

KOLLER LAW LLC
David M. Koller, Esq. (90119)
2043 Locust Street, Suite 1B
Philadelphia, PA 19103
T: (215) 545-8917
F: (215) 575-0826
davidk@kollerlawfirm.com

Counsel for Plaintiff

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

KYLE CARTER,
5450 Wissahickon Avenue
Apartment A623
Philadelphia, PA 19144
Plaintiff,

v.

THE DEVEREUX FOUNDATION d/b/a
DEVEREUX ADVANCED
BEHAVIORAL HEALTH – PA CIDDS,
390 Boot Road
West Chester, PA 19380

444 Devereux Drive
Villanova, PA 19085
Defendant.

Civil Action No.

Complaint and Jury Demand

CIVIL ACTION

Plaintiff, Kyle Carter (hereinafter “Plaintiff”), by and through his attorney, Koller Law, LLC, bring this civil matter against The Devereux Foundation d/b/a Devereux Foundation d/b/a Devereux Advanced Behavioral Health – PA CIDDS (hereinafter “Defendant”), for violations of Title VII of the Civil Rights Act and the Pennsylvania Human Relations Act (“PHRA”). In support thereof, Plaintiff avers as follows:

THE PARTIES

1. Plaintiff incorporates the preceding paragraphs as if set forth more fully at length herein.

2. Plaintiff is an adult individual residing at the above captioned address.
3. Upon information and belief, The Devereux Foundation d/b/a Devereux Advanced Behavioral Health – PA CIDDS provides treatment services for children, adolescents and young adults with disabilities with a location at 390 Boot Road, West Chester, PA 19380 and with a corporate headquarters located at 444 Devereux Drive, Villanova, PA 19085.
4. At all times relevant hereto, Defendant employed managers, supervisors, agents, and employees who Plaintiff alleges had the authority to make decisions concerning Plaintiff's employment. In making said decisions, these individuals engaged in the pattern and practice of discriminatory treatment, which forms the basis of Plaintiff's allegations in the instant Complaint.
5. At all times relevant hereto, Defendant employed managers, supervisors, agents, and employees who acted directly or indirectly in the interest of the employer. In so acting, these individuals engaged in the pattern and practice of discriminatory treatment, which forms the basis of Plaintiff's allegations in the instant Complaint.

JURISDICTION AND VENUE

6. Plaintiff incorporates the preceding paragraphs as if set forth more fully at length herein.
7. The Court may properly maintain personal jurisdiction over Defendant because the Defendant's contacts with this state and this judicial district are sufficient for the exercise of jurisdiction and comply with traditional notions of fair play and substantial justice, thus 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.
8. The Court may exercise 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 for violations of federal law.

9. The Court may also maintain supplemental jurisdiction over state law claims set forth herein pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1367(a) and Rule 18(a) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure because they are sufficiently related to one or more claims within the Court's original jurisdiction that they form part of the same case or controversy.
10. Venue is properly laid in the Eastern District of Pennsylvania pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §§ 1391(b)(1) and 1391(b)(2) because some of the Plaintiff is domiciled in this judicial district, the Defendants is located in this judicial district and because all of the acts and/or omissions giving rise to the claims set forth herein occurred in this judicial district.

EXHAUSTION OF ADMINISTRATIVE REMEDIES

11. Plaintiff incorporates the preceding paragraphs as if set forth more fully at length herein.
12. Plaintiff exhausted his administrative remedies under Title VII and PHRA.
13. Plaintiff timely filed a Charge of Discrimination ("Charge") with the U.S. Equal Employment Opportunity Commission ("EEOC") alleging race discrimination and retaliation against Defendant.
14. The Charge was assigned a Charge Number 530-2020-05083 and was dual filed with the Pennsylvania Human Relations Commission.
15. The EEOC issued Plaintiff a Dismissal and Notice of Rights ("Right to Sue") relative to the Charge and that Right to Sue is dated July 27, 2021. Plaintiff received the Right to Sue by electronic mail.
16. Prior to the filing of this action, Plaintiff notified the EEOC of his intent to proceed with a lawsuit in federal court.

17. Plaintiff files the instant Complaint within ninety (90) days of his receipt of his Right to Sue in this matter.
18. Plaintiff has exhausted his administrative remedies as to the allegations of this Complaint.

MATERIAL FACTS

19. Plaintiff incorporates the preceding paragraphs as if set forth more fully at length herein.
20. On or about April 4, 2019, Defendant hired Plaintiff in the position of Program Director Intellectual Disabilities and Mental health (“IDMH”).
21. Plaintiff was well-qualified for his position and performed well.
22. By way of background, Plaintiff is an African-American male.
23. Shortly after the start of Plaintiff’s employment, he learned that the IDMH department was mainly comprised of African-American clients, while the Autism Spectrum Disorder (“ASD”) department was mainly comprised of Caucasian clients with a Caucasian Director.
24. Furthermore, the ASD department received more staffing support, while Defendant did not fill open Program Coordinator positions in the IDMH department.
25. Although the IDMH department required the additional staffing as there were multiple serious incidents, such as elopement, aggression and sexual assault among clients, Defendant refused to provide Plaintiff with the same support that the Caucasian Program Director received.
26. In addition, the ASD department with the Caucasian Director and clients received much more assistance and attention from the national level administrators at Defendant.

27. In or about September 2019, Plaintiff began to register complaints with Defendant regarding the aforesaid disparate treatment.
28. However, Defendant did not take any action to address Plaintiff's complaints of race discrimination.
29. Throughout Plaintiff's employment, he repeatedly complained to Defendant about this discriminatory treatment due to his complaints not being properly addressed.
30. Instead of addressing Plaintiff's complaints, Defendant began to retaliate against him by issuing him unwarranted disciplines.
31. On or about June 1, 2020, Carol Ann McNellis ("McNellis"), Executive Director (Caucasian), made an inappropriate and racial discriminatory comment regarding the George Floyd protests/riots during a conference call.
32. Plaintiff immediately expressed his opposition to McNellis's racist commentary to Ed Vincent ("Vincent"), Program Administrator.
33. Shortly thereafter, McNellis emailed the staff members and again made a racially offensive comment regarding the availability of food banks for the African-American staff.
34. Plaintiff again complained to Vincent about McNellis's racial animus and discriminatory comments.
35. Notwithstanding same, the Defendant failed and refused to take corrective action.
36. Shortly thereafter, on or about July 20, 2020, in retaliation for his opposition to the racially discriminatory remarks and actions of Defendant, Plaintiff received a final written warning for alleged performance deficiencies.

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.