

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF NEW JERSEY**

EDWARD FEENEY	:	
1708 Covington Rd.	:	CIVIL ACTION
Yardley, PA 19067	:	
	:	No.
Plaintiff,	:	
v.	:	
	:	
PERSANTE HEALTH CARE, INC.	:	JURY TRIAL DEMANDED
d/b/a PERSANTE	:	
200 East Park Dr., Suite 600	:	
Mount Laurel, NJ 08054	:	
	:	
Defendant.	:	
	:	

CIVIL ACTION COMPLAINT

Edward Feeney, (*hereinafter* referred to as “Plaintiff,” unless indicated otherwise), by and through his undersigned counsel, hereby avers as follows:

INTRODUCTION

1. This action has been initiated by Plaintiff against Defendant for violations of the Americans with Disabilities Act, as amended (“ADA” - 42 USC §§ 12101, *et. seq.*), the Age Discrimination in Employment Act (“ADEA” - 29 U.S.C. §§ 621 *et. seq.*), and the New Jersey Law Against Discrimination (“NJ LAD” - N.J.S.A. 10:5-1, *et. seq.*). Plaintiff asserts, *inter alia*, that he was unlawfully discriminated against and terminated from his employment in violation of state and federal law. As a direct consequence of Defendant’s unlawful actions, Plaintiff seeks damages as set forth herein.

JURISDICTION AND VENUE

2. This Court has original subject matter jurisdiction over the instant action pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §§ 1331 and 1343(a)(4) because it arises under the laws of the United States and seeks redress of such federal statutes.

3. This Court may properly maintain personal jurisdiction over Defendant because its contacts with this State and this judicial district are sufficient for the exercise of jurisdiction in order to comply with traditional notions of fair play and substantial justice, satisfying the standard set forth by the United States Supreme Court 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 a substantial part of the events or omissions giving rise to the claims set forth herein occurred in this judicial district, in addition, venue is properly laid in this district because Defendant is deemed to reside where it is subject to personal jurisdiction, rendering Defendant a resident of the District of New Jersey for this action.

PARTIES

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

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

7. Defendant is a company located at the above-captioned address that provides cleaning services.

8. At all times relevant herein, 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 Defendant.

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

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

10. Plaintiff is a 67-year-old male.

11. Plaintiff has and continues to suffer from Polycystic Kidney Disease (“PKD”) which at times, can cause high blood pressure, headaches, blood in urine, kidney stones, and urinary tract infections and can be very dangerous and life threatening.

12. Plaintiff was hired by Defendant in or about 2005.

13. During the majority of Plaintiff’s employment with Defendant, he worked as a sleep technologist – where he would go to various hospitals and labs to conduct sleep studies.

14. In or about March of 2019, Plaintiff was approached by one of his managers and asked to start working within Defendant’s Home Sleep Test (“HST”) division.

15. In this division, Defendant would send out sleep study kits to patients so they could do sleep studies at their home.

16. From in or about March of 2019 through in or about March of 2020, Plaintiff was the only employee performing any work in the HST division.

17. Plaintiff’s work while employed within the HST division of Defendant consisted of scheduling patients for home sleep studies, sending sleep equipment out to patients’ homes, teaching them how to use the kit, and answering any questions they had (among other duties).

18. Plaintiff’s title during the period he was employed with Defendant’s HST division was Clinical HST Manager/Sleep Technologist.

19. In or about March of 2020, Plaintiff requested to work from home because the COVID-19 pandemic was beginning to surface and it appeared that COVID-19 was causing extremely severe complications for those who were advanced in age – like Plaintiff.

20. Plaintiff’s request to work from home starting in March of 2020 was granted and shortly thereafter many other employees of Defendant began to work remotely (also because of the COVID-19 pandemic).

21. When COVID-19 became more prominent, the HST division within Defendant grew substantially because patients could not schedule in-person studies at hospitals or labs.

22. As a result of the increasing demand for home sleep studies, Defendant assigned two people, Rick Kieluhn (“Rick”) and Brendan Feeney (“Brendan”) to help Plaintiff in the HST division.

23. Rick and Brendan were previously performing work in the office pertaining to in-lab studies, but since they had virtually no patients after COVID-19 surfaced, Defendant assigned them to help Plaintiff.

24. In or about April of 2020, Plaintiff was informed by Defendant that he was being furloughed.

25. The decision to furlough Plaintiff seemed odd because Defendant’s HST division was busier than it had ever been before. Furthermore, rather than furlough the two (younger) individuals who were sent to assist Plaintiff in the HST division, Defendant chose to furlough Plaintiff.

26. In or about June of 2020, Plaintiff was re-called from furlough and continued to work remotely upon his return.

27. Because Rick and Brendan had resumed their pre-COVID jobs, Defendant hired 3 more individuals to assist Plaintiff within the HST division.

28. Plaintiff learned that Defendant hired and began training the aforesaid individuals (discussed in Paragraph 27 of the instant Civil Action Complaint) shortly before he was recalled from furlough.

29. All three (3) individuals hired to assist Plaintiff in the HST division (discussed *supra*) had been sleep technologists with Defendant working in labs or hospitals prior to COVID

and are substantially younger than Plaintiff.

30. In or about the end of June of 2020, Plaintiff was asked to physically return to the office. In response to this request, Plaintiff advised Defendant's management, including but not limited to Sean Higgins (hereinafter "Higgins") in Defendant's Human Resources ("HR") office that he suffered from a medical condition and due to his medical condition, he was high-risk for developing severe and life-threatening complications if he were to contract COVID-19.

31. Based on the foregoing, Plaintiff requested to continue working remotely and informed Higgins that he could provide a doctor's note regarding his need for a reasonable medical accommodation.

32. Following his aforesaid conversation with Higgins, Plaintiff provided a doctor's note to Higgins requesting to work remotely as a result of his condition.

33. Plaintiff's request for a reasonable accommodation to continue working remotely (discussed *supra*) was granted and Plaintiff continued to work from home performing his job without issue until in or about January of 2021.

34. Plaintiff was not the only individual in the HST division who continued to work remotely beyond June of 2021. Upon information and belief, all three individuals who were hired to assist Plaintiff in the HST division also worked from home (after going through some initial training in the office).

35. In or about mid-January of 2021, Plaintiff was contacted by his manager, Ashley Shepherd ("Shepherd" – Senior Director of Customer Service), and informed that Defendant was restructuring and moving some employees' jobs around.

36. In response to this news, Plaintiff informed Shepherd that he had a disability and that he needed to continue to work from home because of his aforesaid disability. Shepherd

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.