Case 2:17-cv-04675-JD Document 1 Filed 10/19/17 Page 1 of 24

JS 44 (Rev. 06/17)

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.)

I. (a) PLAINTIFFS	A CONTRACTOR OF THE CONTRACTOR		DEFENDANTS		WARRIE W		
Robert Tomaszewski			City of Philadelphia				
(b) County of Residence of First Listed Plaintiff Philadelphia (EXCEPT IN U.S. PLAINTIFF CASES)			County of Residence of First Listed Defendant Philadelphia (IN U.S. PLAINTIFF CASES ONLY) NOTE: IN LAND CONDEMNATION CASES, USE THE LOCATION OF THE TRACT OF LAND INVOLVED.				
(c) Attorneys (Firm Name, A Caren N. Gurmankin, Esc Console Mattiacci Law 1525 Locust St., 9th Fl., I		;	Attorneys (If Known)				
II. BASIS OF JURISDI	CTION (Place an "X" in One Box Only)			RINCIPAL PARTIES	(Place an "X" in One Box for Plaintiff		
☐ 1 U.S. Government Plaintiff	→ 3 Federal Question (U.S. Government Not a Party)		(For Diversity Cases Only) PT en of This State				
☐ 2 U.S. Government Defendant ☐ 4 Diversity (Indicate Citizenship of Parties in Item III)			Citizen of Another State				
			en or Subject of a preign Country		06 06		
IV. NATURE OF SUIT		1 177	ADREIGHDR/DENATOV	Click here for: Nature BANKRUPTCY	of Suit Code Descriptions. OTHER STATUTES		
CONTRACT 110 Insurance 120 Marine 130 Miller Act 140 Negotiable Instrument 150 Recovery of Overpayment & Enforcement of Judgment 151 Medicare Act 152 Recovery of Defaulted Student Loans (Excludes Veterans) 153 Recovery of Overpayment of Veteran's Benefits 160 Stockholders' Suits 190 Other Contract 195 Contract Product Liability 196 Franchise REAL PROPERTY 210 Land Condemnation 220 Foreclosure 230 Rent Lease & Ejectment 240 Torts to Land 245 Tort Product Liability 290 All Other Real Property	□ 330 Federal Employers' Liability □ 340 Marine □ 345 Marine Product Liability □ 350 Motor Vehicle □ Product Liability □ 360 Other Personal Injury □ 360 Other Personal Injury Medical Malpractice □ 21VIE RIGHTS □ 440 Other Civil Rights □ 441 Voting □ 443 Housing/ Accommodations □ 445 Amer. w/Disabilities Employment □ 446 Amer. w/Disabilities Other □ 448 Education □ 448 Education □ 448 Education □ 550 Civil Rights □ 560 Civil Rights □ 560 Civil Detaince Conditions of Confinement	RY	DRFEITURE/PENALTY 25 Drug Related Seizure of Property 21 USC 881 20 Other LABOR 10 Fair Labor Standards Act 20 Labor/Management Relations 40 Railway Labor Act 51 Family and Medical Leave Act 20 Other Labor Litigation 91 Employee Retirement Income Security Act IMMIGRATION 62 Naturalization Application 65 Other Immigration Actions	□ 422 Appeal 28 USC 158 □ 423 Withdrawal 28 USC 157 PROPERTY RIGHTS □ 820 Copyrights □ 830 Patent □ 835 Patent - Abbreviated New Drug Application □ 840 Trademark SOCIAL SECURITY □ 861 HIA (1395ff) □ 862 Black Lung (923) □ 863 DIWC/DIWW (405(g)) □ 864 SSID Title XVI □ 865 RSI (405(g)) FEDERAL TAX SUITS □ 870 Taxes (U.S. Plaintiff or Defendant) □ 871 IRS—Third Party 26 USC 7609	OTHERSTATOTES □ 375 False Claims Act □ 376 Qui Tam (31 USC 3729(a)) □ 400 State Reapportionment □ 410 Antitrust □ 430 Banks and Banking □ 450 Commerce □ 460 Deportation □ 470 Racketeer Influenced and Corrupt Organizations □ 480 Consumer Credit □ 490 Cable/Sat TV □ 850 Securities/Commodities/ Exchange □ 890 Other Statutory Actions □ 891 Agricultural Acts □ 893 Environmental Matters □ 895 Freedom of Information Act □ 896 Arbitration □ 899 Administrative Procedure Act/Review or Appeal of Agency Decision □ 950 Constitutionality of State Statutes		
V. ORIGIN (Place an "X" in One Box Only) X 1 Original Proceeding State Court							
VII. REQUESTED IN COMPLAINT:	☐ CHECK IF THIS IS A CLASS ACTION UNDER RULE 23, F.R.Cv.P.		DEMAND \$ in excess of \$75,00	•	y if demanded in complaint:		
VIII. RELATED CAST	E(S) (See instructions): JUDGE			DOCKET NUMBER			
DATE 10/19/2017	SIGNATIURE OF A	TTORNEY	OF RECORD				
FOR OFFICE USE ONLY	MOLINT APPLYING IFP	. //	JUDGE	MAG. JU	DGE		

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

CASE MANAGEMENT TRACK DESIGNATION FORM

Telephone	FAX Number	E-Mail Address	
215-545-7676	215-565-2853	gurmankin@consolelaw.com	••••••
Date	Attorney-at-law	Attorney for	
10/19/17	cna/	Plaintiff, Robert Tomaszewski	
(f) Standard Management – C	Cases that do not fall into a	ny one of the other tracks.	(X)
(e) Special Management – Ca commonly referred to as of the court. (See reverse signal management cases.)	ases that do not fall into tra complex and that need spec de of this form for a detaile	cial or intense management by	()
(d) Asbestos – Cases involvir exposure to asbestos.	ng claims for personal injur	ry or property damage from	()
(c) Arbitration – Cases requir	ed to be designated for arb	pitration under Local Civil Rule 53.2.	()
(b) Social Security – Cases re and Human Services deny	equesting review of a decise ving plaintiff Social Security	ion of the Secretary of Health ty Benefits.	()
(a) Habeas Corpus – Cases bi	ought under 28 U.S.C. § 2	2241 through § 2255.	()
SELECT ONE OF THE FO	LLOWING CASE MANA	AGEMENT TRACKS:	
plaintiff shall complete a Case filing the complaint and serve side of this form.) In the ev designation, that defendant sh	e Management Track Design a copy on all defendants. (See that a defendant does hall, with its first appearancies, a Case Management Track Design and the control of the con	y Reduction Plan of this court, counse gnation Form in all civil cases at the tire. See § 1:03 of the plan set forth on the remot agree with the plaintiff regarding see, submit to the clerk of court and servack Designation Form specifying the gned.	me of verse g said ve on
Defendant	:	NO.	
v. City of Philadelphia,	: :		
Robert Tomaszewski, Plaintiff	:	CIVIL ACTION	
	INAGEMENT TRACK D	<u>ESIGNATION FORM</u>	

(Civ. 660) 10/02

Case 2:17-cv-04675-JD Document 1 Filed 10/19/17 Page 3 of 24 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA — DESIGNATION FORM to be used by counsel to indicate the category of the case for the purpose of assignment to appropriate calendar.

Address of Plaintiff: Philadelphia, PA 19152					
Address of Defendant: 1401 John F. Kennedy Boulevard; Philadelphia, P.	A 19102				
Place of Accident, Incident or Transaction: (Use Reverse Side For	Additional Space)				
Does this civil action involve a nongovernmental corporate party with any parent corporation	and any publicly held corporation owning 10% or more of its stock?				
(Attach two copies of the Disclosure Statement Form in accordance with Fed.R.Civ.P. 7.1(a)) Yes□ NoĎ				
Does this case involve multidistrict litigation possibilities?	Yes□ No IX				
RELATED CASE, IF ANY: Case Number: Judge	Data Tampinatadi				
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 earlier numbered suit pending or within one y					
	Yes□ No⊠				
2. Does this case involve the same issue of fact or grow out of the same transaction as a prior action in this court?	suit pending or within one year previously terminated				
	Yes□ No ⊠				
3. Does this case involve the validity or infringement of a patent already in suit or any earlier	3.2				
terminated action in this court?	Yes□ No ⊠				
4. Is this case a second or successive habeas corpus, social security appeal, or pro se civil rigit	hts case filed by the same individual?				
• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •	Yes□ No ∑				
CIVIL: (Place ✓ in ONE CATEGORY ONLY)					
A. Federal Question Cases:	B. Diversity Jurisdiction Cases:				
1. □ Indemnity Contract, Marine Contract, and All Other Contracts	1. Insurance Contract and Other Contracts				
2. □ FELA	2. □ Airplane Personal Injury				
3. □ Jones Act-Personal Injury	3. □ Assault, Defamation				
4. Antitrust	4. Marine Personal Injury				
5. Patent	5. Motor Vehicle Personal Injury				
6. Labor-Management Relations	6. Declarational Injury (Please specify)				
7. X Civil Rights	7. Products Liability				
8. □ Habeas Corpus	8. Products Liability — Asbestos				
9. □ Securities Act(s) Cases	9. □ All other Diversity Cases				
10. □ Social Security Review Cases	(Please specify)				
11. □ All other Federal Question Cases (Please specify)					
ARBITRATION CERT	TIFIC A TION				
I, Caren N. Gurmankin, Esquire , counsel of record do hereby cert	Category)				
R Pursuant to Local Civil Rule 53.2, Section 3(c)(2), that to the best of my knowledge and					
\$150,000.00 exclusive of interest and costs; Relief other than monetary damages is sought.					
10/10/17	205900				
DATE: 10/19/17 Attorney-o-Law	Attorney I.D.#				
NOTE: A trial de novo will be a trial by jury only if the	·				
I certify that, to my knowledge, the within case is not related to any case now pending of	r within one year previously terminated action in this court				
except as noted above.					
DATE: 10/19/17	205900				
DATE: 10/19/17 Attorney-at-Law	Attorney I.D.#				
CIV. 609 (5/2012)	•				

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

ROBERT TOMASZEWSKI Philadelphia, PA 19152

CIVIL ACTION NO.

Plaintiff,

٧.

CITY OF PHILADELPHIA 1401 John F. Kennedy Boulevard Philadelphia, PA 19102

JURY TRIAL DEMANDED

Defendant. :

COMPLAINT

I. INTRODUCTION

Plaintiff, Robert Tomaszewski, brings this action against his employer, the City of Philadelphia ("Defendant"). Plaintiff has over thirty two (32) years of experience working in Defendant's Department of Prisons, including over eleven (11) years of experience as a Deputy Commissioner, and an excellent record within the Department. Defendant passed him over for promotion into the open Commissioner position, and, instead, selected a less experienced, less qualified employee based on race and sex. After Plaintiff complained about Defendant's discriminatory conduct in failing to promote him, Defendant retaliated against him.

Defendant discriminated against Plaintiff based on his race, and retaliated against him based on his complaints about the same, in violation of Title VII of

the Civil Rights Act of 1964, as amended, 42 U.S.C. §2000e, *et seq.* ("Title VII"), 42 U.S.C. §1981 ("Section 1981"), the Pennsylvania Human Relations Act, as amended, 43 P.S. §951, *et seq.* ("PHRA"); and the Philadelphia Fair Practices Ordinance, as amended, Phila. Code §9-1101, *et seq.* ("PFPO"). Defendant also discriminated against Plaintiff based on his sex, and retaliated against him based on his complaints about the same, in violation of Title VII, the PHRA, and the PFPO. Defendant's conduct also deprived Plaintiff of his constitutional rights of the Equal Protection Clause of the Constitution in violation of 42 U.S.C. §1983 ("Section 1983").

II. PARTIES

- Plaintiff, Robert Tomaszewski, is an individual and a citizen of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania.
 - 2. Plaintiff is white.
 - Plaintiff is male.
- 4. Defendant, the City of Philadelphia, is a political subdivision of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, with its principal office located at 1401 John F. Kennedy Boulevard, Philadelphia, PA 19102.
- 5. Defendant is engaged in an industry affecting interstate commerce and regularly do business in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania.
- 6. At all times material hereto, Defendant employed more than fifteen (15) employees.
- 7. Defendant has engaged in a pattern and practice of considering characteristics such as race and/or sex when making employment decisions.

- 8. At all times material hereto, Defendant instituted, acquiesced in, ratified and/or made employment decisions based on consideration of characteristics such as race and/or sex.
- 9. At all times material hereto, Defendant acted by and through its authorized agents, servants, workmen, and/or employees acting within the course and scope of their employment with Defendant and in furtherance of Defendant's business.
- 10. At all times material hereto, Defendant acted as an employer within the meaning of the statutes which form the basis of this matter.
- 11. At all times material hereto, Plaintiff was an employee of Defendant within the meaning of the statutes which form the basis of this matter.
- 12. At all times material hereto, Defendant acted under color of state law.

III. JURISDICTION AND VENUE

- 13. The causes of action which form the basis of this matter arise under Title VII. Section 1981, Section 1983, the PHRA, and the PFPO.
- 14. The District Court has jurisdiction over Count I (Title VII) pursuant to 42 U.S.C. §2000e-5 and 28 U.S.C. §1331.
- 15. The District Court has jurisdiction over Count II (Section 1981) pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §1331.
- 16. The District Court has jurisdiction over Count III (Section 1983) pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §1331.
 - 17. The District Court has supplemental jurisdiction over Count IV

(PHRA) pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §1367.

- 18. The District Court has supplemental jurisdiction over Count V (PFPO) pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §1367.
- 19. Venue is proper in the District Court under 28 U.S.C. §1391(b) and 42 U.S.C. §2000(e)-5(f).
- 20. On or about July 5, 2016, Plaintiff filed a Charge of Discrimination with the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission ("EEOC"), complaining of acts of discrimination alleged herein. This Charge was cross-filed with the Pennsylvania Human Relations Commission ("PHRC"). Attached hereto, incorporated herein and marked as Exhibit "1" is a true and correct copy of the EEOC Charge of Discrimination (with personal identifying information redacted).
- 21. On or about July 25, 2017, the EEOC issued to Plaintiff a Notice of Right to Sue for Charge of Discrimination. Attached hereto, incorporated herein and marked as Exhibit "2" is a true and correct copy of the notice with personal identifying information redacted.
- 22. Plaintiff has fully complied with all administrative prerequisites for the commencement of this action.

IV. FACTUAL ALLEGATIONS

- Plaintiff was hired by Defendant in or around 1984 as a
 Correctional Officer in the Department of Prisons.
- 24. Plaintiff has consistently demonstrated excellent performance throughout his employment with Defendant. He was promoted multiple times, including, just about two (2) years after he started working at Defendant, into the

position of Correctional Sergeant. He was subsequently promoted into the position of Lieutenant, and then Captain, Deputy Warden, and then Warden.

- 25. In or about 2005, Plaintiff was promoted into the position of Deputy Commissioner for Administration.
- 26. In or around late 2015, Defendant's Commissioner of Prisons announced that he would be retiring effective January 2016. As a result, Defendant posted the position of Commissioner and created a panel to inteview potential candidates for the position.
- 27. Plaintiff applied for the Commissioner position, as he was qualified for the same. He was interviewed by Defendant's search panel in or around December 2015.
- 28. On or about January 8, 2016, Defendant announced that it was appointing an employee from outside of the Department of Prisons as Acting Commissioner for a six (6) month period so that it could continue searching for a permanent Commissioner. Around that time, Defendant contacted Plaintiff and told him only that it was going in a different direction regarding the Commissioner position.
- 29. In or around April 2016, the Acting Commissioner also told Plaintiff that Mayor Kenney's administration agreed that, per pressure from the Philadelphia Chapter of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, Defendant would appoint a black female as the next Commissioner.
- 30. Around that time, the Acting Commissioner informed Plaintiff that he had a discussion with First Deputy Managing Director of Defendant who was

also a member of Defendant's search panel for the Commissioner position. In that discussion, the Acting Commissioner told the First Deputy that he was aware that Defendant was searching for a black female to fill the Commissioner position. The Acting Commissioner also told the Deputy that, based on what Defendant was looking for, it should interview a black female Deputy Commissioner within the Department of Prisons, Blanche Carney.

- 31. The Acting Commissioner told Plaintiff that the First Deputy did not deny that Defendant was looking to fill the Commissioner position with a black female.
- 32. To the best of Plaintiff's knowledge, Carney had not applied for the Commissioner position.
- 33. In around April 2016, Defendant interviewed Carney for the Commissioner position.
- 34. To the best of Plaintiff's knowledge, since January 2016, Defendant had interviewed only black female candidates for the Commissioner position.
- 35. On or about April 23, 2016, Defendant announced that it had selected Carney for the Commissioner position.
- 36. Carney was less qualified than Plaintiff for the Commissioner position. By way of example only, Plaintiff had substantially greater tenure in Defendant's Department of Prisons than Carney, and Plaintiff had over eleven (11) years as a Deputy Commissioner at the time that Defendant selected Carney, while she had approximately one (1) year of experience as a Deputy Commissioner.

- 37. Upon Carney becoming Commissioner effective on or about May23, 2016, Plaintiff reported directly to her.
- 38. Defendant did not provide Plaintiff with a reason as to why it failed to promote him into the position of Commissioner.
- 39. On or about July 5, 2016, Plaintiff filed his Charge of Discrimination with the EEOC regarding the race and sex discriminatory to which Defendant subjected him by not selecting him for the Commissioner position. He advised Defendant, including Carney, of the same.
- 40. In or around August 2016, Defendant conducted an audit of one (1) of the funds in the Department that was administered by Plaintiff's office. As part of the audit, the Department's Chief of Staff noticed some perceived irregularities regarding withdrawals, and reported the same to Carney. As the Chief of Staff subsequently told Plaintiff, Carney said that she wanted him to send the matter to Defendant's Office of Inspector General ("OIG") to conduct an investigation as she was annoyed by the fact that Plaintiff had filed an EEOC Charge.
- 41. At the conclusion of the OIG's investigation, in or around February 2017, Plaintiff was informed that it concluded that there were no irregularities regarding the fund and no improprieties regarding the administration of the fund.
- 42. To date, Defendant has not informed Plaintiff of remedial and/or corrective action that it has taken regarding his complaints of discrimination.
- 43. Defendant's conduct demonstrates that it has a pattern and practice of considering characteristics such as race and/or sex when making employment decisions. Aside from that which is set forth above, evidence of the

same includes, but is not limited to, the following:

- (a) In a meeting with Carney and the Chief of Staff for the Department of Prisons, Plaintiff was told that he could not fill a particular position because the candidate who was selected was of Indian descent and, according to Carney, there were "too many Indians" in that particular unit of the Department;
- (b) Carney told Plaintiff that Defendant's First Deputy Managing
 Director instructed her to fill an open position with a Hispanic female candidate;
- (c) Carney also told Plaintiff that he had been pressured to recommend a Hispanic candidate for the open position because there were not enough high-ranking employees of Hispanic origin within the prison system; and,
- (d) During the hiring process for a particular position within the Department, the First Deputy Managing Director stated that, "too many white women are applying for this position."
- 44. Plaintiff's race was a motivating and/or determinative factor in Defendant's discriminatory treatment of Plaintiff, including its failure to promote him into the Commissioner position.
- 45. Plaintiff's sex was a motivating and/or determinative factor in Defendant's discriminatory treatment of Plaintiff, including its failure to promote him into the Commissioner position.
- 46. Plaintiff's complaining of sex discrimination was a motivating and/or determinative factor in Defendants' retaliatory treatment of Plaintiff, including falsely accusing him of engaging in improper conduct and subjecting him to an

investigation regarding the same.

- 47. Defendant failed to prevent or address the discriminatory and retaliatory conduct referred to herein and further failed to take corrective and remedial measures to make the workplace free of discriminatory and retaliatory conduct.
- 48. The retaliatory action taken against Plaintiff after he complained of discriminatory conduct would have discouraged a reasonable employee from complaining of discrimination.
- 49. As a direct and proximate result of the discriminatory and retaliatory conduct of Defendant, Plaintiff has in the past incurred, and may in the future incur, a loss of earnings and/or earning capacity, loss of benefits, pain and suffering, embarrassment, humiliation, loss of self-esteem, mental anguish, and loss of life's pleasures, the full extent of which is not known at this time.
- 50. Defendant acted with malice, reckless indifference, and/or deliberate indifference to Plaintiff's protected rights.

COUNT I - Title VII

- 51. Plaintiff incorporates herein by reference paragraphs 1 through 50 above, as if set forth herein in their entirety.
- 52. By committing the foregoing acts of discrimination and retaliation against Plaintiff, Defendant has violated Title VII.
 - 53. Said violations were done with malice and/or reckless indifference.

- 54. As a direct and proximate result of Defendant's violation of Title VII, Plaintiff has suffered the damages and losses set forth herein and has incurred attorneys' fees and costs.
- 55. Plaintiff is now suffering and will continue to suffer irreparable injury and monetary damages as a result of Defendant's discriminatory and retaliatory acts unless and until this Court grants the relief requested herein.
- 56. No previous application has been made for the relief requested herein.

COUNT II – Section 1981

- 57. Plaintiff incorporates herein by reference paragraphs 1 through 56 above, as if set forth herein in their entirety.
- 58. By committing the foregoing acts of discrimination and retaliation, Defendant has violated Section 1981.
 - 59. Said violations were done with malice and/or reckless indifference.
- 60. As a direct and proximate result of Defendant's violation of Section 1981, Plaintiff has suffered the damages and losses set forth herein and has incurred attorneys' fees and costs.
- 61. Plaintiff is now suffering and will continue to suffer irreparable injury and monetary damages as a result of Defendant's discriminatory and retaliatory acts unless and until this Court grants the relief requested herein.
- 62. No previous application has been made for the relief requested herein.

COUNT III – Section 1983

- 63. Plaintiff incorporates herein by reference paragraphs 1 through 62 above, as if set forth herein in their entirety.
- 64. Defendant's discriminatory and retaliatory conduct, as set forth herein, deprived Plaintiff of equal protection under the law as guaranteed by the Fourteenth Amendment of the United States Constitution.
- 65. Defendant's violation of the constitution included policies, practices, and/or customs to treat white employees less favorably than non-white employees, which was committed, directed, implemented, and/or ratified by officials of Defendant in supervisory capacities with policymaking and decision-making authority.
- 66. As a direct and proximate result of Defendant's acts and conduct which caused and continue to cause Plaintiff to be denied equal protection under the law, Plaintiff has suffered and will suffer those injuries, damages, and losses alleged herein and has incurred and will incurred attorneys' fees.
- 67. The wrongful acts and conduct of Defendant were done with deliberate indifference to the statutory and constitutional rights of Plaintiff.

<u>COUNT IV - PHRA</u>

- 68. Plaintiff incorporates herein by reference paragraphs 1 through 67 above, as if set forth herein in their entirety.
- 69. Defendant, by the above improper and discriminatory and retaliatory acts, has violated the PHRA.
 - 70. Said violations were intentional and willful.

- 71. As a direct and proximate result of Defendant's violation of the PHRA, Plaintiff has sustained the injuries, damages, and losses set forth herein and has incurred attorney's fees and costs.
- 72. Plaintiff is now suffering and will continue to suffer irreparable injuries and monetary damages as a result of Defendant's discriminatory and retaliatory acts unless and until the Court grants the relief requested herein.
- 73. No previous application has been made for the relief requested herein.

COUNT V - PFPO

- 74. Plaintiff incorporates herein by reference paragraphs 1 through 73 above, as if set forth herein in their entirety.
- 75. Defendant, by the above improper and discriminatory and retaliatory acts, has violated the PFPO.
 - 76. Said violations were intentional and willful.
- 77. As a direct and proximate result of Defendant's violation of the PFPO, Plaintiff has sustained the injuries, damages, and losses set forth herein and has incurred attorney's fees and costs.
- 78. Plaintiff is now suffering and will continue to suffer irreparable injuries and monetary damages as a result of Defendant's discriminatory and retaliatory acts unless and until the Court grants the relief requested herein.
- 79. No previous application has been made for the relief requested herein.

RELIEF

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff seeks damages and legal and equitable relief in connection with Defendant's improper conduct, and specifically prays that the Court grant the following relief to the Plaintiff by:

- (a) declaring the acts and practices complained of herein to be in violation of Title VII;
- (b) declaring the acts and practices complained of herein to be in violation of Section 1981;
- (c) declaring the acts and practices complained of herein to be in violation of Section 1983;
- (d) declaring the acts and practices complained of herein to be in violation of the PHRA;
- (e) declaring the acts and practices complained of herein to be in violation of the PFPO;
- (f) enjoining and permanently restraining the violations alleged herein;
- (g) entering judgment against the Defendant and in favor of the Plaintiff in an amount to be determined;
- (h) awarding compensatory damages to make the Plaintiff whole for all lost earnings, earning capacity and benefits, past and future, which Plaintiff has suffered or may suffer as a result of Defendant's improper conduct;
- (i) awarding compensatory damages to Plaintiff for past and future pain and suffering, emotional upset, mental anguish, humiliation, and loss

of life's pleasures, which Plaintiff has suffered or may suffer as a result of Defendant's improper conduct;

- (j) awarding Plaintiff such other damages as are appropriate under Title VII, Section 1981, Section 1983, the PHRA, and the PFPO;
- (k) awarding Plaintiff the costs of suit, expert fees and other disbursements, and reasonable attorney's fees; and,
- (I) granting such other and further relief as this Court may deem just, proper, or equitable including other equitable and injunctive relief providing restitution for past violations and preventing future violations.

CONSOLE MATTIACCI LAW, LLC

Dated: October 19, 2017 BY:

Stephen G. Console (36656)

Caren N. Gurmankin (205900) 1525 Locust St., 9th Floor

Philadelphia, PA 19102

(215) 545-7676

Attorneys for Plaintiff, Robert Tomaszewski

Exhibit 1

The state of the s							
CHARGE OF DISCRIMIN	IATION			ENCY	CHAI	RGE NU	JMBER
This form is affected by the Privacy Act of 197 before consolidating this form,	4; See privacy st	atement	×	FEPA EEOC	<i>5</i> 30 20		32101
STATE OR LOCAL AGENCY: Pennsylvania Commission; Philadelphia Commission on	Human Relation Human Relation	15		***************************************	sunki daka	70	<u>040[</u>
NAME (Indicate Mr., Ms., Mrs.) Robert Tomaszewski			ÉNU	MBER (/	nclude Area C	ode)	······································
STREET ADDRESS CIT	Y, STATE AND	סול					
Ph	iladelphia, PA 1:	9152			DATE OF BI		
NAMED IS THE EMPLOYER, LABOR ORGA STATE OF LOCAL GOVERNMENT WHO DIS	MIZATION Char	11 25528 88	T AGI	ENCY, A	PPRENTICES	SHIP, C	OMMITTEE
City of Philadelphia	NUMBER OF Over 500	EMPLOYE	ES	TELEP	HONE (Includ	e Area (Code)
STREET ADDRESS CIT	Y, STATE AND 2	ZIP			COUNTY	M.,.,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,	······································
1401 John F. Kennedy Boulevard Phi	ladelphia, PA 19	107	Philadelphia				
CAUSE OF DISCRIMINATION (Check appropriate box(es)) XX Race Color XX Sex Religion National Origin Retaliation Age Disability Other (Specify)			DATE DISCRIMINATION TOOK PLACE Earliest Latest				
THE PARTICULARS ARE:			***************************************	······································		April 23	, 2016
In or about 1984, I was hired as Prisons. In 1986, I was promoted to Co 1996, I was promoted to Captain. In 198 promoted to Warden. In 2005, I was prothe position that I currently hold. Throughout my over thirty-two (3: Prisons and my over eleven (11) years a hardworking employee, performed my jo positive performance feedback.	orrectional Sen 39, I was promoted to Depo 2) years of em as Deputy Con b duties in an	geant. In oted to Eury Comr	199 Depunissi t at F er th t ma	3, I was ty Ward loner fo Respon- ere, I hanner, as	promoted fen. In 2003 Administration	to Lieu 3, I was ation, was ation, was ation, was ation, was	tenant, Instruction
X I want this charge filed with both the EEOC and the State or local Agency, if any. I will advise the agencies if I change my address or telephone number and cooperate fully with them in the processing of my charge in accordance with their procedures		Requirements)					
declare under penalty or penury that the foregoing is	Assembly and the second	is true to th	e-bec	t of my kn	ewledge inform	ation ark	-belief,
docume under penanty or penalty that the inlegging is	ude and correct.				c. ***	<u></u>	
, Does longer			ED A	ND-SWO	W TO HEFOR	C EMETH	
Date: 1 4 (6 Charging Party (Signature	ė)	(Day-Month	ı, and	year)			
1 All dates set forth herein are approx	«imate.			*		?	3

EEOC Charge of Discrimination Page 2 of 3 Robert Tomaszewski v. City of Philadelphia

2. Summary of Harm

Respondent discriminated against me based on my race (white) and sex (male) in connection with its failure to hire or promote me into a position for which I applied and was the most qualified candidate. Evidence of Respondent's discrimination includes, but is not limited to, the following:

- a. In late 2015, the Commissioner of Prisons, Louis Giorla, announced that he intended to retire in January 2016.
- In or about December 2015, Respondent had a search panel begin interviewing for candidates to fill the soon-to-be vacant position of Commissioner of Prisons ("Commissioner") position.
- · c. On December 9, 2015, I applied and interviewed for the Commissioner position.
 - d. I was one (1) of six (6) candidates who interviewed for the Commissioner position during December 2015.
 - e. Of the six (6) candidates who interviewed for the Commission position in December 2015, only one (1) candidate was African American and none were female.
 - f. One (1) of the candidates who applied for the Commissioner position in December 2015 was Michael Resnick (white, male). Prior to applying for the Commissioner position, Mr. Resnick was Director of Public Safety at Respondent. In Mr. Resnick's prior role as Director of Public Safety, one (1) of his direct reports was the Commissioner. However, in January 2016, Mr. Resnick's Director of Public Safety position was eliminated.
- g. On January 8, 2016, Respondent announced that Mr. Resnick would temporarily assume the role of Acting Commissioner for a period of up to six (6) months so that the Respondent's search panel could continue searching for a new candidate to fill the Commissioner position on a permanent basis.
- h. From that time, Respondent specifically sought out female, African American candidates for the Commissioner position.
- Between January and March 2016, all of the candidates that Respondent interviewed for the Commissioner position were female and African American.
- j. In early April 2016, Mr. Resnick told Brian Abernathy First Deputy Managing Director of Respondent and one (1) of the members of Respondent's search panel that he was aware that Respondent was searching for a female, African American candidate to fill the Commissioner position and suggested that Respondent consider interviewing one (1) of the deputy commissioners in Respondent's Department of Prisons, Blanche Carney, who was female and African American.
- k. Mr. Abernathy did not deny that Respondent was searching for a female, African American candidate to fill the Commissioner position.
- I. In April 2016, Respondent interviewed Ms. Carney for the Commissioner position.

EEOC Charge of Discrimination Page 3 of 3 Robert Tomaszewski v. City of Philadelphia

- m. On April 23, 2016, Respondent announced that it had selected Ms. Carney for the Commissioner position.
- n. I was the most qualified candidate for the Commissioner position and was considerably more qualified and experienced than Ms. Carney.
- o. By way of example only, and without limitation, Ms. Carney had only had approximately one (1) year of experience as a deputy commissioner, whereas I had over eleven (11) years of experience as a deputy commissioner and over thirty-two (32) years of experience in Respondent's Department of Prisons.
- p. Respondent has a pattern and practice of considering race and sex when making employment decisions, including, but not limited to, decisions relating to hiring and promotions.
- q. By way of example only, and without limitation, in April 2016, Ms. Carney informed me that Mr. Abernathy told her to fill her prior deputy commissioner position with a female, Hispanic candidate.
- r. On May 23, 2016, Ms. Carney assumed the Commissioner position.
- s. At that time, Mr. Resnick was demoted into a deputy commissioner position.

B. Respondent's Stated Reasons

a. Respondent has failed to provide me with any legitimate, non-discriminatory reason for failing to hire me for a position for which I applied and was the most qualified candidate.

C. Statutes and Basis for Allegations

Respondent discriminated against me based on my race (white) and sex (male) in violation of Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, as amended, 42 U.S.C. § 2000e et seq., the Pennsylvania Human Relations Act, 43 Pa.C.S. § 951 et seq., and the Philadelphia Fair Practices Ordinance, Phila. Code § 9-1100 et seq.

D. CLASS CHARGE

I bring this charge of discrimination on behalf of all employees of Respondent who have been subjected to adverse employment actions because of race and sex, including, but not limited to, failures to hire or promote and demotions.

INFORMATION FOR COMPLAINANTS & ELECTION OPTION TO DUAL FILE WITH THE 16 JUL -5 PM 2: 53 PENNSYLVANIA HUMAN RELATIONS COMMISSION Robert Tomaszewski v. City of Philadelphia ### CEIVED RECEIVED **RECEIVED **PHILADELPHIA **PRICE OFFICE**

Robert Tomaszewski v. City of Philadelphia
EEOC No.
You have the right to file this charge of discrimination with the Pennsylvania Human Relations Commission (PHRC) under the Pennsylvania Human Relations Act. Filing your charge with PHRC protects your state rights, especially since there may be circumstances in which state and federal laws and procedures vary in a manner which would affect the outcome of your case.
Complaints filed with the PHRC must be filed within 180 days of the act(s) which you believe unlawful discrimination. If PHRC determines that your PHRC complaint is untimely, it will be dismissed.
If you want your charge filed with the PHRC, including this form as part of your EEOC charge, with your signature under the verification below, will constitute filing with the PHRC. You have chosen EEOC to investigate your complaint, so PHRC will not investigate it and, in most cases, will accept EEOC's finding. If you disagree with PHRC's adoption of EEOC's finding, you will have the chance to file a request for preliminary hearing with PHRC.
Since you have chosen to file your charge first with EEOC, making it the primary investigatory gency, the Respondent will not be required to file an answer with PHRC, and no other action with PHRC is required by either party, unless/until otherwise notified by PHRC.
If your case is still pending with PHRC after one year from filing with PHRC, you have the ight to file—your complaint in state court. PHRC will inform you of these rights and ibligations at that time. [Sign and date appropriate request below]
X I want my charge filed with PHRC. I hereby incorporate this form and the verification selow into the attached EEOC complaint form and file it as my PHRC complaint. I request EEOC to transmit it to PHRC.
X I understand that false statements in this complaint are made subject to the penalties of Pa.C.S. §4904, relating to unsworn falsification to authorities.
X Signature and Date 7/4/16
The state of the s

I do not want my charge dual filed with PHRC

Signature and Date

Exhibit 2

EEOC Form 181-B (11/18)

U.S. EQUAL EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITY COMMISSION

NOTICE OF RIGHT TO SUE (ISSUED ON REQUEST)

	rt Tomaszewski delphia, PA 19152		From:	Philadelphia District Office 801 Market Street Sulte 1300 Philadelphia, PA 19107		
	On behalf of person(s) aggrieved w CONFIDENTIAL (29 CFR §1601.7(
EEOC Charg	e No.	EEOC Representative		Telephone No.		
530-2016-	03481	Legal Unit, Legal Technician		(215) 440-2828		
Namannam	ie Person Aggrieved:		(See also	the additional information enclosed with this form.)		
Act (GINA): been issued of your rece	This is your Notice of Right to Su at your request. Your lawsuit und	e, issued under Title VII, the a der Title VII, the ADA or GINA	ADA or GINA \ must be file	or the Genetic Information Nondiscrimination based on the above-numbered charge. It has ed in a federal or state court <u>WITHIN 90 DAYS</u> he time limit for filing suit based on a claim under		
X	More than 180 days have passe	ed since the filing of this char	ge.			
	Less than 180 days have passe be able to complete its administ	ed since the filing of this charg trative processing within 180	je, but I have days from the	determined that it is unlikely that the EEOC will filing of this charge.		
X	- Market Control of the Control of t					
	The EEOC will continue to process this charge.					
Age Discrin 90 days afte your case:	nination in Employment Act (All r you receive notice that we have	DEA): You may sue under the completed action on the char	ge. In this re	vilme from 60 days after the charge was filed untiligard, the paragraph marked below applies to		
	The EEOC is closing your case 90 DAYS of your receipt of th	. Therefore, your lawsuit und Is Notice. Otherwise, your rig	er the ADEA ght to sue ba	must be filed in federal or state court <u>WITHIN</u> sed on the above-numbered charge will be lost.		
	The EEOC is continuing its han you may file suit in federal or st	dling of your ADEA case. Ho ato court undor tho ADEA at t	wever, if 60 c	lays have passed since the filing of the charge,		
in federal or	oct (EPA): You already have the ristate court within 2 years (3 years ins that occurred more than 2 years)	for willful violations) of the alle	ged EPA und	harge is not required.) EPA suits must be brought erpayment. This means that backpay due for ot be collectible.		
If you file sui	t, based on this charge, please ser	nd a copy of your court compla	int to this offic	ce.		
		On beha	of the Com	07/25/2017		
Enclosures	(a)	Spencer H. District I		(Date Malled)		
cc:						
	Linda Busilio. Sr. Legal Asst. St CITY OF PHILADELPHIA	upervisor		s Romeu, Esq. E LAW OFFICES		

Linda Busilio. Sr. Legal Asst. Supervisor CITY OF PHILADELPHIA Philadelphia Law Department, Labor & Employment Unit 1515 Arch Street 16th Floor Philadelphia, PA 19102

Nicholas Romeu, Esq. CONSOLE LAW OFFICES 1525 Locust Street 9th Floor Philadelphia, PA 19102