

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
EASTERN DISTRICT OF MICHIGAN  
SOUTHERN DIVISION

---

MATTHEW LAMBERT,

Plaintiff,

Case No.  
Hon.

vs.

CVS PHARMACY, INC., a Rhode Island  
profit corporation, and OMNICARE, INC., a  
Delaware profit corporation, both also known  
as OMNICARE a CVSHealth Company,  
jointly and severally,

Defendants.

---

Raymond J. Sterling (P34456)  
James C. Baker (P62668)  
Attorneys for Plaintiff  
STERLING ATTORNEYS AT LAW, P.C.  
33 Bloomfield Hills Pkwy., Ste. 250  
Bloomfield Hills, MI 48304  
(248) 644-1500  
rsterling@sterlingattorneys.com  
jbaker@sterlingattorneys.com

---

**COMPLAINT AND JURY DEMAND**

Plaintiff, Matthew Lambert, by his attorneys Sterling Attorneys at Law,  
P.C., for his Complaint against Defendants, submits the following:

## JURISDICTION AND PARTIES

1. This is an action for sex discrimination and retaliation in violation of Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, 42 USC 2000e *et seq.*, and Michigan's Elliott-Larsen Civil Rights Act, MCL 37.2101 *et seq.*, arising out of Plaintiff's employment relationship with Defendants.

2. Plaintiff Matthew Lambert is a resident of Spring, Texas, but at all times relevant to the claims in this pending case, he was a resident of Farmington Hills, Michigan, within the Eastern District of Michigan.

3. Defendant CVS PHARMACY, INC. ("CVS") is a profit corporation incorporated under the laws of the State of Rhode Island, authorized to transact business in Michigan, that relative to this pending case maintains its place of business in Livonia, Michigan, within the Eastern District of Michigan.

4. Defendant OMNICARE, INC. ("Omnicare") is a profit corporation incorporated under the laws of the State of Rhode Island, authorized to transact business in Michigan, that relative to this pending case maintains its place of business in Livonia, Michigan, within the Eastern District of Michigan.

5. For the purposes of this litigation, both CVS and Omnicare are also known as "Omnicare, a CVSHealth Company."

6. Defendants were Plaintiff's joint employers.

7. The events giving rise to this cause of action occurred within the Eastern District of Michigan.

8. This Court has federal question jurisdiction under 28 USC 1331 because this action arises under the laws of the United States.

9. This Court has supplemental jurisdiction over plaintiff's state law claims under 28 USC 1367(a).

10. Plaintiff timely files this complaint within 90 days of receiving his EEOC right to sue notices, which were emailed to him on or about July 15, 2021.

### **BACKGROUND FACTS**

11. Plaintiff, a male, became employed with CVS on June 1, 2005, and thereafter with Omnicare on or about December 1, 2018.

12. At all times relevant to this litigation, Plaintiff was employed as a "Pharmacy Operations Manager."

13. Plaintiff was qualified to perform his duties as Pharmacy Operations Manager.

14. Throughout his employment, Plaintiff performed his job duties in a manner that was satisfactory or better.

15. Defendants' performance reviews revealed Plaintiff's positive performance and confirmed the positive quality of his work.

16. In or around December 2019, Plaintiff's previous supervisor retired, and Plaintiff was assigned new management.

17. On January 8, 2020, without warning, Plaintiff was subjected to and issued a Level Two corrective action.

18. Plaintiff has evidence showing that female employees who were similarly situated to him were not subjected to disciplinary action for the same or similar reasons that Plaintiff was disciplined.

19. On or about January 21, 2020, Plaintiff formally complained to Defendants that he believed he was being discriminated against because of his sex.

20. Defendants took no action to address or remedy Plaintiff's complaint.

21. Rather, after he complained about disparate treatment and discrimination based on his sex, Plaintiff was forced to perform all overnight shifts whereas his similarly-situated female counterparts were not so required.

22. In March 2020, despite being eligible for a performance bonus, Defendants denied Plaintiff his bonus

23. Plaintiff was the only manager in the district who was bonus eligible who did not receive a bonus.

24. Female managers in the district that were bonus eligible received a bonus.

25. On July 20 and August 20, 2020, Plaintiff was again issued discipline for routine matters that similarly-situated female co-workers who engaged in the same routine behaviors were not.

26. On or about September 16, 2020, Plaintiff filed a formal charge of discrimination with the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission.

27. Defendants were aware of Plaintiff's EEOC charge.

28. Between September 16, 2020 and October 23, 2020, Defendants' agents and employees, including Plaintiff's supervisory and management staff, intensified discriminatory and retaliatory treatment toward Plaintiff.

29. On October 23, 2020 Plaintiff was terminated without justification.

30. Plaintiff's engaging in protected activity was a reason for his termination.

**COUNT I**  
***Discrimination in violation of Title VII***

31. Plaintiff incorporates by reference his prior claims, and the previous paragraphs above as though set forth in full again here.

32. At all material times, Plaintiff was an employee and Defendants were his employers covered by and within the meaning of Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, 42 USC 2000-e *et seq.*

33. Defendants, by agents and employees, treated Plaintiff differently, harassed him, subjected him to disparate treatment, denied him earned benefits

# Explore Litigation Insights

Docket Alarm provides insights to develop a more informed litigation strategy and the peace of mind of knowing you're on top of things.

## Real-Time Litigation Alerts



Keep your litigation team up-to-date with **real-time alerts** and advanced team management tools built for the enterprise, all while greatly reducing PACER spend.

Our comprehensive service means we can handle Federal, State, and Administrative courts across the country.

## Advanced Docket Research



With over 230 million records, Docket Alarm's cloud-native docket research platform finds what other services can't. Coverage includes Federal, State, plus PTAB, TTAB, ITC and NLRB decisions, all in one place.

Identify arguments that have been successful in the past with full text, pinpoint searching. Link to case law cited within any court document via Fastcase.

## Analytics At Your Fingertips



Learn what happened the last time a particular judge, opposing counsel or company faced cases similar to yours.

Advanced out-of-the-box PTAB and TTAB analytics are always at your fingertips.

## API

Docket Alarm offers a powerful API (application programming interface) to developers that want to integrate case filings into their apps.

## LAW FIRMS

Build custom dashboards for your attorneys and clients with live data direct from the court.

Automate many repetitive legal tasks like conflict checks, document management, and marketing.

## FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS

Litigation and bankruptcy checks for companies and debtors.

## E-DISCOVERY AND LEGAL VENDORS

Sync your system to PACER to automate legal marketing.