IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA

TRACY WILLIAMS

860 N. Franklin Street Pottstown, PA 19464

NO. _____

Plaintiff,

CIVIL ACTION

vs.

JURY TRIAL DEMANDED

FRANKLIN LABS, LLC

1800 Centre Avenue Reading, PA 19605

-and-

HARVEST HEALTH & RECREATION, INC. c/o Registered Agent Solutions, Inc.

300 W. Clarendon Avenue, Suite 240 Phoenix, AZ 85013

Defendants.

COMPLAINT

Plaintiff, Tracy Williams, by and through undersigned counsel, hereby files the following

Complaint against Defendants:

INTRODUCTION

1. Plaintiff has initiated this action to redress violations by Defendants of, *inter alia*, the Age Discrimination in Employment Act ("ADEA" - 29 U.S.C. §§ 621 *et. seq.*), the Americans with Disabilities Act ("ADA" - 42 U.S.C. 12101 et seq.), Title VII of the Civil Rights Act and the

Case 5:21-cv-00864 Document 1 Filed 02/25/21 Page 2 of 14

Pennsylvania Human Relations Act ("PHRA").¹ Plaintiff was unlawfully terminated by Defendants and has suffered damages more fully described/sought herein.

JURISDICTION AND VENUE

2. This Court, in accordance with 28 U.S.C. § 1331, has jurisdiction over Plaintiff's claims because this civil action arises under laws of the United States.

3. This Court may properly maintain personal jurisdiction over each Defendant because each Defendant's contacts with this state and this judicial district are sufficient for the exercise of jurisdiction over each Defendant to comply with traditional notions of fair play and substantial justice, satisfying the standard set forth by the Supreme Court of the United States in International Shoe Co. v. Washington, 326 U.S. 310 (1945) and its progeny.

4. Pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1391(b)(1) and (b)(2), venue is properly laid in this district because all of the acts and/or omissions giving rise to the claims set forth herein occurred in this judicial district.

5. Plaintiff exhausted federal administrative remedies for her claims by first dualfiling a charge of discrimination with the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission ("EEOC") and the Pennsylvania Human Relations Commission ("PHRC") and receiving a right to sue letter mailed on or about February 3, 2021.

6. Plaintiff will seek leave to amend this pleading to incorporate claims under the PHRA at the end of the statutory one year waiting period required by Pennsylvania law and pursue

¹ Plaintiff's claims under the PHRA are referenced herein for notice purposes. She is required to wait 1 full year before initiating a lawsuit from date of dual-filing with the EEOC. Plaintiff must however file her lawsuit in advance of same because of the date of issuance of her federal right-to-sue-letter. Plaintiff's PHRA claims however will virtually mirror her federal claims.

Case 5:21-cv-00864 Document 1 Filed 02/25/21 Page 3 of 14

relief and/or damages under that statute that are not already available under federal law. *See* 43 P.S. § 962(c).

PARTIES

7. The foregoing paragraphs are incorporated herein in their entirety as if set forth in full.

8. Plaintiff is an adult individual, with an address as set forth in the caption.

9. Defendant Franklin Labs LLC ("Defendant FL") is a Pennsylvania limited liability corporation with a principal place of business at the above-captioned address.

10. Defendant FL is believed and therefore averred to have at one point operated at least five ("5") marijuana dispensaries in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania.

11. Defendant Harvest Health & Recreation Inc. ("Defendant HHR") is believed and therefore averred to be a Canadian corporation registered to do business in the State of Arizona.

12. Defendant HHR has a registered agent for service of process at the above-captioned address.

13. Defendant HHR's principal office addresses are believed and therefore averred to be 2200 HSBC Building, 8825 West Georgia Street, Vancouver, Canada and/or 1155 West Rio Salado Parkway Suite 201 Tempe, AZ 85281.

14. Defendant HHR advertises on its website at <u>http://www.harvesthoc.com</u> that it does business and/or sales within the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, but upon information and belief may not yet be registered as a foreign corporation doing business in the Commonwealth.

15. Defendant HHR also advertises as doing business in the States of Arizona, California, Florida and Maryland.

Case 5:21-cv-00864 Document 1 Filed 02/25/21 Page 4 of 14

16. During the course of her employment, Plaintiff was employed by Defendant FL who was subsequently acquired by Defendant HHR for approximately \$25.5 million dollars.

17. Defendants publicly announced the purchase on or about March 27, 2020 prior to Plaintiff's unlawful termination.

18. Upon information and belief, Defendants FL and HHR ("Defendants") comprise one general operation and were a joint employer of Plaintiff during his period of employment.

19. Upon information and belief, because of their interrelation of operations, common ownership or management, centralized control of labor relations, common ownership and/or financial controls, and/or other factors, Defendants are sufficiently interrelated and integrated in their activities, labor relations, ownership and management that they may be treated as a single and/or joint employer for purposes of the instant action.

20. Alternatively, upon information and belief, Defendant HHR is liable as a successor in interest to Defendant FL.²

21. At all times relevant herein, each Defendant acted by and through its agents, servants and employees, each of whom acted at all times relevant herein in the course and scope of their employment with and for each Defendant.

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

22. The foregoing paragraphs are incorporated herein in their entirety as if set forth in full.

23. Plaintiff is 52 years old with a date of birth of June 10, 1968.

² In the Third Circuit, when a party files a discrimination case "the doctrine of successor liability applies <u>where the</u> <u>assets of the defendant-employer are transferred to another entity</u>. An aggrieved employee may enforce a claim or judgment against a successor <u>that would have been valid against the predecessor</u>." <u>Brzozowski v. Corr.</u> <u>Physician Servs.</u>, 360 F.3d 173, 178 (3d Cir. 2004) (<u>emphasis added</u>)

Case 5:21-cv-00864 Document 1 Filed 02/25/21 Page 5 of 14

24. Plaintiff is a Black (African-American) female.

25. Plaintiff became an employee of Defendants effective on or about March 2, 2020 about a month before Defendants announced that Defendant HHR was acquiring Defendant FL.

26. At all times, Plaintiff was physically employed for Defendants at 1800 Centre Avenue in Reading, Pennsylvania.

27. Plaintiff worked in an approximate 46,000 square foot marijuana cultivation, manufacturing and processing industrial building.

28. Due to the aforesaid acquisition as referenced above, during her short period of employment (approximately 3 months), the workplace was being substantially changed (including as to management hierarchy).

29. Plaintiff was initially hired as a trimmer and later moved to work in packaging.

30. Management within Defendants included Scott Lee ("Lee") (a Director of Cultivation) and "Tyler" (last name unknown) who oversaw packaging and trimming.

31. Plaintiff was unlawfully terminated on or about May 20, 2020 shortly before completing her 90-day work timeframe.

32. At time of termination, Plaintiff was informed by both "Tyler" and Lee that they would not be moving forward with her as an employee any longer.

33. The termination was both discriminatory and retaliatory.

34. Plaintiff's short tenure with Defendants was primarily during the initial stages of the global COVID-19 pandemic.

35. During her employment, Plaintiff had gotten sick on at least one occasion--even at times vomiting in the restroom.

Case 5:21-cv-00864 Document 1 Filed 02/25/21 Page 6 of 14

36. Plaintiff suffers from severe bouts of Colitis and other gastrointestinal complications, both of which are long-term disabilities.

37. Plaintiff was also one of very few Black employees and upon information and belief one of the oldest employees at her location.

38. Most of the workforce was non-Black and comprised of younger people believed to be in their 20's and 30's.

39. Plaintiff was referred to the job by a family member who spoke with management.

40. Plaintiff believes and therefore avers she obtained the job based upon a strong recommendation and referral.

41. Lee appeared reluctant to hire Black people in general.

42. In particular, he informed Plaintiff's distant family member if he hired a Black employee, he wanted an assurance Plaintiff would not be "one of those angry black women."

43. Throughout Plaintiff's short tenure, she was definitively treated much more harshly and disparately than anyone else in the workplace. By way of example and without limitation:

- Plaintiff had been suspended for traveling on a weekend despite no policy even being disseminated as to what employees were not permitted to do on their personal time;
- b. Because Plaintiff was getting sick at times due to her health problems, she was told she had to get tested for COVID-19. Plaintiff explained that there were others who coughed, sneezed, looked sick, and those persons were typically not required to get tested for COVID-19. Plaintiff expressly clarified to management she suffered from disability. These discussions occurred *within weeks* of her termination from employment;

- c. Lee at times would also tell Plaintiff don't act "angry," consistent with his discriminatory view of Black women and despite the fact that Plaintiff was nothing but pleasant and professional;
- d. Plaintiff was given a disciplinary document during her employment tenture for not weighing something properly even though others worked at her weight station. Plaintiff did not believe she did anything wrong and others were not admonished in the same way.
- e. Management identified some cleaning duties would be required by employees later into Plaintiff's hire. Plaintiff was instructed to clean, mop, and perform other cleaning duties more so than others in the workplace. Plaintiff was being assigned other employee work areas to clean and being singled out for the bulk of the janitorial work. Plaintiff was the one being assigned to clean bathrooms and the employee breakroom. Upon information and belief, Defendants made these assignments in an attempt get Plaintiff to resign.
- 44. The aforementioned examples above are just that—<u>examples</u> of disparate treatment.
- 45. Toward the end of Plaintiff's employment, in the last two ("2") to three ("3") weeks, Plaintiff mentioned to both Lee and "Tyler" that she felt she was treated unfairly *based on her race and age*.
- 46. Plaintiff mentioned the disparate treatment to Lee and "Tyler" on a couple of occasions in the aforementioned timeframe.
- 47. Lee and "Tyler" effectively ignored the complaints, blew them off and then terminated Plaintiff in close proximity to them.

Case 5:21-cv-00864 Document 1 Filed 02/25/21 Page 8 of 14

48. Plaintiff's termination was pretextual in that Defendants terminated her because of (a) her disclosures of health problems; (b) notice that she would need certain accommodations of breaks or restroom at times due to health problems; and (c) her age, race and/or her complaints of differential treatment wherein she specifically referenced her age and race to Lee and "Tyler".

COUNT I

<u>Violations of the Age Discrimination in Employment Act ("ADEA")</u> ([1] Age Discrimination, [2] Retaliation and [3] Hostile Work Environment) -Against Both Defendants-

49. The foregoing paragraphs are incorporated herein in their entirety as if set forth in full.

50. Plaintiff believes and avers herein that Defendants terminated her employment because of her advanced age and otherwise subjected younger co-workers to more favorable treatment.

51. Defendants also retaliated against Plaintiff for her aforementioned complaints of discrimination.

52. These actions as aforesaid constitute unlawful discrimination, retaliation and a hostile work environment under the ADEA.

53. Plaintiff has suffered damages as set forth more fully herein.

COUNT II

<u>Violations of the Americans with Disabilities Act "ADA"</u> [1] Actual/Perceived/Record of Disability Discrimination; [2] Retaliation; [3] Failure to Accommodate; [4] Hostile Work Environment) -Against All Defendants-

50. The foregoing paragraphs are incorporated herein in their entirety as if set forth in

full.

Case 5:21-cv-00864 Document 1 Filed 02/25/21 Page 9 of 14

51. Plaintiff was terminated because of [1] her actual and/or perceived disabilities; [2] her record of impairment; [3] her requested accommodation(s), which also constitutes unlawful retaliation.

52. Defendants also failed to engage in the interactive process and/or otherwise failed to accommodate her.

53. Defendants also retaliated against Plaintiff for engaging in protected activity.

54. These actions as aforesaid constitute violations of the ADA.

55. Plaintiff has suffered damages as set forth more fully herein.

COUNT III <u>Violations of 42 U.S.C. § 1981</u> ([1] Racial Discrimination, [2] Retaliation, [3] Hostile Work Environment) -Against All Defendants-

56. The foregoing paragraphs are incorporated herein in their entirety as if set forth in full.

57. Plaintiff was subjected to disparate treatment by Defendants.

58. Plaintiff was subjected to a hostile work environment during her entire tenure by conduct, actions, and discriminatory statements by Defendants through their highest levels of management. This constitutes a violation of § 1981.

59. Plaintiff was subjected to unlawful retaliation based on her engagement in protected activity.

60. Plaintiff has suffered damages as set forth more fully herein.

COUNT IV <u>Violations of Title VII of the Civil Rights Act</u> ([1] Racial Discrimination, [2] Retaliation, [3] Hostile Work Environment)

50. The foregoing paragraphs are incorporated herein in their entirety as if set forth in full.

51. Plaintiff was subjected to disparate treatment by Defendants.

Case 5:21-cv-00864 Document 1 Filed 02/25/21 Page 10 of 14

52. Plaintiff was subjected to a hostile work environment during her entire tenure by conduct, actions, and discriminatory statements by Defendants through their highest levels of management.

53. Plaintiff was subjected to unlawful retaliation for engaging in protected activity.

54. Plaintiff has suffered damages as set forth more fully herein.

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff prays that this Court enter an Order providing that:

A. Each Defendant is to promulgate and adhere to a policy prohibiting discrimination in the future against any employee(s);

B. Each Defendant is to compensate Plaintiff, reimburse Plaintiff, and make Plaintiff whole for any and all pay and benefits Plaintiff would have received had it not been for each Defendant's illegal actions, including but not limited to back pay, front pay, salary, pay increases, bonuses, insurance, benefits, training, promotions, reinstatement and seniority;

C. Plaintiff is to be awarded punitive damages to the extent permitted by applicable law, in an amount believed by the Court or trier of fact to be appropriate to punish Defendant for its willful, deliberate, malicious and outrageous conduct and to deter Defendant or other employers from engaging in such misconduct in the future;

D. Plaintiff is to be accorded other equitable and legal relief as the Court deems just, proper and appropriate (including but not limited to damages for emotional distress, pain, suffering and humiliation); and

E. Plaintiff is to be awarded the costs and expenses of this action and reasonable attorney's fees as provided by applicable federal and state law.

F. Plaintiff demands trial by jury on all issues so triable.

Case 5:21-cv-00864 Document 1 Filed 02/25/21 Page 11 of 14

Respectfully submitted,

KARPF, KARPF & CERUTTI, P.C.

Ari R. Karpf, Esq. W. Charles Sipio, Esq. 3331 Street Rd. Bldg. 2, Ste. 128 Bensalem, PA 19020

Date: February 25, 2021

Case 5:21-cv-00864 Document 1 Filed 02/25/21 Page 12 of 14

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA

CASE MANAGEMENT TRACK DESIGNATION FORM

Tracy Williams

CIVIL ACTION

NO.

Fanklin Labs, LLC, et al.

In accordance with the Civil Justice Expense and Delay Reduction Plan of this court, counsel for plaintiff shall complete a Case Management Track Designation Form in all civil cases at the time of filing the complaint and serve a copy on all defendants. (See § 1:03 of the plan set forth on the reverse side of this form.) In the event that a defendant does not agree with the plaintiff regarding said designation, that defendant shall, with its first appearance, submit to the clerk of court and serve on the plaintiff and all other parties, a Case Management Track Designation Form specifying the track to which that defendant believes the case should be assigned.

SELECT ONE OF THE FOLLOWING CASE MANAGEMENT TRACKS:

(a)	Habeas Corpus – Cases brought under 28 U.S.C. § 2241 through § 2255.	())
(b)	Social Security – Cases requesting review of a decision of the Secretary of Health and Human Services denying plaintiff Social Security Benefits.	(2)
(c)	Arbitration - Cases required to be designated for arbitration under Local Civil Rule 53.2.	()	1
(d)	Asbestos – Cases involving claims for personal injury or property damage from exposure to asbestos.	())
(e)	Special Management – Cases that do not fall into tracks (a) through (d) that are commonly referred to as complex and that need special or intense management by the court. (See reverse side of this form for a detailed explanation of special			
	management cases.)	()	ŕ
(f)	Standard Management - Cases that do not fall into any one of the other tracks.	(X	()	
	\sim			

2/25/2021		Plaintiff
Date	Attorney-at-law	Attorney for
(215) 639-0801	(215) 639-4970	akarpf@karpf-law.com
Telephone	FAX Number	E-Mail Address

(Civ. 660) 10/02

Case 5:21-cv-00864NT Page 13 of 14 FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA

DESIGNATION FORM

(to be used by counsel or pro se plaintiff to indicate the category of the case for the purpose of assignment to the appropriate calendar)

Address of Plaintiff: <u>860 N. Franklin Street</u>, Pottstown, PA 19464

Address of Defendant: 1800 Centre Avenue, Reading, PA 19605 / 300 W. Claredon Avenue, Suite 240, Phoenix, AZ 85013

Place of Accident, Incident or Transaction: ______ Defendants place of business

RELATED CASE, IF ANY:							
Case Number:	Judge:	Date Terminated:					
Civil cases are deemed related when Yes is answered to any of the following questions:							
1. Is this case related to property included in an earl previously terminated action in this court?							
2. Does this case involve the same issue of fact or grow out of the same transaction as a prior suit Yes No X							
3. Does this case involve the validity or infringement of a patent already in suit or any earlier Yes No X							
4. Is this case a second or successive habeas corpus, case filed by the same individual?							
I certify that, to my knowledge, the within case \Box is / \boxtimes is not related to any case now pending or within one year previously terminated action in this court except as noted above. DATE: $\frac{2/25/2021}{Attorney-at-Law / Pro Se Plaintiff}$							
CIVIL: (Place a \infty in one category only) B. Diversity Jurisdiction Cases: A. Federal Question Cases: B. Diversity Jurisdiction Cases: 1. Indemnity Contract, Marine Contract, and All Other Contracts 1. 2. FELA 1. 3. Jones Act-Personal Injury 3. 4. Antitrust 2. 5. Patent 3. 6. Labor-Management Relations 4. 7. Civil Rights 7. 9. Securities Act(s) Cases 7. 10. Social Security Review Cases 9. 11. All other Federal Question Cases 9. (Please specify):							
ARBITRATION CERTIFICATION (The effect of this certification is to remove the case from eligibility for arbitration.) I. Ari R. Karpf , counsel of record or pro se plaintiff, do hereby certify: IX Pursuant to Local Civil Rule 53.2, § 3(c) (2), that to the best of my knowledge and belief, the damages recoverable in this civil action case exceed the sum of \$150,000.00 exclusive of interest and costs: IN Relief other than monetary damages is sought. DATE: 2/25/2021 ARK2484 / 91538							
DATE: 2/25/2021 Attorney-at-Law / Pro Se Plaintiff Attorney I.D. # (if applicable) NOTE: A trial de novo will be a trial by jury only if there has been compliance with F.R.C.P. 38. Attorney I.D. # (if applicable)							

JS 44 (Rev. 06/17)

Case 5:21-cv-00864, Document 1, Filed 02/25/21 Page 14 of 14 CIVIL COVER SHEET

The JS 44 civil cover sheet and the information contained herein neither replace nor supplement the filing and service of pleadings or other papers as required by law, except as provided by local rules of court. This form, approved by the Judicial Conference of the United States in September 1974, is required for the use of the Clerk of Court for the purpose of initiating the civil docket sheet. *(SEE INSTRUCTIONS ON NEXT PAGE OF THIS FORM.)*

purpose of initiating the errif a							
I. (a) PLAINTIFFS			DEFENDANT	8			
WILLIAMS, TRACY			FRANKLIN LA	BS, LLC, ET AL.			
(b) County of Residence of	of First Listed Plaintiff N	Aontgomery	County of Residence	County of Residence of First Listed Defendant Berks			
· , ·	XCEPT IN U.S. PLAINTIFF CA	6 1		(IN U.S. PLAINTIFF CASES C	ONLY)		
			NOTE: IN LAND C THE TRAC	ONDEMNATION CASES, USE TI T OF LAND INVOLVED.	HE LOCATION OF		
(c) Attorneys (Firm Name, A	Address and Talankona Number	.)	Attorneys (If Known))			
Karpf, Karpf & Cerutti,				,			
Suite 128, Bensalem, PA			. .				
II. BASIS OF JURISDI	ICTION (Place an "X" in O	ne Box Only)	III. CITIZENSHIP OF H (For Diversity Cases Only)	'RINCIPAL PARTIES	(Place an "X" in One Box for Plaintif and One Box for Defendant)		
1 U.S. Government Plaintiff	X 3 Federal Question (U.S. Government)	Not a Party)	I Citizen of This State	PTF DEF 1 1 Incorporated or Prin	PTF DEF		
i idilitii	(0.5. Government)	(or a 1 arry)	Chizen of This State	of Business In T	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		
2 U.S. Government Defendant	4 Diversity (Indicate Citizenshi	ip of Parties in Item III)	Citizen of Another State	2 2 Incorporated and Pr of Business In A			
			Citizen or Subject of a Foreign Country	3 3 Foreign Nation	6 6		
IV. NATURE OF SUIT			EQDEEVELDE		of Suit Code Descriptions.		
CONTRACT I 110 Insurance	PERSONAL INJURY	ORTS PERSONAL INJUR	FORFEITURE/PENALTY Y I 625 Drug Related Seizure	BANKRUPTCY ' 422 Appeal 28 USC 158	OTHER STATUTES 375 False Claims Act		
120 Marine	' 310 Airplane	 365 Personal Injury - Product Liability 	of Property 21 USC 881	' 423 Withdrawal 28 USC 157	['] 376 Qui Tam (31 USC 3729(a))		
 130 Miller Act 140 Negotiable Instrument 	' 315 Airplane Product Liability	367 Health Care/	1 690 Other		400 State Reapportionment		
I 150 Recovery of Overpayment & Enforcement of Judgment	' 320 Assault, Libel & Slander	Pharmaceutical Personal Injury		PROPERTY RIGHTS 820 Copyrights	 410 Antitrust 430 Banks and Banking 		
151 Medicare Act	' 330 Federal Employers'	Product Liability 368 Asbestos Personal		830 Patent	□ 450 Commerce		
152 Recovery of Defaulted Student Loans	Liability ' 340 Marine	Injury Product		835 Patent - Abbreviated New Drug Application	470 Racketeer Influenced and		
(Excludes Veterans)153 Recovery of Overpayment	' 345 Marine Product Liability	Liability PERSONAL PROPER	TY LABOR	840 Trademark SOCIAL SECURITY	Corrupt Organizations 480 Consumer Credit		
of Veteran's Benefits 160 Stockholders' Suits	350 Motor Vehicle355 Motor Vehicle	370 Other Fraud371 Truth in Lending	710 Fair Labor Standards Act	 861 HIA (1395ff) 862 Black Lung (923) 	 490 Cable/Sat TV 850 Securities/Commodities/ 		
190 Other Contract	Product Liability	380 Other Personal	2 720 Labor/Management	' 863 DIWC/DIWW (405(g))	Exchange		
 195 Contract Product Liability 196 Franchise 	' 360 Other Personal Injury	Property Damage 385 Property Damage	Relations 740 Railway Labor Act 	 864 SSID Title XVI 865 RSI (405(g)) 	 890 Other Statutory Actions 891 Agricultural Acts 		
	' 362 Personal Injury - Medical Malpractice	Product Liability	' 751 Family and Medical Leave Act		 893 Environmental Matters 895 Freedom of Information 		
REAL PROPERTY	CIVIL RIGHTS	PRISONER PETITION	NS 790 Other Labor Litigation	FEDERAL TAX SUITS	Act		
210 Land Condemnation220 Foreclosure	440 Other Civil Rights441 Voting	Habeas Corpus: 463 Alien Detainee	791 Employee Retirement Income Security Act	 870 Taxes (U.S. Plaintiff or Defendant) 	896 Arbitration899 Administrative Procedure		
 230 Rent Lease & Ejectment 240 Torts to Land 	 442 Employment 443 Housing/ 	510 Motions to Vacate Sentence	;	871 IRS—Third Party 26 USC 7609	Act/Review or Appeal of Agency Decision		
 245 Tort Product Liability 290 All Other Real Property 	Accommodations 445 Amer. w/Disabilities -	 530 General 535 Death Penalty 	MALCHARION		 950 Constitutionality of State Statutes 		
290 All Other Real Property	Employment	Other:	IMMIGRATION Image: 462 Naturalization Application	1	State Statutes		
	446 Amer. w/Disabilities - Other	 540 Mandamus & Othe 550 Civil Rights 	er 0 465 Other Immigration Actions				
	448 Education	 555 Prison Condition 560 Civil Detainee - 					
		Conditions of Confinement					
V. ORIGIN (Place an "X" i	n One Box Only)	Commentent					
X1 Original 0 2 Re	emoved from 3 ate Court	Remanded from Appellate Court		ferred from her District fy) General and figure General and figu			
VI. CAUSE OF ACTION	ADEA (29USC6	21); ADA (42USC	re filing (<i>Do not cite jurisdictional sta</i> (12101); Title VII (42USC2	tutes unless diversity):	Direct inc		
TI. CAUSE OF ACTION	Brief description of ca	use: ADEA, ADA. Titl	e VII and the PHRA.				
VII. REQUESTED IN COMPLAINT:		IS A CLASS ACTION		CHECK YES only JURY DEMAND	if demanded in complaint: XYes 'No		
VIII. RELATED CAS							
IF ANY	(See instructions):	JUDGE	~	DOCKET NUMBER			
DATE 2/25/2021		SIGNATURE OF AT	ORNEY OF RECORD				
FOR OFFICE USE ONLY	يى	0					
RECEIPT # A	MOUNT	APPLYING IFP	JUDGE	MAG. JUI	DGE		
Print	Save As				Reset		