

**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](mailto:davidk@kollerlawfirm.com)

*Counsel for Plaintiff*

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

---

**STEPHANIE JOHNSON,**  
**5709 Delancey Street**  
**Philadelphia, PA 19143**  
**Plaintiff,**

**v.**

**UNIVERSITY OF PENNSYLVANIA**  
**HEALTH SYSTEM d/b/a**  
**CHESTER COUNTY HOSPITAL,**  
**701 East Marshall Street**  
**West Chester, PA 19380**  
  
**3400 Spruce Street**  
**Philadelphia, PA 19104**  
**Defendant.**

**: Civil Action No.**  
**:**  
**:**  
**:**  
**:**  
**: Complaint and Jury Demand**  
**:**  
**:**  
**:**  
**:**  
**:**  
**:**  
**:**  
**:**

---

**CIVIL ACTION**

Plaintiff, Stephanie Johnson (hereinafter “Plaintiff”), by and through her attorney, Koller Law, LLC, bring this civil matter against University of Pennsylvania Health System d/b/a Chester County Hospital (hereinafter “Defendant”), for violations of Section 1981 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, University of Pennsylvania Health System d/b/a Chester

County Hospital is a major multi-hospital health system with a location at 701 East Marshall Street, West Chester, PA 19380 and with a corporate headquarters located at 3400 Spruce Street, Philadelphia, PA 19104.

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 her administrative remedies under PHRA.
13. Plaintiff timely filed a Complaint of Discrimination ("Complaint") with the U.S. Equal Employment Opportunity Commission ("EEOC") alleging race discrimination and retaliation against Defendant.
14. The Complaint was assigned a Charge Number 530-2020-04450 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 Notice is dated June 30, 2021. Plaintiff received the notice by electronic mail.
16. Prior to the filing of this action, Plaintiff notified the EEOC of her intent to proceed with a lawsuit in federal court.
17. Plaintiff files the instant Complaint within two (2) years of her receipt of her 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. Plaintiff is an African-American female.
21. In November 2019, Defendant hired Plaintiff as a part-time Security Officer.
22. Plaintiff was well qualified for her position and performed well.
23. In the spring of 2020, Defendant changed Plaintiff's schedule to per diem due to the COVID-19 pandemic.
24. In the spring of 2020, Walter Vieira (Hispanic), Director, offered extra hours to Plaintiff's department.
25. Mr. Vieira asked in a group meeting if anyone would like to work these extra shifts.
26. Plaintiff volunteered but Mr. Vieira ignored Plaintiff and turned to her Caucasian, male co-workers and directly asked them if they wanted the extra shifts.
27. Plaintiff did not say anything to object because she was afraid of retaliation and feared losing her job.
28. Between spring 2020 and July 2020, Defendant overlooked Plaintiff for any overtime opportunities despite her willingness to work extra shifts.
29. Defendant gave the extra shifts to Plaintiff's Caucasian, male co-workers.
30. In a meeting on June 26, 2020, Brian Naylor (Caucasian), Supervisor, and Mr. Vieira issued Plaintiff three (3) disciplines for minor issues that her Caucasian coworkers were not disciplined for.
31. Mr. Naylor said that despite there write-ups, he did not want to lose her as an employee because Defendant needed "my kind" and to the effect that "I knew things because where my kind was from."

32. Plaintiff asked what Mr. Naylor meant by “my kind,” and he said, “you know what I mean – diversity.”
33. Plaintiff believed his comments were discriminatory and based on her race.
34. Following this meeting, Plaintiff was very upset and uncomfortable about the discriminatory comments that Mr. Naylor made and left work early.
35. Plaintiff informed both Mr. Vieira and Mr. Naylor, in person, that she needed to leave early, and they approved it.
36. On July 15, 2020, Plaintiff informed Mr. Vieira and Mr. Naylor that she was unable to report to work due to her daughter being ill.
37. Plaintiff proceeded to report Mr. Naylor’s discriminatory comments and inquired about a change in schedule to Susan Karr (Caucasian), Director of Human Resources, via email, but she did not respond.
38. On July 25, 2020, Mr. Vieira sent Plaintiff a text message requesting that she return her uniform to Defendant.
39. On July 27, 2020, Plaintiff sent Mr. Vieira a text message inquiring if she was still employed, but he did not respond to her.
40. Plaintiff continued to text Mr. Vieira and contact Human Resources to inquire about her job status, but she did not hear back.
41. On August 6, 2020, Moira Meyreles (Caucasian), Human Resource Representative, called Plaintiff and informed her that Defendant had mailed her a termination letter effective July 16, 2020.
42. Defendant terminated Plaintiff the day after she requested a shift change.

# 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.