon information and belief, in 2016 White Oak made a substantial loan to ElectrifiAi; in July 2018, White Oak demanded repayment of same.

15. When ElectrifiAi was unable to repay the loan on time, White Oak took over ownership, including acquiring Opera Solutions OpCo LLC's assets and management of same; as part of the rebranding effort arising from the change in ownership, White Oak changed the company's name from "Opera Solutions OpCo LLC" to "ElectrifiAi" in or around Summer 2019.

16. Since taking over in 2018, Corporate Defendants have formed several limited liability companies and engaged in multiple complex commercial transactions, including:

- a. Upon information and belief, White Oak formed Opera Solutions OPCO, LLC as a successor entity to Opera Solutions, LLC in or around 2018, and placed ElectrifiAi's assets in Opera Solutions OPCO, LLC.

- b. According to Corporate Defendants' filings with the federal government in 2019, Opera Solutions OPCO, LLC is a wholly owned subsidiary of Opera Solutions Intermediate, LLC, which is in turn owned by White Oak.
 - c. Upon information and belief, Opera Solutions Holding, LLC is an entity that was used during the restructuring of the company in 2018 and 2019. As of March 2020, the Company operated at least partially under the ElectrifiAi LLC entity for government contracting purposes.
17. The enumerated Corporate Defendants are all closely related entities.
- a. Upon information and belief, White Oak is the ultimate and sole owner of ElectrifiAi and the related entities.
 - b. White Oak provides significant funding to ElectrifiAi and oversees ElectrifiAi's finances.
 - c. The ElectrifiAi Board of Directors is entirely composed of by White Oak executives, including Darius Mozaffarian, Partner and President of White Oak; Daniel Homrich, a White Oak associate, was the Secretary of Opera Solutions OPCO LLC until January 2020.
 - d. Defendant Scott was on ElectrifiAi's board until he became the CEO, and Scott and Homrich were signatories on Opera Solutions OPCO LLC's financial accounts.
18. When White Oak took over ElectrifiAi, it installed new management, including appointing Defendant Scott to serve as CEO.
- a. Upon information and belief, when Defendant Scott first assumed the position of CEO at ElectrifiAi, he remained a senior employee of White Oak.

- b. Until a separate EEOC Complaint was filed against Defendant Scott, White Oak's website listed him as a Managing Director and a member of the leadership team at White Oak.
- c. After Defendant Scott assumed control of ElectrifiAi, he decimated the Human Resources department, as described below; consequentially, White Oak handled Human Resources complaints against Defendant Scott beginning in mid-2019.

Fahey's Employment with ElectrifiAi

19. Following a series of interviews with ElectrifiAi employees, including but not limited to Defendants Scott, CEO of ElectrifiAi, and Clark, General Counsel and Human Resources ("HR") Representative of ElectrifiAi, Plaintiff formally terminated her prior employment, and subsequently joined ElectrifiAi on October 21, 2019.

20. During the hiring process interviews, Plaintiff specifically asked the interviewing ElectrifiAi employees about the environment and culture of ElectrifiAi, and its treatment of women specifically.

21. Plaintiff was informed by Defendants Scott and Clark of ElectrifiAi's culture of supporting and internally promoting women.

22. Relying upon these representations by Defendants Scott and Clark, Plaintiff formally executed ElectrifiAi's Offer Letter on October 31, 2019, leaving her well-established senior leadership employment to join ElectrifiAi.

23. In light of ElectrifiAi's active recruitment of Plaintiff, Plaintiff was eager to assist and work with Defendants ElectrifiAi, White Oak, and Scott.

24. Prior to her commencement of employment with ElectrifiAi, Defendant Scott reduced the human resources and marketing departments of ElectrifiAi and consolidated control, with White Oak's knowledge and permission.

25. During Plaintiff's first month of her employment with ElectrifiAi, significant efforts were focused on obtaining sales for ElectrifiAi; due to the lack of sales, Defendant Scott would repeatedly grow enraged in the workplace and inappropriately yell at and demean employees of ElectrifiAi, including Plaintiff.

26. Defendant Scott continued to make racist, sexist, and discriminatory comments toward female and minority employees who did not align with his conduct, all with White Oak's knowledge and accord; following several complaints by various employees,

27. On Wednesday, December 11, 2019 – a few weeks after the commencement of Plaintiff's employment with ElectrifiAi – Gregg McNulty, ElectrifiAI's Chief Information Officer ("CIO"), called Plaintiff at 10:45 P.M. on her cellphone while he was severely intoxicated.

28. Immediately after answering Defendant McNulty's call, Plaintiff was bombarded with various sexual advances and innuendos that constituted sexual harassment; despite countless attempts to have McNulty terminate the unlawful telephone conversation, McNulty persisted. Ultimately, after forty-five (45) minutes of repeated harassment and torment, the call ended.

29. Plaintiff immediately contacted Defendant Scott and informed him of Defendant McNulty's inappropriate and harassing actions; Defendant Scott's response was that Defendant McNulty was intoxicated every night, and that Defendant Scott would "handle" the situation.

30. The following week, Defendant Scott advised Plaintiff that he had contacted Human Resources – headed by Diane Clark – and that the situation would be monitored; Plaintiff believed some form of remedial action would be taken as a result.

31. Conversely, Plaintiff's reporting of aforementioned sexual harassment led to abrasive retaliation at the hands of Defendants Scott, McNulty, and additional ElectrifiAi executives.

32. Shortly following Plaintiff's reporting of Defendant McNulty's sexual harassment, Defendant Scott replaced himself with Defendant McNulty on all meetings to which Plaintiff was a participant; Defendant McNulty had no input, role, or need to participate on the meetings, but served as Defendant Scott's intimidator with respect to all ElectrifiAi employees, including Plaintiff.

33. Beginning in late December 2019, Defendant Scott joined Defendant McNulty in discriminating and harassing Plaintiff and treating her in an aggressive and offensive manner.

34. Defendant Scott would routinely berate Plaintiff in meetings where Defendants McNulty, Diane Clark and Minna Nahvi, Senior Vice President were all present; Nahvi would also continually berate Plaintiff in retaliation for reporting Defendant McNulty's sexual harassment.

35. In an attempt to test Plaintiff's loyalty to ElectrifiAi, Defendant Scott called Plaintiff on February 21, 2020 to discuss the resignation of long-time employee Deepak Heda. Defendant Scott informed Plaintiff that Heda relayed feeling undervalued to Scott; in response, Defendant Scott told Heda, "I'm going to tie up all you fucking Indian towelhead niggers and call immigration."

36. When Plaintiff was startled by Defendant Scott's conduct, Scott became aggressive and hung up the phone on Plaintiff. This became a pivotal point moving forward, as Defendant Scott's actions became more enraged and more retaliatory against Plaintiff, causing serious and permanent injuries, as well as significant and substantial damages.

37. Defendant Scott only became more emboldened by the onset of the COVID-19 pandemic; hostilely informing his employees that if they did not like the way he acted, they could "get the

fuck out,” and went further to threaten “good luck finding anything because there are no fucking jobs and your families will starve and it will be your fault.”

38. When Plaintiff requested time off – to which she was entitled – as she was working almost ninety (90) hours a week, Defendant Scott stated: “I haven’t had a fucking day off in eighteen (18) months, you don’t get a fucking day off or an hour off. If you can’t fucking handle it, get the fuck out.”

39. With no alternative during the global pandemic, Plaintiff was forced to remain employed by ElectrifiAi despite the shocking actions and environment she endured on a daily basis at the hands of Defendants.

40. As the pandemic became more severe, in March 2020 Defendant Scott began requiring senior leaders – including Plaintiff – to attend meetings seven (7) days a week. Said meetings would begin and end upon Scott’s demands sometimes extending all hours of the night and weekends. At each meeting, Scott reminded the female and minority employees that they were worthless and would suffer deeply from the state of the economy if they wanted to leave ElectrifiAi.

41. In the first quarter of 2020, several employees left ElectrifiAi, including new hires who would resign after two (2) weeks, causing Plaintiff to assume even more responsibilities. As a result of this increased workload, continued harassment, belittling, and lack of compassion or decency from Defendants, Plaintiff began to suffer from physical illnesses and afflictions to which she sought medical attention, including depression, anxiety, nausea, migraines, stomach pains, and insomnia.

42. Plaintiff was forced to seek medical treatment from her primary care physician and therapist; both whom required Plaintiff to immediately take two (2) weeks of medical leave.

43. Plaintiff informed the Human Resources Department of ElectrifiAi, who upon information and belief notified Defendant Scott and Diane Clark, of her necessary medical leave, scheduled to commence on June 2, 2020 and cease on June 18, 2020. Plaintiff appropriately submitted medical leave and short-term disability documentation on June 17, 2020 and June 18, 2020.

44. Plaintiff was approved for short-term medical leave under the Family and Medical Leave Act (“FMLA”) and went on medical leave with the intention of returning to work at the conclusion thereof.

45. Plaintiff never returned to work as she was wrongfully terminated while out on official, approved medical leave for short-term disability under the FMLA due to the actions of Defendants.

46. Plaintiff was never given a chance to return to her position or offered any accommodations, despite advising Defendants of her medical condition.

47. Rather, in an attempt to purchase Plaintiff’s silence, on June 30, 2020 ElectrifiAI sent Plaintiff an Employment Separation Agreement and a Release of Claims

48. Thereafter, Plaintiff filed a charge with the United States Equal Employment Opportunity Commission (the “EEOC”) in December, 2020, complaining of the acts of disability and sex discrimination and retaliation alleged herein.

49. On or about March 17, 2021, the EEOC issued Plaintiff a notice informing her of her right to sue ElectrifiAi and White Oak. Plaintiff has thus complied fully with all prerequisites required by Title VII.

COUNT ONE
NJLAD SEX DISCRIMINATION (ALL DEFENDANTS)

50. Plaintiff repeats and realleges each paragraph of the Complaint as if fully set forth herein.

51. By the acts and practices described above, Defendants have discriminated against Plaintiff on the basis of her sex in violation of the New Jersey Law Against Discrimination (“NJLAD”).

52. ElectrifiAI Defendants are liable under NJLAD as Plaintiff’s employer.

53. White Oak Defendants are liable under NJLAD as Plaintiff’s employer.

54. Defendant Scott is liable under NJLAD as Plaintiff’s employer and as an aider and abettor of discrimination against Plaintiff.

55. Defendant McNulty is liable under NJLAD as an aider and abettor of discrimination against Plaintiff.

56. As evidenced herein, all Defendants actively participated in discriminatory conduct against Plaintiff on the basis of her sex and/or acted with negligence and willful indifference to Plaintiff’s statutorily protected rights under the NJLAD.

57. As a result of Defendants’ discriminatory acts, Plaintiff has suffered, is suffering, and will continue to suffer irreparable injury, monetary damage, mental anguish, emotional distress, humiliation, and other compensable damage.

58. In addition, Plaintiff is entitled to punitive damages and all other remedies appropriate under NJLAD.

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff demands judgment against Defendants for damages, interest, attorney’s fees, cost of suit, and such other and further relief as the Court may deem just and appropriate.

COUNT TWO
NJLAD DISABILITY DISCRIMINATION (ALL DEFENDANTS)

59. Plaintiff repeats and realleges each paragraph of the Complaint as if fully set forth herein.

60. By the acts and practices described above, Defendants have discriminated against Plaintiff on the basis of her disability in violation of the New Jersey Law Against Discrimination (“NJLAD”).

61. ElectrifiAi Defendants are liable under NJLAD as Plaintiff’s employer.

62. White Oak Defendants are liable under NJLAD as Plaintiff’s employer.

63. Defendant Scott is liable under NJLAD as Plaintiff’s employer and as an aider and abettor of discrimination against Plaintiff.

64. Defendant McNulty is liable under NJLAD as an aider and abettor of discrimination against Plaintiff.

65. As evidenced herein, all Defendants actively participated in discriminatory conduct against Plaintiff on the basis of her disability and/or acted with negligence and willful indifference to Plaintiff’s statutorily protected rights under the NJLAD.

66. As a result of Defendants’ discriminatory acts, Plaintiff has suffered, is suffering, and will continue to suffer irreparable injury, monetary damage, mental anguish, emotional distress, humiliation, and other compensable damage.

67. In addition, Plaintiff is entitled to punitive damages and all other remedies appropriate under NJLAD.

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff demands judgment against Defendants for damages, interest, attorney’s fees, cost of suit, and such other and further relief as the Court may deem just and appropriate.

COUNT THREE
NJLAD RETALIATION (ALL DEFENDANTS)

68. Plaintiff repeats and realleges each paragraph of the Complaint as if fully set forth herein.

69. By the acts and practices described above, all Defendants have retaliated against Plaintiff in violation of the NJLAD for her protected activity and active opposition to Defendants' sexual-discrimination practices prohibited by the NJLAD and disability-discrimination practices prohibited by the NJLAD.

70. ElectrifiAi Defendants are liable under NJLAD as Plaintiff's employer.

71. White Oak Defendants are liable under NJLAD as Plaintiff's employer.

72. Defendant Scott is liable under NJLAD as Plaintiff's employer and as an aider and abettor of retaliation against Plaintiff.

73. Defendant McNulty is liable under NJLAD as an aider and abettor of retaliation against Plaintiff.

74. All Defendants actively participated in and/or acted with willful indifference to Plaintiff's statutorily protected rights, and retaliated against Plaintiff for her exercise of those rights.

75. As a result of Defendants' retaliatory acts, Plaintiff has suffered, is suffering, and will continue to suffer irreparable injury, monetary damage, mental anguish, emotional distress, humiliation, and other compensable damages.

76. In addition, Plaintiff is entitled to punitive damages and all other remedies as may be appropriate under the NJLAD.

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff demands judgment against Defendants for damages, interest, attorney's fees, cost of suit, and such other and further relief as the Court may deem just and appropriate.

COUNT FOUR
VIOLATION OF THE CONSCIENTIOUS EMPLOYEE PROTECTION ACT
(CORPORATE DEFENDANTS)

77. Plaintiff repeats and realleges each paragraph of the Complaint as if fully set forth herein.

78. After Plaintiff's reporting of Defendant McNulty's and Defendant Scott's conduct, which Plaintiff reasonably believed to be illegal, Plaintiff was retaliated against and subjected to negative workplace conditions, as addressed herein.

79. Through these retaliatory acts and practices, Defendants have committed retaliatory harassment and adverse employment actions against Plaintiff in violation of the New Jersey Conscientious Employee Protection Act ("CEPA").

80. ElectrifiAi Defendants are liable under CEPA as Plaintiff's employer.

81. White Oak Defendants are liable under CEPA as Plaintiff's employer.

82. Defendant Scott is liable under CEPA as Plaintiff's employer.

83. As a result of Defendants' discriminatory acts, Plaintiff has suffered, is suffering, and will continue to suffer irreparable injury, monetary damage, mental anguish, emotional distress, humiliation, and other compensable damages.

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff demands judgment against Defendants for damages, interest, attorney's fees, cost of suit, and such other and further relief as the Court may deem just and appropriate.

COUNT FIVE
TITLE VII SEX DISCRIMINATION (ALL DEFENDANTS)

84. Plaintiff repeats and realleges each paragraph of the Complaint as if fully set forth herein.

85. As addressed herein, Defendants have discriminated against Plaintiff in the terms and conditions of her employment based on her sex, in violation of Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 (“Title VII”).

86. ElectrifAI Defendants are liable under Title VII as Plaintiff’s employer.

87. White Oak Defendants are liable under Title VII as Plaintiff’s employer.

88. Defendant Scott is liable under Title VII as Plaintiff’s employer.

89. Defendant McNulty is liable under Title VII as an aider and abettor of discrimination against Plaintiff.

90. Defendants have acted with malice and reckless indifference to Plaintiff’s statutorily protected rights under Title VII.

91. As a result of Defendants’ unlawful discriminatory acts, Plaintiff has suffered, is suffering, and will continue to suffer irreparable injury, monetary damage, mental anguish, emotional distress, humiliation, and other compensable damages.

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff demands judgment against Defendants for damages, interest, attorney’s fees, cost of suit, and such other and further relief as the Court may deem just and appropriate.

COUNT SIX
TITLE VII RETALIATION (ALL DEFENDANTS)

92. Plaintiff repeats and realleges each paragraph of the Complaint as if fully set forth herein.

93. By the acts and practices described above, Defendants have retaliated against Plaintiff and subjected her to negative workplace conditions in violation of Title VII for her protected

activity and active opposition to Defendants' sexual-discrimination practices prohibited by Title VII.

94. ElectrifiAi Defendants are liable under Title VII as Plaintiff's employer.

95. White Oak Defendants are liable under Title VII as Plaintiff's employer.

96. Defendant Scott is liable under Title VII as Plaintiff's employer.

97. Defendant McNulty is liable under Title VII as an aider and abettor of retaliation against Plaintiff.

98. Defendants acted with malice and/or reckless indifference to Plaintiff's statutorily protected rights under Title VII, and retaliated against Plaintiff for her exercise of those rights.

99. As a result of Defendants' unlawful retaliations against Plaintiff, Plaintiff has suffered, is suffering, and will continue to suffer irreparable injury, monetary damage, mental anguish, emotional distress, humiliation, and other compensable damages.

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff demands judgment against Defendants for damages, interest, attorney's fees, cost of suit, and such other and further relief as the Court may deem just and appropriate.

COUNT SEVEN
AMERICANS WITH DISABILITIES ACT VIOLATION
(CORPORATE DEFENDANTS)

100. Plaintiff repeats and realleges each paragraph of the Complaint as if fully set forth herein. Defendants have discriminated against Plaintiff in the terms and conditions of her employment based on her disability, in violation of the Americans with Disabilities Act ("ADA").

101. ElectrifiAi Defendants are liable under the ADA as Plaintiff's employer.

102. White Oak Defendants are liable under the ADA as Plaintiff's employer.

103. Defendant Scott is liable under the ADA as Plaintiff's employer.

104. Defendants acted with malice and/or reckless indifference to Plaintiff's statutorily protected rights under the ADA by discriminating against Plaintiff and ultimately terminating Plaintiff for discriminatory reasons that were based, in part, on Plaintiff's disability, as addressed herein.

105. As a result of Defendants' unlawful discrimination against Plaintiff on the basis of her disability, Plaintiff has suffered, is suffering, and will continue to suffer irreparable injury, monetary damage, mental anguish, emotional distress, and other compensable damages.

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff demands judgment against Defendants for damages, interest, attorney's fees, cost of suit, and such other and further relief as the Court may deem just and appropriate.

COUNT EIGHT
FAMILY AND MEDICAL LEAVE ACT OF 1993 VIOLATION
(CORPORATE DEFENDANTS)

106. Plaintiff repeats and realleges each paragraph of the Complaint as if fully set forth herein.

107. Defendants have discriminated against Plaintiff for her statutorily protected, and subsequently authorized, use of medical leave under the Family and Medical Leave Act of 1993 ("FMLA") by terminating Plaintiff during her authorized use of FMLA leave, as addressed herein.

108. ElectrifiAI Defendants are liable as Plaintiff's employer.

109. White Oak Defendants are liable as Plaintiff's employer.

110. Defendants acted with malice and/or reckless indifference to Plaintiff's statutorily protected rights under FMLA.

111. As a result of Defendants' unlawful discrimination against Plaintiff under FMLA, Plaintiff has suffered, is suffering, and will continue to suffer irreparable injury, monetary damage, mental anguish, emotional distress, humiliation, and other compensable damages.

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff demands judgment against Defendants for damages, interest, attorney's fees, cost of suit, and such other and further relief as the Court may deem just and appropriate.

COUNT NINE
INTENTIONAL INFLICTION OF EMOTIONAL DISTRESS
(ALL DEFENDANTS)

112. Plaintiff repeats and realleges each paragraph of the Complaint as if fully set forth herein.

113. The conduct alleged above with respect to Plaintiff was intentional, outrageous in character, and so extreme as to go beyond the bounds of decency.

114. By the alleged conduct described above, Defendants intentionally inflicted emotional distress on Plaintiff.

115. As a direct and proximate result Plaintiff has suffered substantial loss of income and other pecuniary harm; diminishment of career opportunity; loss of self-esteem; disruption of her family life; emotional distress; physical and mental pain and other irreparable harm; pain and suffering.

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff demands judgment against Defendants for damages, including punitive damages, interest, attorney's fees, cost of suit, and such other and further relief as the Court may deem just and appropriate.

Dated: June 11, 2021

WILLIAMS, GRAFFEO & STERN, LLC
Attorneys for Plaintiff,

Brian Graffeo

By: _____
BRIAN P. GRAFFEO, ESQ.

JURY DEMAND

Pursuant to Rule 38(b) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, Plaintiff hereby demands a trial by jury for all issues so triable.

Dated: June 11, 2021

WILLIAMS, GRAFFEO & STERN, LLC
Attorney for Plaintiff,

Brian Graffeo

By: _____
BRIAN P. GRAFFEO, ESQ.

DEMAND TO PRESERVE EVIDENCE

Defendants are hereby directed and demanded to preserve all physical and electronic information pertaining in any way to Plaintiff's causes of action and/or prayers for relief, to any defenses to same, and pertaining to any party, including but not limited to, electronic data storage, closed circuit TV footage, digital images, computer images, cache memory, searchable data, emails, spreadsheets, employment files, memos, text messages and any and all online social or work related websites, entries on social networking sites (including, but not limited to, Facebook, twitter, Myspace, etc.) and any other information and/or data and/or documents which may be relevant to any claim or defense in this litigation. Failure to do so will result in separate claims for spoliation of evidence and/or for adverse inferences.

Dated: June 11, 2021

WILLIAMS, GRAFFEO & STERN, LLC
Attorney for Plaintiff,

Brian Graffeo

By: _____
BRIAN P. GRAFFEO, ESQ.