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

TR	Δ	CV	WII	T	TΔ	. 1	/IS
1 1/	ᄼ		***	4	/ 1	N I V	

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

Pennsylvania Human Relations Act ("PHRA"). 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 dual-filing 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

2

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.

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 http://www.harvesthoc.com 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.

- 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.

4

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. Physician Servs.</u>, 360 F.3d 173, 178 (3d Cir. 2004) (<u>emphasis added</u>)

- 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.

- 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:
 - a. 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.

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

Violations of the Americans with Disabilities Act "ADA" [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.

- 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 Violations of 42 U.S.C. § 1981

([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 Violations of Title VII of the Civil Rights Act

- ([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.

- 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.

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

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

CASE MANAGEMENT TRACK DESIGNATION FORM

Tracy Willia	me	CIVIL ACTION	•
V.	ills ·		
	:	NO	
Fanklin Labs, LLC	C, et al.	NO.	
plaintiff shall complete a Ca filing the complaint and serv side of this form.) In the designation, that defendant	se Management Track D e a copy on all defendants event that a defendant do shall, with its first appear rties, a Case Managemen	elay Reduction Plan of this court, counsesignation Form in all civil cases at the teasing the second of the plan set forth on the research of the second agree with the plaintiff regardinance, submit to the clerk of court and second track Designation Form specifying the ssigned.	ime of everse g said rve on
SELECT ONE OF THE F	OLLOWING CASE MA	NAGEMENT TRACKS:	
(a) Habeas Corpus - Cases	brought under 28 U.S.C.	§ 2241 through § 2255.	()
(b) Social Security - Cases and Human Services de	requesting review of a denying plaintiff Social Sec	cision of the Secretary of Health urity Benefits.	()
(c) Arbitration - Cases requ	ired to be designated for	arbitration under Local Civil Rule 53.2.	()
(d) Asbestos – Cases involvexposure to asbestos.	ring claims for personal in	njury or property damage from	()
commonly referred to as	complex and that need s	tracks (a) through (d) that are pecial or intense management by ailed explanation of special	()
	Constitution to make full ins	to any and of the other treels	
(i) Standard Management –	· Cases that do not lan in	to any one of the other tracks.	(X)
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 Process distriled College/21 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: 860 N. Franklin Street, 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						
Is this case related to property included in an earlier numbered suit pending or within one year 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 pending or within one year previously terminated action in this court?						
3. Does this case involve the validity or infringement of a patent already in suit or any earlier numbered case pending or within one year previously terminated action of this court?						
4. Is this case a second or successive habeas corpus, social security appeal, or pro se civil rights case filed by the same individual?						
I certify that, to my knowledge, the within case this court except as noted above. DATE: 2/25/2021 ARK2484 / 91538 Attorney-at-Law / Pro Se Plaintiff Attorney I.D. # (if applicable)						
CIVIL: (Place a √ in one category only)						
CIVIL: (Place a $$ in one category only) A. Federal Question Cases:	B. Diversity Jurisdiction Cases:					
	B. Diversity Jurisdiction Cases: 1. Insurance Contract and Other Contracts 2. Airplane Personal Injury 3. Assault, Defamation 4. Marine Personal Injury 5. Motor Vehicle Personal Injury 6. Other Personal Injury (Please specify): 7. Products Liability 8. Products Liability – Asbestos 9. All other Diversity Cases (Please specify):					
A. Federal Question Cases: 1. Indemnity Contract, Marine Contract, and All Other Contracts 2. FELA 3. Jones Act-Personal Injury 4. Antitrust 5. Patent 6. Labor-Management Relations 7. Civil Rights 8. Habeas Corpus 9. Securities Act(s) Cases 10. Social Security Review Cases 11. All other Federal Question Cases (Please specify): ARBITRAT	1. Insurance Contract and Other Contracts 2. Airplane Personal Injury 3. Assault, Defamation 4. Marine Personal Injury 5. Motor Vehicle Personal Injury 6. Other Personal Injury (Please specify): 7. Products Liability 8. Products Liability – Asbestos 9. All other Diversity Cases (Please specify): ON CERTIFICATION					
A. Federal Question Cases: 1. Indemnity Contract, Marine Contract, and All Other Contracts 2. FELA 3. Jones Act-Personal Injury 4. Antitrust 5. Patent 6. Labor-Management Relations 7. Civil Rights 8. Habeas Corpus 9. Securities Act(s) Cases 10. Social Security Review Cases 11. All other Federal Question Cases (Please specify): ARBITRAT (The effect of this certification is to a security of the contract of the	1. Insurance Contract and Other Contracts 2. Airplane Personal Injury 3. Assault, Defamation 4. Marine Personal Injury 5. Motor Vehicle Personal Injury 6. Other Personal Injury (Please specify): 7. Products Liability 8. Products Liability – Asbestos 9. All other Diversity Cases (Please specify): CON CERTIFICATION Remove the case from eligibility for arbitration.)					
A. Federal Question Cases: 1. Indemnity Contract, Marine Contract, and All Other Contracts 2. FELA 3. Jones Act-Personal Injury 4. Antitrust 5. Patent 6. Labor-Management Relations 7. Civil Rights 8. Habeas Corpus 9. Securities Act(s) Cases 10. Social Security Review Cases 11. All other Federal Question Cases (Please specify): ARBITRAT (The effect of this certification is to secure of the corp.) X. Pursuant to Local Civil Rule 53.2, § 3(c) (2), that to the best of my exceed the sum of \$150,000.00 exclusive of interest and costs: Relief other than monetary damages is sought.	1. Insurance Contract and Other Contracts 2. Airplane Personal Injury 3. Assault, Defamation 4. Marine Personal Injury 5. Motor Vehicle Personal Injury 6. Other Personal Injury (Please specify): 7. Products Liability 8. Products Liability – Asbestos 9. All other Diversity Cases (Please specify): CON CERTIFICATION The move the case from eligibility for arbitration.)					

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

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 purpose of initiating the civil do	This form, approved by the ocket sheet. (SEE INSTRUCT	e Judicial Conference of TIONS ON NEXT PAGE OF	the United States in September 19 <i>FTHIS FORM.</i>)	74, is required for the use of the	ne Clerk of Court for the	
I. (a) PLAINTIFFS			DEFENDANTS			
WILLIAMS, TRACY			FRANKLIN LABS, LLC, ET AL.			
(b) County of Residence of First Listed Plaintiff Montgomery			County of Residence of First Listed Defendant Berks			
(Ez	XCEPT IN U.S. PLAINTIFF CA	SES)		(IN U.S. PLAINTIFF CASES ON ONDEMNATION CASES, USE TO OF LAND INVOLVED.		
(c) Attorneys (Firm Name, A	Address, and Telephone Number)	Attorneys (If Known)			
Karpf, Karpf & Cerutti, I Suite 128, Bensalem, PA						
II. BASIS OF JURISDI	CTION (Place an "X" in Or	ne Box Only)	III. CITIZENSHIP OF P	RINCIPAL PARTIES		
1 U.S. Government X 3 Federal Question Plaintiff (U.S. Government Not a Party)			(For Diversity Cases Only) and One Box for Defendant) PTF DEF Citizen of This State 1 Incorporated or Principal Place 4 4 of Business In This State			
2 U.S. Government 4 Diversity Defendant (Indicate Citizenship of Parties in Item III)			Citizen of Another State 2 2 Incorporated and Principal Place of Business In Another State 5 5			
			Citizen or Subject of a Foreign Country	3 Foreign Nation	6 6	
IV. NATURE OF SUIT		ly) PRTS	FORFEITURE/PENALTY	Click here for: Nature BANKRUPTCY	of Suit Code Descriptions. OTHER STATUTES	
☐ 110 Insurance ☐ 120 Marine ☐ 130 Miller Act ☐ 140 Negotiable Instrument ☐ 150 Recovery of Overpayment	PERSONAL INJURY 310 Airplane 315 Airplane Product Liability 320 Assault, Libel & Slander 330 Federal Employers' Liability 340 Marine 345 Marine Product Liability 350 Motor Vehicle 7355 Motor Vehicle Product Liability 360 Other Personal Injury 362 Personal Injury Medical Malpractice CIVIL RIGHTS 440 Other Civil Rights 441 Voting 442 Employment 443 Housing/ Accommodations 445 Amer. w/Disabilities Employment 446 Amer. w/Disabilities Other 448 Education	PERSONAL INJURY 365 Personal Injury - Product Liability 367 Health Care/ Pharmaceutical Personal Injury Product Liability 368 Asbestos Personal Injury Product Liability PERSONAL PROPER 370 Other Fraud 371 Truth in Lending 380 Other Personal Property Damage Product Liability PRISONER PETITION Habeas Corpus: 463 Alien Detainee 510 Motions to Vacate Sentence 530 General 535 Death Penalty Other: 540 Mandamus & Othe 550 Civil Rights 555 Prison Conditions of Confinement	of Property 21 USC 881 George Cher TY LABOR 710 Fair Labor Standards Act 720 Labor/Management Relations At Act 751 Family and Medical Leave Act 751 Family and Medical Leave Act 1790 Other Labor Litigation 1791 Employee Retirement Income Security Act IMMIGRATION 462 Naturalization Application	' 422 Appeal 28 USC 158 ' 423 Withdrawal	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	
	moved from 3 3 atte Court	Appellate Court	Reopened Anothe (specify		n - Litigation -	
VI. CAUSE OF ACTIO	ADEA (29USC6 Brief description of ca	21); ADA (42USC) use:	e filing (<i>Do not cite jurisdictional statu</i> 12101); Title VII (42USC20	utes unless diversity):		
VII. REQUESTED IN	Violations of the	ADEA, ADA, Title	e VII and the PHRA. DEMAND \$	CHECK And	if demanded in complaint:	
COMPLAINT:	UNDER RULE 2	IS A CLASS ACTION 3, F.R.Cv.P.	DEMAIND \$	JURY DEMAND		
VIII. RELATED CASI IF ANY	(See instructions):	JUDGE	_	DOCKET NUMBER		
DATE 2/25/2021		SIGNATURE OF AT	ORNEY OF RECORD			
FOR OFFICE USE ONLY	er e					

Print

AMOUNT

RECEIPT#

Save As...

APPLYING IFP

JUDGE

Reset

MAG. JUDGE