1	Anna Y. Park, SBN 164242		
	anna.park@eeoc.gov		
2	Nakkisa Akhavan, SBN 286260		
3	nakkisa.akhavan@eeoc.gov		
4	Taylor Markey, SBN 319557		
	taylor.markey@eeoc.gov		
5	Derek W. Li, SBN 150122		
6	derek.li@eeoc.gov		
7	U.S. EQUAL EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITY COMMISSION		
/	255 East Temple Street, Fourth Floor		
8	Los Angeles, CA 90012		
9	Telephone: (213) 785-3008		
	Facsimile: (213) 894-1301		
10	E Mail: lado.legal@eeoc.gov		
11	L Wan. Indo.legal@eecc.gov		
12	Attorneys for Plaintiff		
	U.S. EQUAL EMPLOYMENT		
13	OPPORTUNITY COMMISSION		
14	IINITED STATE	S DISTRICT COURT	
15	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA		
	CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA		
16	U.S. EQUAL EMPLOYMENT	Case No.:	
17	OPPORTUNITY COMMISSION,		
18	71.1.100	<b>COMPLAINT - TITLE VII</b>	
	Plaintiff,	<ul> <li>Civil Rights</li> </ul>	
19	vs.	• Employment Discrimination –	
20	<b>V3.</b>	Sexual Harassment, Retaliation, and	
21	PACIFIC CULINARY GROUP, INC.;	Constructive Discharge	
	AND CB FOODS, INC., DOES 1-10,		
22	INCLUSIVE,	42 U.S.C. §§ 2000e, et seq.	
23	D C 1		
	Defendants.	JURY TRIAL DEMAND	
24			
25			
26			
27			
28			

#### **NATURE OF THE ACTION**

This is an action brought by Plaintiff United States Equal Employment Opportunity Commission (the "Commission") under Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, as amended (hereinafter "Title VII"), and Title I of the Civil Rights Act of 1991 to correct unlawful employment practices on the basis of sex (female and male) and to provide appropriate relief for a class of aggrieved individuals who were adversely affected by such practices. As alleged with greater particularity in this Complaint, the Commission alleges that Pacific Culinary Group, Inc. ("Pacific Culinary"), CB Foods, Inc. ("CB Foods"), and Does 1-10 (collectively "Defendants") subjected a class of aggrieved individuals, both female and male, to severe or pervasive sexual harassment and/or hostile work environment on the basis of sex (female and male); to retaliation; and/or to constructive discharge.

### **JURISDICTION AND VENUE**

- 1. Jurisdiction of this Court is invoked pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §§ 451, 1331, 1337, 1343, and 1345. This action is authorized and instituted pursuant to Section 706(f)(1) and (3) of Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 as amended ("Title VII"), 42 U.S.C. §§ 2000e-5(f)(1) and (3) and Section 102 of the Civil Rights Act of 1991, 42 U.S.C. § 1981a.
- 2. The employment practices alleged to be unlawful were and are now being committed within the jurisdiction of the United States District Court for the Central District of California.

#### **PARTIES**

### Plaintiff EEOC

3. Plaintiff United States Equal Employment Opportunity Commission is an agency of the United States of America charged with administration, interpretation, and enforcement of Title VII, and is expressly authorized to bring this action by §§ 706(f)(1) and (3) of Title VII, 42 U.S.C. §§ 2000e-5(f)(1) and (3).

### Defendant Pacific Culinary, Inc.

- 4. At all relevant times, Defendant Pacific Culinary has been in the business of selling, manufacturing, and producing Asian food products.
- 5. At all relevant times, Defendant Pacific Culinary has continuously been a corporation doing business in the State of California and Los Angeles County.
- 6. At all relevant times, Defendant Pacific Culinary has continuously employed fifteen (15) or more persons.
- 7. At all relevant times, Defendant Pacific Culinary has continuously been an employer engaged in an industry affecting commerce within the meaning of Sections 701(b), (g), and (h) of Title VII, 42 U.S.C. § 2000e-(1)(b), (g), and (h).

### Defendant CB Foods, Inc.

- 8. At all relevant times, Defendant CB Foods has been in the business of selling Asian food products.
- 9. At all relevant times, Defendant CB Foods has continuously been a corporation doing business in the State of California and Los Angeles County.
- 10. At all relevant times, Defendant CB Foods has continuously employed fifteen (15) or more persons as an integrated enterprise / single employer with Defendant Pacific Culinary.
- 11. At all relevant times, Defendant CB Foods has continuously been an employer engaged in an industry affecting commerce within the meaning of Sections 701(b), (g), and (h) of Title VII, 42 U.S.C. § 2000e-(1)(b), (g), and (h).
- 12. Since at least 2020, Defendants Pacific Culinary and CB Foods have been collectively operating as a single employer and/or integrated enterprise in California. Defendants have common management and ownership, centralized control of labor operations, and interrelation of operations, which include but are not limited to the following:
  - a. Operate under the common management and ownership of CEO
     Bingham Lee;

- Share the same business location at 566 Monterey Pass Road,
   Monterey Park, California;
- c. Share centralized control of labor operations through CEO Bingham Lee who controls the hiring, discipline, and the working conditions of employees;
- d. Share common employment documents such as employment applications, termination forms, leave request forms, confidentiality agreements, and common employment policies;
- e. Share interrelated operations as Defendant CB Foods obtained orders for Asian food products which are manufactured and distributed by Defendant Pacific Culinary to the customers / clients; and
- f. Share the same legal counsel on information and belief.
- 13. Defendants CB Foods and Pacific Culinary acted as employers over the employment terms and conditions of the aggrieved individuals in a variety of ways, including but not limited to the following:
  - a. Bingham Lee, the CEO of Defendant CB Foods, controls the hiring, discipline, and employment terms and conditions of the employees of Pacific Culinary;
  - b. Defendant CB Foods Chief Operating Officer exercised supervisorial authority and responsibilities over the employees of Defendant Pacific Culinary; and
  - c. Defendant CB Foods' harassment policy and reporting procedure were used by Defendant Pacific Culinary.
- 14. All of the acts and failures to act alleged herein were duly performed and attributable to all Defendants, each acting as a successor, agent, alter ego, employee, indirect employer, joint employer, integrated enterprise and/or under the direction and control of the others, except as specifically alleged otherwise. Said acts and failures to act were within the scope of such agency and/or employment, and each Defendant

participated in, approved and/or ratified the unlawful acts and omissions by the other Defendants complained of herein. Whenever and wherever reference is made in this Complaint to any act by a Defendant or Defendants, such allegations and reference shall also be deemed to mean the acts and failures to act of each Defendant acting individually, jointly, and/or severally.

15. Plaintiff is ignorant of the true names and capacities of each defendant sues as DOES 1 through 10, inclusively, and therefore Plaintiff sues said defendants by fictitious names. Plaintiff reserves the right to amend the complaint to name each DOE defendant individually or corporately as it becomes known. Plaintiff alleges that each DOE defendant was in some manner responsible for the acts and omissions alleged herein and Plaintiff will amend the complaint to allege such responsibility when the same shall have been ascertained by Plaintiff.

#### **ADMINISTRATIVE PROCEDURES**

- 16. More than thirty days prior to the institution of this lawsuit, the Charging Parties filed charges of discrimination with the Commission alleging violations of Title VII by Defendant Pacific Culinary.
- 17. On June 15 and 16, 2022, the Commission issued Letters of Determination to Defendants Pacific Culinary and Defendant CB Foods finding reasonable cause to believe that Defendants violated Title VII. The Commission invited Defendants to join with the Commission in informal methods of conciliation to endeavor to eliminate the unlawful employment practices and provide appropriate relief.
- 18. The Commission engaged in communications with Defendants to provide them with the opportunity to remedy the discriminatory practices described in the Letter of Determination.
- 19. The Commission was unable to secure from Defendants a conciliation agreement acceptable to the Commission.
- 20. On or about December 23, 2022, the Commission issued to Defendants a Notice of Failure of Conciliation.

# 

### 

# 

## 

# 

# 

# 

# 

## 

## 

# 

# 

## 

### 

21. All conditions precedent to the institution of this lawsuit have been fulfilled.

# STATEMENT OF CLAIMS

#### SEXUAL HARASSMENT

- 22. Since at least 2020, Defendants have engaged in unlawful employment practices in violation of §§ 703(a)(1) of Title VII, 42 U.S.C. §§ 2000e-2(a)(1) by subjecting a class of female and male aggrieved individuals to ongoing sexual harassment by a supervisor and/or third party and/or coworker that was severe or pervasive; and creating and maintaining an offensive, abusive, and intimidating hostile work environment because of sex (female and male).
- 23. The class of aggrieved individuals is comprised of employees working since at least January 2020 in a variety of positions, including but not limited to production workers and office workers.
- 24. Since at least January 2020, the aggrieved individuals were subjected to frequent and ongoing physical and/or verbal sexual harassment by a male individual who was Defendants' Chief Operating Officer.
- 25. At all relevant times, he had supervisorial authority or responsibilities over Defendants' employees, including hiring and discipline.
- 26. His sexual harassment of aggrieved individuals included but was not limited to the following:
  - a. Fondling or attempting to fondle the aggrieved individuals' breasts;
  - b. kissing or attempting to kiss the aggrieved individuals;
  - c. hugging the aggrieved individuals' shoulders or bodies or squeezing them tightly;
  - d. touching or attempting to touch or grab the aggrieved individuals' bodies and private areas;
  - e. leering at and ogling the breasts and bodies of the aggrieved individuals;

- f. making sexual comments to the aggrieved individuals expressing his desire for their breasts, buttocks, and other body parts and asking about their sexual preferences and sexual activities;
- g. Pointing to his groin, joking about his erection and big penis, and/or expressing his desire to have his penis sucked to and in front of the aggrieved individuals; and
- h. making sexually suggestive gestures about the size of the aggrieved individuals' breasts.
- 27. The sexual harassment was unwelcomed and sufficiently severe or pervasive to alter the terms and conditions of the aggrieved individuals' employment;
- 28. For some aggrieved individuals, the harassment culminated in tangible employment actions, including but not limited to unjustified discipline and termination.
- 29. His physical and verbal sexual harassment of aggrieved individuals was ubiquitous, open, and frequent in nature.
- 30. Since at least 2020, Defendants knew or should have known of the sexually hostile work environment. Defendants received multiple complaints of sexual harassment, including but not limited to charges filed by the Charging Parties with the EEOC.
  - 31. Defendants failed to take effective corrective and preventative measures.
- 32. Because of Defendants' failure to take effective corrective and preventative measures, the sexual harassment continued unabated.
- 33. The effect of the practices as detailed above has been to deprive the aggrieved individuals of equal employment opportunities and otherwise adversely affect their status as employees because of their sex (female and male).
- 34. The unlawful employment practices as detailed above were intentional and caused the aggrieved individuals to suffer pain and suffering.

# 3

### 4

# 5 6

## 7 8

### 9 10

# 11 12

- 13
- 14
- 15 16
- 17 18
- 19
- 20 21
- 22

23 24

25

26 27

28

The unlawful employment practices as detailed above were done with 35. malice or with reckless indifference to the federally protected rights of the aggrieved individuals.

#### **RETALIATION**

- Since at least 2020, Defendants engaged in unlawful employment practices 36. in violation of Section 704(a) of Title VII, 42 U.S.C. § 2000e-3(a) by subjected a class of aggrieved individuals to retaliation and/or retaliatory harassment.
- The aggrieved individuals objected to, resisted, or reported the sexual 37. harassment and advances detailed above.
- Following the aggrieved individuals' objections to, resistance, and/or reports of the sexual harassment and advances, they were subjected to retaliation by, among other things, further harassment and/or by being disciplined / terminated for pretextual reasons.
- The effect of the practices as detailed above has been to deprive the 39. aggrieved individuals of equal employment opportunities and otherwise adversely affect their status as employees because they engaged in protected activity in opposition to unlawful employment practices.
- The unlawful employment practices as detailed above were intentional and 40. caused the aggrieved individuals to suffer pain and suffering.
- 41. The unlawful employment practices as detailed above were done with malice or with reckless indifference to the federally protected rights of the aggrieved individuals.

### **CONSTRUCTIVE DISCHARGE**

42. Since at least 2020, Defendants have engaged in unlawful employment practices as detailed above in violation of §§ 703(a)(1) and 704(a) of Title VII, 42 U.S.C. §§ 2000e-2(a)(1) and 2000e-3(a) by subjecting a class of aggrieved individuals to sexual harassment sexually hostile work environment and/or retaliation.

- 43. Because of the unlawful employment practices detailed above, the aggrieved individuals were subjected to intolerable working conditions which forced them to resign from their employment.
- 44. The effect of the practices as detailed above has been to deprive the aggrieved individuals of equal employment opportunities and otherwise adversely affect their status as employees because of their sex (female and male) and/or because of their engagement in protected activity in opposition to unlawful employment practices.
- 45. The unlawful employment practices as detailed above were intentional and caused the aggrieved individuals to suffer pain and suffering.
- 46. The unlawful employment practices as detailed above were done with malice or with reckless indifference to the federally protected rights of the aggrieved individuals.

### PRAYER FOR RELIEF

Wherefore, the Commission respectfully requests that this Court:

- A. Grant a permanent injunction enjoining Defendants, its officers, successors, assigns, and all persons in active concert or participation with it, from engaging in any employment practices in violation of Sections 703(a) and 704(a) of Title VII.
- B. Order Defendants to institute and carry out policies, practices, and programs which provide equal employment opportunities for employees; and which eradicate the effects of its past and present unlawful employment practices and ensure that it does not engage in further unlawful practices in violation of Sections 703(a) and 704(a) of Title VII.
- C. Order Defendants to make the aggrieved individuals whole by providing compensation for past and future pecuniary losses resulting from the unlawful practices described above, in amounts to be determined at trial.
- D. Order Defendants to make the aggrieved individuals whole by providing compensation for past and future non-pecuniary losses, pursuant to Title VII, resulting from the unlawful practices described above, including but not limited to emotional pain,

	1
	2
	3
	4
	5
	6
	7
	8
	9
1	0
1	1
1	2
1	3
1	4
1	5
1	6
1	7
1	8
1	9
2	0
2	1
2	2
2	3
2	4
2	5
2	6
2	7
2	8

suffering, inconvenience, mental anguish, humiliation, and loss of enjoyment of life, in amounts to be determined at trial.

- E. Order Defendants to pay the aggrieved individuals punitive damages, pursuant to Title VII, for its malicious or reckless conduct as described above, in amounts to be determined at trial.
- F. Order Defendants to make the aggrieved individuals whole by providing appropriate backpay with interest, in amounts to be determined at trial, and other affirmative relief necessary to eradicate the effects of its unlawful employment practices.
- G. Grant such further relief as the Court deems necessary and proper in the public interest.
  - H. Award the Commission the costs of this action.

### **JURY TRIAL DEMAND**

The Commission requests a jury trial on all questions of fact raised by its Complaint.

Dated: April 21, 2023 Respectfully Submitted,

GWENDOLYN YOUNG REAMS, Acting General Counsel

CHRISTOPHER LAGE, Deputy General Counsel

U.S. EQUAL EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITY COMMISSION 131 "M" Street, N.E. Washington, D.C. 20507

By:

ANNA Y. PARK
Regional Attorney
Los Angeles District Office
U.S. EQUAL EMPLOYMENT
OPPORTUNITY COMMISSION

9