

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF OHIO
EASTERN DIVISION

DAVID NUNLEY,

Plaintiff,

v.

ARGOS HEALTH, INC., ET AL.,

Defendants.

)
) **CASE NO. 5:21-CV-01134**
)
)

) **NOTICE OF REMOVAL**
)
)
)

Pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §§ 1332, 1441, and 1446, Defendants Argos Health, Inc. (“Argos” or the “Company”) and David Rothgerber (“Mr. Rothgerber”) (Argos and Mr. Rothgerber are collectively referred to as “Defendants”) hereby file their Notice of Removal to this Court of an action pending against them in the Summit County Court of Common Pleas. Removal is based on the following grounds:

1. On or around April 29, 2021, Plaintiff David Nunley (“Plaintiff”) filed a lawsuit against Defendants in the Summit County Court of Common Pleas entitled *David Nunley v. Argos Health, Inc., et al.*, Case No. CV 2021-04-1377 (the “State Court Action”). Plaintiff’s Complaint asserts claims of race and sex discrimination, retaliation, aiding and abetting, and negligent training, retention, and supervision. Copies of the Complaint and Summons are attached as Exhibit A.

2. On or after May 5, 2021, Defendant Argos was served with a copy of the Complaint and Summons. *See* Exhibit A.

3. On or after May 5, 2021, Mr. Rothgerber was served with a copy of the Complaint and Summons. *See* Exhibit A.

4. Removal of this action is timely as Defendants filed this Notice of Removal within thirty (30) days of their receipt of the Summons and notice of the State Court Action. *See* 28 U.S.C. § 1446.

I. Basis for Removal: Diversity Jurisdiction

5. A case may be removed from state to federal court if the case could have originally been brought in the federal forum. *See* 28 U.S.C. § 1441(a)(5). This is a civil action over which this Court has original jurisdiction under 28 U.S.C. § 1332, diversity of citizenship, and, therefore, may be removed to this Court under 28 U.S.C. § 1441(a)-(b).

6. This Court has diversity jurisdiction over this case under 28 U.S.C. § 1332, which requires that: (1) the parties on each side of the case are citizens of different states; and (2) the amount in controversy exceeds \$75,000, exclusive of interest and costs. *See* 28 U.S.C. § 1332(a)(1).

II. The Citizenship of the Parties is Diverse

7. Upon information and belief, and according to Argos's business records and documents submitted by Plaintiff to Argos in connection with Plaintiff's employment, Plaintiff is a citizen of the State of Ohio.

8. For purposes of diversity jurisdiction, a corporation is a citizen of its state of incorporation and the state of its principal place of business. 28 U.S.C. § 1332(c)(1).

9. Defendant Argos is a corporation organized under the laws of the State of Delaware, and its principal place of business is located in Dallas, Texas.

10. With the exception of the additional named Defendant, David Rothgerber, there is complete diversity among the parties.

11. The citizenship of Mr. Rothgerber should be disregarded for purposes of determining jurisdiction under 28 U.S.C. § 1441 because the Complaint presents no colorable claim against Mr. Rothgerber, and Plaintiff fraudulently joined Mr. Rothgerber as a Defendant in an apparent effort to defeat the jurisdiction of this Court. The Supreme Court has held that a plaintiff cannot defeat a defendant's right of removal on the basis of diversity of citizenship by the fraudulent joinder of a non-diverse defendant against whom the plaintiff has no reasonable cause of action. *Wilson v. Republic Iron & Steel Co.*, 257 U.S. 92, 97 (1921) (citation omitted); *see also Alexander v. Electronic Data Sys. Corp.*, 13 F.3d 940, 949 (6th Cir. 1994).

12. In order to determine whether a non-diverse defendant was fraudulently joined, the Sixth Circuit considers whether the plaintiff has a colorable basis for her/his claim against that defendant. *Alexander*, 13 F. 3d at 949. A review of the Complaint reveals that Plaintiff has no colorable basis for his Ohio Revised Code chapter 4112 claims for race and sex discrimination, retaliation, and aiding and abetting against Mr. Rothgerber.¹

13. As an initial matter, Plaintiff filed his Complaint on April 29, 2021. Effective April 15, 2021, Ohio House Bill 352 revised Ohio Revised Code chapter 4112 to eliminate individual liability for supervisors and managers relating to employment discrimination claims under state law. *See* R.C. §§ 4112.01(A)(2), 4112.02(A), and 4112.08(A) (“no person has a cause of action or claim based on an unlawful discriminatory practice relating to employment described in division (A)(24)(a) of section 4112.01 of the Revised Code against a supervisor, manager, or other employee of an employer unless that supervisor, manager, or other employee is the employer”). It is undisputed that Mr. Rothgerber did not personally employ Plaintiff –

¹ Upon Removal of the State Court Action, Defendants plan to file a Motion to Dismiss Mr. Rothgerber as a party to this action.

rather, Argos employed Plaintiff. Accordingly, there is no colorable basis for his race and sex discrimination claims against Mr. Rothgerber. *See id.*

14. Nowhere in the Complaint does Plaintiff assert he complained to Mr. Rothgerber of alleged discrimination or that Mr. Rothgerber was otherwise made aware of any alleged protected activity. Accordingly, there is no colorable basis for his retaliation claim against Mr. Rothgerber.

15. Lastly, Plaintiff asserts Mr. Rothgerber aided and abetted in discriminating against him. (Compl., ¶¶ 56-57.) “Ohio’s courts generally construe aiding and abetting as an intentional act: ‘[O]ne is not an aider and abetter unless he knowingly does something which he ought not to do . . . which assists or tends in some way to affect the doing of the thing which the law forbids.’” *Luke v. City of Cleveland*, N.D. Ohio No. 1:02CV1225, 2005 WL 2245187, *8 (Aug. 22, 2005) (citations omitted). Although there are vague and conclusory allegations directed at Mr. Rothgerber (*e.g.* “David Rothgerber... continued to target Plaintiff because of his race,” Compl., ¶ 15), and allegations concerning a couple of Mr. Rothgerber’s workplace interactions with Plaintiff, the allegations contained in the Complaint do not state a colorable basis for Plaintiff’s aiding and abetting claim. *See, e.g., Caiazza v. Mercy Med. Ctr.*, 5 Dist. No. 2013CA00181, 2014-Ohio-2290, ¶ 28 (complaint failed to state an aiding and abetting claim against individual defendants who were involved in discussions regarding complained of termination decision, agreed with the termination decision, but did not make the termination decision). Plaintiff does not allege that Mr. Rothgerber made discriminatory remarks or demonstrated discriminatory animus, or otherwise knowingly did something he should not have done to aid or assist in discrimination against Plaintiff.

16. Because there are no colorable claims against Mr. Rothgerber, his citizenship should be disregarded for purposes of determining jurisdiction under 28 U.S.C. § 1441 and his presence in this lawsuit cannot prevent removal.

17. Because Plaintiff is a citizen of the State of Ohio and Argos is a citizen of the States of Delaware and Texas, complete diversity exists between the relevant parties.

18. Defendants are represented by the undersigned counsel in this matter and each Defendant joins in and consents to removal of this action.

III. The Amount In Controversy Exceeds \$75,000

19. The standard for determining whether a plaintiff's claim meets the amount in controversy is whether the district court finds, by a preponderance of the evidence, that the amount in controversy is greater than \$75,000. 28 U.S.C. § 1446(c)(2)(B). A defendant seeking removal need only show that, assuming the plaintiff proves his or her claims, the amount in controversy "more likely than not" exceeds \$75,000. *See, e.g., Everett v. Verizon Wireless*, 460 F.3d 818, 822 (6th Cir. 2006) (internal quotation omitted).

12. Courts may consider actual/compensatory damages, punitive damages, and, in some cases, attorney's fees to determine whether the amount in controversy exceeds \$75,000. *See, e.g., Klepper v. First Am. Bank*, 916 F.2d 337, 340-41 (6th Cir. 1990).

13. Although Plaintiff's Complaint does not specifically allege the total damages sought, Plaintiff's Complaint prays for monetary damages including his lost wages, reinstatement or front pay, lost fringe benefits, statutory damages, emotional distress, and any other compensatory damages, punitive damages, prejudgment interest at the statutory rate, post-judgment interest, interest on unpaid wages pursuant to Ohio Revised Code § 4113.15, attorney's

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.