

**Case Name:** 2026 Jane Doe

**Date of Call:** March 28, 2025

**State / City / County:** One Meadow Way, Menlo Park, CA 94025

**Employer name and number of employees:** Meta  
500+

**Last position held and wage paid:** Infrastructure Accounting Manager,  
Salary \$215,000 per year

**Hire date:** 05/31/2022

**Fire date:** 02/10/2025

**Potential Violations:**

- Discrimination
- Retaliation
- Hostile work environment
- Wrongful Termination

## Case Summary

SUMMARY (All names and dates have been highlighted for easy reference.)

In third-person and chronological order, this is a concise overview of the key events and issues shared during the phone call. The caller is referred to as PC for confidentiality.

---

### Timeline of Events

1. [MAY 31, 2022] – PC's Start Date
  - o PC began working for a large company (Meta) in a hybrid, full-time role.
2. Throughout 2023 – PC maintains strong performance
  - o According to PC, all assigned projects and goals were consistently met or exceeded.
  - o No formal Write-ups or official Performance plan were initiated against PC during this period.
3. [JANUARY/FEBRUARY 2024] – Onset of Alleged Harassment
  - o PC reports that [John Doe], a manager, began treating her differently from male counterparts, including assigning heavier workloads and setting stricter in-office requirements.
  - o PC felt this behavior amounted to Discrimination and Harassment, especially targeted at female employees.
  - o PC did not file a formal complaint with HR due to fear of Retaliation, but she informed another manager at the same level as [John Doe] about the differential treatment.
4. [SEPTEMBER 2024] – PC confirms pregnancy
  - o PC learned she was pregnant and continued working despite experiencing significant stress and emotional distress related to the alleged harassment.
  - o PC did not request formal FMLA or Medical Leave at this time but expressed concern about her workload and stress level.
  - o PC informed them of pregnancy and due date.

**Case Name: 2026 Jane Doe**

5. [FEBRUARY 10, 2025] – Notification of Termination
  - o PC was notified that she would be laid off in what the company called a performance-based termination.
  - o No substantive documentation (such as a performance review) was provided to PC to justify the decision.
  
6. [APRIL 18, 2025] – Official Termination Date / Severance Deadline
  - o PC's final date of employment was set for [APRIL 18, 2025], and she was given a severance offer to sign by that date.
  - o PC states that her male colleagues with lesser performance results were not impacted by the layoffs, reinforcing her suspicion of Discrimination tied to gender and pregnancy.
  
7. PC mentioned having a list of witnesses including (Sam Omeara who experienced the same harassment)

---

Key Issues and Relevant Terms

- Start Date: [MAY 31, 2022]
- Termination: [APRIL 18, 2025] (notified on [FEBRUARY 10, 2025])
- Discrimination: Alleged differential treatment toward PC (female, pregnant) compared to male peers
- Harassment: Alleged daily/weekly hostility or non-responsiveness from [John Doe]
- Retaliation: PC was concerned about reporting issues to HR, fearing negative consequences
- FMLA / Medical Leave: PC questioned eligibility for FMLA once pregnant; no formal leave was taken
- Performance: PC contends she met or exceeded goals, with no Performance plan or Write-ups on file
- HR: PC refrained from lodging a formal complaint, citing fear of Retaliation
- Pregnancy: Central to PC's claim of unfair treatment and potential pregnancy discrimination

---

Items Not Clearly Implicated

- Wage and Hour Violations
  - o PC did not report unpaid wages, denied breaks, or meal violations.
  
- Defamation, Contract Claims, or Privacy Violations
  - o None were mentioned in the call.
  
- Workers' Compensation or Workplace Safety
  - o PC did not file for workers' comp; no unsafe work environment was described.

**Case Name: 2026 Jane Doe**

---

Conclusion

PC believes her layoff was Discriminatory, specifically related to pregnancy and gender, and amounted to Harassment and Retaliation. She also questions if she was denied or uninformed about FMLA options. No formal complaints or Write-ups were documented, and no Performance plan was provided. If her account is accurate, there may be grounds for claims under FEHA, Title VII, and possibly FMLA/CFRA. However, further investigation and legal consultation would be required to determine whether there is sufficient evidence for a valid legal action.

---

This summary is intended for informational purposes, highlighting potential legal issues based on PC's narrative and does not constitute legal advice.

**Case Name:** 1991 John Doe

**Date of Call:** March 26, 2025

**State / City / County:** 1616 Industrial Rd, Jennings, LA 70546

**Employer name and number of employees:** Guinn construction, 101 - 500

**Last position held and wage paid:** Labor Operator, Hourly \$29

**Client Worked and terminated in the state of California**

**Hire date:** 03/03/2018

**Fire date:** 03/11/2023

**Potential Violations:**

- Discrimination
- Retaliation
- Wrongful Termination
- Hurt on the job

## Case Summary

PC spoke with a representative from an employee advocacy service regarding a possible wrongful termination matter. The representative explained the intake process, clarified that the call was recorded, and noted they were not an attorney.

**Start of Employment:** July 3, 2018 (Start Date)

PC began working at Guinn Construction around this time. PC served as a full-time, hourly employee (approximately 50 hours per week) with an hourly wage of \$29. PC worked for the company for roughly five years.

### Prior Workplace Incidents

PC mentioned having two previous injuries on the job. In both instances, PC stated that Guinn Construction paid for doctor visits.

PC also described a drug-testing incident on one job site under a foreman named John Doe 2. An accident occurred involving another employee, but only PC was required to take a drug test. According to PC, the other employee was at fault but was not tested.

### Reassignment to Another Job Site

After PC questioned why only they were tested, PC contacted someone in management (referred to variously as the Director of Operations or HR). In response, PC was transferred to another job site. PC believes this led to a reduction in available work hours, pay and he wasn't getting his per diem.

**Date of Injury:** October 18, 2023

On the second job site, PC sustained another injury (a possible hernia). PC reported the injury and was sent to an occupational doctor who allegedly said it was only a strain. PC then saw a personal doctor, who confirmed a hernia requiring surgery.

## Case Name: 1991 John Doe

**Termination:** November 3, 2023 (Termination Date)

Shortly after reporting the injury and being cleared to return to work by the occupational doctor, PC was informed by Guinn Construction that their employment was terminated. PC believes the termination was directly related to reporting the injury and the resulting workers' compensation issue.

### Workers' Compensation and Wrongful Termination

PC has an open workers' compensation case but states it does not cover the wrongful termination aspect. PC is seeking legal counsel specifically for potential wrongful termination and related claims.

### Additional Names Mentioned

John Doe 3

John Doe 4

John Doe 5

PC noted these individuals witnessed some of the events or worked alongside PC during the incidents.

Key Terms and Observations

**Start Date:** July 3, 2018

**Termination:** November 3, 2023

**Retaliation:** PC believes they were singled out for drug testing and later terminated after reporting a workplace injury.

**Discrimination:** PC felt targeted by the foreman (John Doe 2) because PC had previously reported safety or job-related concerns.

Medical Leave / Workers' Compensation: PC reported an injury, saw two different doctors (one occupational, one personal), and is awaiting surgery. PC alleges they were terminated shortly after reporting the injury.

HR Involvement: PC contacted management/HR regarding the drug-testing discrepancy and reported the injury. PC believes HR did not remedy the issues.

**Case Name: 1991 John Doe**

**Conclusion**

PC alleges wrongful termination and possible retaliation stemming from a workplace injury and the subsequent workers' compensation claim. The timeline suggests that PC's final injury report led to an unfavorable occupational doctor assessment followed quickly by termination. Potential legal issues include retaliation for filing a workers' compensation claim, possible disability discrimination under state (FEHA) or federal (ADA) law, and violation of public policy for firing an employee who reported an on-the-job injury.

**Case Name: 1984 Jane Doe 2**

**Date of Call: March 26, 2025**

**State / City / County:** 2850 gateway oaks drive suite 450 Sacramento 95833

**Employer name and number of employees:** Sundt Constructions  
500+

**Hire date:** 01/06/2020

**Fire date:** 03/20/2025

**Last position held and wage paid:** Started as prevailing wage coordinator and promoted to project administrator. \$65,000 - \$90,000 per year

**Potential Violations:**

- Retaliation
- Hostile work environment
- Wage & hour disputes
- Wrongful Termination
- Hurt on the job

## Case Summary

**Background:**

PC was employed as a Project Administrator at a company, having been promoted from a Prevailing Wage Coordinator. Throughout their tenure, PC handled multiple responsibilities such as managing labor compliance, insurance, time cards, and subcontractor reports, among others. PC was in the position for over five years, earning a starting salary of \$65,000, with annual bonuses and a recent bump in salary to \$43 per hour.

**Timeline of Events:**

**Early September 2024:**

PC was placed on a Performance Improvement Plan due to issues with their start time and anxiety-related absences.

PC had informed their boss, Jane Doe, about their anxiety and stress issues, and was regularly seeing a doctor for treatment.

Despite performance concerns, PC continued to meet work expectations and did not face major issues until later in the year.

**September 2024 - March 2025:**

PC experienced stress and anxiety and was prescribed medication by their doctor. This led to several missed workdays, but PC managed their workload with the help of their mother, who took on additional responsibilities.

During this time, PC continued to perform well at work despite the ongoing mental health challenges, working through lunch and taking on overtime to meet deadlines, though overtime was not compensated.

## Case Name: 1984 Jane Doe 2

PC requested Family and Medical Leave (FMLA) in early March 2025, following a discussion with their doctor.

March 2025:

On March 13th or 14th, PC informed their employer about needing FMLA and disability leave.

March 17th, PC sent an official request to HR for FMLA and disability paperwork. They received an acknowledgment, but no follow-up was made by HR.

On March 20th, PC was terminated by the company. The termination was presented as part of a workforce reduction, though it was only applied to PC and one other employee in similar positions.

PC disputes the severance offered, claiming that they were given only two weeks' severance while a coworker who had been with the company for a shorter time received more compensation.

PC also mentions that the open position of a coworker (front desk) who left the company was not affected by the workforce reduction, suggesting that they could have been reassigned.

Other Details:

PC experienced retaliation concerns, believing that the termination was linked to their request for FMLA, especially given the proximity to the request and the lack of follow-up on the matter.

Discrimination was suspected due to unequal treatment in working hours, with PC being required to start at 8 a.m. while others with children were allowed flexibility.

Despite working overtime on weekends without pay, PC did not receive compensation for the extra hours worked and did not receive a company phone, using their personal phone for work purposes.

Key Issues:

Potential Retaliation: PC requested FMLA on March 17th, and was terminated just three days later on March 20th. This close timing suggests a possible retaliation claim under FMLA.

Discrimination: PC was required to adhere to a strict 8 a.m. start time, while other employees with children were allowed flexible hours, which could point to discriminatory practices regarding work-life balance.

## Case Name: 1984 Jane Doe 2

**Performance Plan:** PC was placed on a Performance Improvement Plan that appeared to focus on schedule-related issues, despite other employees in similar roles being given exceptions. This raises questions about unfair treatment.

**Overtime and Compensation:** PC worked significant overtime without pay, which could raise concerns about wage and hour violations.

**Medical Leave:** PC's FMLA request was not properly addressed, and the lack of follow-up from HR after acknowledging the request could suggest violations related to medical leave rights.

**Discrimination:** Unequal treatment in terms of work schedules, especially for employees with children, could indicate discriminatory practices.

**Wage and Hour Violations:** PC was not compensated for overtime work and used personal equipment for company-related tasks without reimbursement.

**Failure to Address Medical Leave:** HR's lack of response to PC's FMLA request and the abrupt termination could violate medical leave protections.

### Conclusion:

There are potential legal claims for retaliation, discrimination, wage and hour violations, and failure to accommodate medical leave in PC's case. Further investigation and legal counsel are advised to determine the best course of action based on the timeline of events and the details provided.

**Case Name: 2007 John Doe 3**

**Date of Call: March 26, 2025**

**State / City / County:** 1601 Iowa avenue, California

**Employer name and number of employees:** Ced greentech renewables  
51 -100 employees

**Last position held and wage paid:** Delivery driver  
Hourly (\$22.25/hour)

**Hire date:** 10/15/2021

**Fire date:** 03/04/2025

**Potential Violations:**

- Discrimination
- Wrongful Termination
- Hurt on the job

## Case Summary

Chronological Summary of the Call for PC:

### 1. Employment Overview:

PC worked at CED Greentech Renewables in Riverside, California starting in October 2021 as a Delivery Driver. PC was paid \$22.25 per hour, working 45 to 55 hours per week.

### 2. Injury and Workers' Compensation:

In August 2024, PC was rear-ended while on the job, leading to physical injuries. PC opened a workers' compensation case due to the accident, which is still ongoing. However, there were complications with the handling of both the injury and subsequent workers' comp case.

### 3. Driver's License Suspension Incident:

On February 28, 2025, PC was informed by their supervisor, John Doe, that their driver's license had been reported as suspended following a random DMV check. Despite PC's claim that their license was active and valid, they were suspended without pay for five days until further investigation could take place.

### 4. Further Investigation:

PC called the DMV on March 3, 2025, to verify their license status. The DMV confirmed that PC's license was valid and not suspended.

### 5. Termination:

On March 4, 2025, PC was informed by John Doe that they were being terminated due to the alleged suspended license issue. PC contested this, explaining that their license was valid and that they had not been given the opportunity to clarify the situation before being let go. The termination was completed without further investigation or a chance for PC to explain.

**Case Name: 2007 John Doe 2**

**6. Unemployment Issues:**

After termination, PC attempted to apply for unemployment benefits, but their claim was denied due to the employer's statement that PC's license was suspended. Despite providing documentation showing the license was valid, PC was unable to receive unemployment benefits.

**7. Retaliation Allegations:**

PC felt that the termination was retaliatory, suggesting that the company used the suspension of their license as an excuse to fire them, possibly due to the open workers' comp case related to the injury they sustained in August 2024.

**8. Job Conditions and Breaks:**

PC reported difficulties with meal breaks and rest periods, as they were often unable to take breaks on time due to the nature of their work as a delivery driver. They noted that they were instructed to clock out for their breaks and then add the time back at the end of their shift, but these were not taken as scheduled.

**9. Harassment and Discrimination:**

PC did not report explicit discrimination or harassment but felt that their treatment was retaliatory, particularly due to the timing of the termination and the lack of proper investigation into the DMV issue.

**10. Final Pay and Wages:**

PC confirmed that they did receive their last paycheck but was unsure if all wages due, including accrued vacation time, were properly included. They did not report any write-ups or performance plans during their employment.

**Next Steps:**

PC should consult with a California employment attorney to explore potential claims related to wrongful termination, retaliation, wage and hour violations, and failure to accommodate medical or injury-related leave. There may be strong grounds for pursuing legal action based on the employer's actions and failure to properly investigate the circumstances surrounding the termination.

**Case Name: 2111 John Doe 3**

**Date of Call: March 23, 2025**

**State / City / County:** Temple Heights Drive, Oceanside, Orange County, California 92056

**Employer name and number of employees:** New Wave Electric (outsource)  
100 – 500 employees

**Last position held and wage paid:** Electrician or Warehouse Worker  
Hourly \$25

**Hire date:** 02/01/2023

**Fire date:** 08/01/2024

**Potential Violations:**

- Discrimination
- Retaliation
- Hostile work environment
- Wrongful Termination

## Case Summary

SUMMARY (In Third Person, Chronological Order, with Confidentiality Measures)

[Name: Jane Doe] greeted [Name: PC] on [Date: April 3, 2025] to conduct an intake call regarding a potential employment claim. [Name: PC] explained that he began working (through a temp agency) at a company he referred to as “Outsource” or “New Wave Electric” around [Date: February 2023], though there was also mention of involvement with “STI Imaging.” The assignment was initially slated to last six months, but [Name: PC] was terminated after about three months, around [Date: August 2024].

During his time on the job, [Name: PC] stated:

- He worked as an electrician or in a warehouse role, performing full-time, hourly work (approximately 40 hours per week at a rate of \$25 per hour).
- He has a speech-related disability or impairment that made his voice difficult to understand.
- Coworkers and supervisors allegedly accused him of being “drunk” or “on drugs” because of his speech and refused to communicate effectively with him and made fun of him.
- He was left stranded on a scissor lift when it malfunctioned, creating a safety hazard. [Name: PC] claims he reported this safety issue [Date: July 2024]
- Management and at least one supervisor reportedly harassed him about his speech and refused to offer proper assistance or accommodation.

Shortly thereafter, [Name: PC] was terminated. He believes the termination was connected to his disability and the complaints he raised regarding safety.

---

### Key Terms Mentioned

- Start Date: [Date: February 2023]
- Termination: [Date: August 2024]
- Discrimination/Harassment: Alleged on the basis of a speech-related disability
- Potential Retaliation: For reporting a safety hazard with the scissor lift

No references were made to the following items during the call, based on the transcript:

- FMLA (Family and Medical Leave Act)

**Case Name: 2111 John Doe 3**

- Write-ups
  - Performance Plan
  - HR (Human Resources)
-

**Case Name: 2110 John Doe 4**

**Date of Call: March 23, 2025**

**State / City / County:** 3210 Maryfield Road, San Diego, CA 92121

**Employer name and number of employees:** Navega Therapeutics

6 employees

**Last position held and wage paid:** Scientist

salary 107k

**Hire date:** 11/15/2021

**Fire date:** 03/28/2025

**Potential Violations:**

- Hostile work environment
- Sexual Harassment
- Wrongful Termination

## Case Summary

Below is a concise, chronological summary of the phone call, with the caller's name replaced by PC for confidentiality. All names and dates are highlighted, and key employment-law terms (e.g., Write-ups, Discrimination, Termination, FMLA, Performance plan, HR) are included or noted where relevant. Unnecessary details have been removed to maintain clarity, with emphasis on potential legal concerns and the timeline of events.

---

Summary of the Call for PC

### 1. Start Date – November 15, 2021

- PC began working for Navia Therapeutics (address: 3210 Maryfield Road, San Diego, CA 92121) on November 15, 2021 as a Scientist.

- PC's annual salary was \107,000, working full-time (~40 hours/week).

### 2. Job Duties and Exposure to Chemotherapy Drug (2023 – 2024)

- Throughout 2023, PC worked extensively with a chemotherapy agent (Paclitaxel), mixing and administering it to animal models without formal protocols or protective measures.

- PC repeatedly handled the drug (approx. 10 times/month) under potentially hazardous conditions, experiencing severe skin inflammation, rashes, and eye pain from April 2023 to October 2023.

- Medical tests initially suggested possible autoimmune disease, but no conclusive diagnosis was reached. PC paid significant out-of-pocket medical expenses (approx. \2,000).

### 3. Discovery of Unsafe Conditions (September 2024)

- In September 2024, a senior scientist, Christina, posted in a Teams group message (which included PC, other colleagues, and management) about CDC regulations for handling the chemotherapy drug—regulations that were not being followed.

- The CEO, Anna, (also the spouse of PC's supervisor, Fernando) claimed ignorance of these regulations but did not introduce proper safety protocols or reimburse PC's medical costs.

## Case Name: 2110 John Doe 4

### 4. Reduction of Duties and Isolation (Late 2024 – March 2025)

- After Jane Doe's revelation, PC was isolated and assigned only menial tasks, such as changing animal cages—work PC felt required no advanced degree.
- PC expressed concern to colleagues about her reduced responsibilities.

### 5. Harassment and Prior Complaints

- PC described sexual harassment by a coworker, John Doe, who made inappropriate comments (about PC's appearance, religion, and role as a woman) and pressured PC for rides after work.
- PC reported these incidents to John Doe 2, the immediate supervisor, and briefly to an HR representative employed at the company. No meaningful action was taken at the time.
- John Doe 2 also engaged in harassing behavior, making PC use a personal vehicle to move lab equipment and scrutinizing PC's facial expressions at work.

### 6. Termination – March 28, 2025

- On March 28, 2025, PC was terminated without formal write-ups or a Performance plan. John Doe 2's claimed lack of funds as the reason, but the company had recently announced a \$4 million funding boost in team meetings.
- Initially, John Doe 2 offered two weeks' pay as severance but then presented a separation form with a 7-page agreement waiving PC's rights to sue. The proposed payout (approximately \$5,000 before taxes) was less than two normal paychecks.
- PC did not sign the agreement.

### 7. Additional Points

- PC did not file a formal workers' compensation claim or FMLA leave, though PC used regular PTO for medical appointments when the cause of the inflammation was still unknown.
- PC briefly consulted Jane Doe2 about the unsafe drug-handling procedures but did not move forward with a formal complaint, fearing retaliation.
- PC was paid for accrued wages but refused to sign the proposed severance to preserve the right to pursue legal claims.

---

**Case Name: 2067 Jane Doe 3**

**Date of Call: March 18, 2025**

**State / City / County:** 301 howard's st 13 floor San Francisco, CA

**Employer name and number of employees:** Hilti Fieldwire, Inc.  
101 - 500

**Hire date:** 07/20/2021

**Fire date:** 03/13/2025

**Last position held and wage paid:** Hr Business Partner  
Salary: \$164,000/year

**Potential Violations:**

- Retaliation
- Wrongful Termination

## Case Summary

Summary of the Call (with Confidentiality Measures)

(All personal names are replaced with "PC." Highlighted items appear in brackets for clarity and emphasis.)

---

Chronological Narrative (in Third Person)

### 1. Start Date

PC began employment with the company on [JULY 20, 2020/2021] (the exact year is referenced inconsistently but is on or about [JULY 20]).

### 2. Role and Workplace Details

- PC worked as an HR Business Partner (non-union, non-government).
- The employer had an acquisition by another entity in [NOVEMBER 2021] (approximate date mentioned).
- At the time of termination, there were around [200] employees under the combined organization.

### 3. Discrimination Concerns Raised (Ongoing Since [2022])

- PC reported discriminatory merit and promotion practices within the HR team, indicating that PC was "the only" individual of a particular demographic group (the exact group was not specified, but PC implied membership in a protected class).
- These concerns were escalated to a Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion (DEI) leader at the acquiring company.
- PC continued raising these concerns from [2022] up to [MARCH 2025].

### 4. Termination Date and Circumstances

- On [MARCH 13, 2025], PC had a scheduled meeting with a direct manager (who had joined from

## Case Name: 2067 Jane Doe 3

from the acquiring company) to discuss ongoing merit concerns.

- Shortly after raising these issues again, PC was informed of termination on [MARCH 13, 2025].

### 5. Severance Offer and Final Wages

- PC was offered a severance of approximately 4 months' pay (around [\$39,000]).
- Final wages were not provided on the same day (i.e., [MARCH 13, 2025]); PC received the vacation/"accrued PTO" payout about one week later.

### 6. Performance and Write-Ups

- PC indicated there were no performance issues or formal write-ups on file.
- PC was not placed on a Performance Improvement Plan (PIP).

### 7. No Mention of FMLA/Medical Leave

- PC did not reference taking or requesting Family and Medical Leave (FMLA/CFRA) or any other medical leave during employment.

---

### Key Names and Dates (Highlighted)

- [PC]: The individual who was terminated (caller).
- [JULY 20, 2020/2021]: Approximate start date with the employer.
- [NOVEMBER 2021]: Month/year of corporate acquisition (approximate).
- [2022]: Year PC began raising discrimination concerns.
- [MARCH 13, 2025]: Date of termination.

---

### Conclusion

- The primary allegations revolve around discrimination (specifically regarding merit/promotion practices) and retaliation for raising these issues.
- A potential wage violation for delayed final pay is also noted.
- No explicit mention of FMLA, medical leave, or performance plan processes.
- Further investigation would be required to confirm whether these events meet the legal thresholds for wrongful termination claims under California law or federal law.

---

> Disclaimer: This summary is for informational purposes only and does not constitute legal advice. Any potential claims mentioned above would require additional factual investigation by a qualified attorney.

**Case Name:** 2056 John Doe 5

**Date of Call:** March 20, 2025

**State / City / County:** 10011 Artesia Pl, Bellflower, Los Angeles, California.

**Employer name and number of employees:** United drain and plumbing  
11 - 50

**Hire date:** 11/22/2022

**Fire date:** 03/29/2023

**Last position held and wage paid:** Plumber's Assistant  
\$20 hourly

**Potential Violations:**

- Retaliation
- Wage & hour disputes
- Wrongful Termination
- Hurt on the job

## Case Summary

Below is a concise, chronological summary of the phone call. All names and dates are highlighted for clarity, and the caller's name is replaced with PC. This summary is written in the third person to maintain neutrality and omits any personally identifying information beyond what was explicitly mentioned in the transcript. Key details and potential legal issues under California employment law are noted afterward.

---

### Summary of Events (Chronological Order)

#### 1. Initial Introduction (Time Unknown)

- PC speaks with a representative from Employee Advocate Services about a potential wrongful termination claim.
- The representative clarifies that the call is recorded for quality assurance and that they are not an attorney.

#### 2. Employment Overview

- PC confirms the dispute occurred in California.
- PC was employed full-time, in person, at United Drain and Plumbing in Bellflower, LA County.
- PC began working on November 22, 2022 (referred to as Start Date).
- PC's final rate of pay was approximately \$20 per hour, with around 40+ hours of work per week.
- PC did not sign a severance agreement upon leaving.

#### 3. Workers' Compensation Claim

- PC has an ongoing workers' compensation case for a head injury but clarifies it is separate from any wrongful termination claim.

## Case Name: 2056 John Doe 5

### 4. Termination

- PC indicates the Termination date was around late March or early April 2023. There is some uncertainty about the exact date.

### 5. Workplace Injuries & Incident with Supervisor

- PC slipped and fell on a prior occasion while doing underground leakage work in the rain, injuring his back/buttocks.

- Later, PC's hand was allegedly smashed by John Doe, a supervisor at United Drain and Plumbing. This incident pinched flesh from PC's hand.

- PC reported the injury to the "owner's son," who dismissed it.

- PC states that cameras may have recorded the report or the aftermath.

- The following day, PC was informed of Termination—allegedly prompted by John Doe threatening not to return to work unless PC was fired.

### 6. Alleged Harassment

- PC describes ongoing harassment from John Doe, including insulting remarks about PC's appearance (calling him "fat" or "ugly"), telling PC not to talk to clients, and making drunken, sometimes threatening phone calls after work hours.

- PC mentions that John Doe once called him claiming to have a gun and demanding a ride from a bar.

- PC states no formal HR complaint was filed, but PC verbally informed the "owner's son" of John Doe's behavior.

### 7. Break/Meal Period Issues

- PC claims the employer rarely provided timely breaks or lunches.

- PC asked the boss about breaks and was told to consider drive time from one job site to another as the "break."

- PC believes this violates California's meal and rest break laws.

### 8. Unpaid Overtime & Timesheet Alteration

- PC was allegedly required to start work at 7 AM to prepare the shop but had official start times changed to 8 AM by a "shop manager."

- PC also believes the timesheets were falsified to indicate that breaks and lunches were taken at standard times, even when they were not.

### 9. Disability & Accommodations

- PC indicates having a disability (nature undisclosed) and states there was some form of accommodation. PC believes Termination still followed soon after the hand-smashing incident and confrontation with John Doe.

## Case Name: 2056 John Doe 5

### 10. Final Pay

- PC received final pay but does not believe he received compensation for the unrecorded hour of daily work or missed break periods.

### 11. Job Search Assistance

- The representative asks if PC would be interested in job placement and resume help, to which PC agrees.

### 12. Next Steps

- PC consents to have the information shared with attorneys in the Employee Advocate Services network.
- PC is informed to expect contact within 4–48 hours.

---

### Conclusion

From the information PC provided, the strongest potential claims appear to revolve around wage and hour violations, retaliation (for reporting unpaid wages or workplace injuries), harassment (though it may not be based on a protected characteristic, more details are needed), and possibly disability discrimination if PC can establish that the disability or accommodations played a role in the decision to terminate. There is also a question of workers' compensation retaliation since PC was injured on the job and had a pending workers' comp case.

If further facts do not support any of the above legal theories—particularly the link to a protected class or a specific legal protection—there may not be a valid legal claim for discrimination under FEHA or Title VII, although other claims (wage/hour and retaliation) could still proceed.

All final determinations would depend on additional evidence and a detailed legal evaluation by a qualified California employment attorney.

**Case Name: 2047 Jane Doe 4**

**Date of Call: March 20, 2025**

**State / City / County:** 3210 West Pico Blvd, Los Angeles, CA 90019 – Los Angeles County

**Employer name and number of employees:** SunRay Healthcare Center  
101 - 500

**Hire date:** 02/01/2024

**Fire date:** 03/25/2025

**Last position held and wage paid:** Licensed Nurse / Charge Nurse  
Hourly \$42

## Case Summary

SUMMARY OF CALL (WITH “PC” SUBSTITUTION AND KEY DETAILS HIGHLIGHTED)

[Apr 2, 2025], [Jane Doe] spoke with PC regarding a possible wrongful termination or employment dispute. The call was recorded for qualification and training purposes. Jane Doe clarified that she is not an attorney and cannot provide legal advice.

1. Start Date / Initial Employment
  - o PC began working at a healthcare facility (referred to here as “the Facility”) around [February 2025] (exact date not confirmed).
  - o PC held the position of Licensed Nurse/Charge Nurse, earning an hourly rate of \$42.
2. Work Environment and Write-Ups
  - o PC mentioned working approximately 40–50 hours weekly.
  - o PC received at least one prior Write-up for a medication documentation error. PC stated that this error had already been addressed by a previous Director of Nursing, yet it was brought up again later, suggesting possible repeated scrutiny or targeting.
3. Discrimination and Hostile Environment
  - o PC reported ongoing tension with a [Quality Assurance Nurse] (name unclear in the transcript).
  - o PC alleged that this individual used discriminatory language, specifically referencing “you people” when addressing PC (who is Black) and another Black colleague.
  - o PC believed these statements contributed to a hostile work environment and indicated Discrimination based on race.
  - o PC mentioned reporting these statements to administration; however, PC stated there was no meaningful response or follow-up from management.
4. Forging Signature Incident and Potential Retaliation

## Case Name: 2047 Jane Doe 4

- o PC discovered that the Quality Assurance Nurse allegedly forged PC's signature on crash cart logs. [Beginning of 2025].
  - o PC reported this forgery to the [Administrator] at the Facility. PC did not receive a response, so PC then reported the incident to the [Board of Nursing].
  - o After that report, PC noticed increased scrutiny from the Quality Assurance Nurse, including frequent check-ups and taking pictures during rounds.
  - o PC perceived these actions as Retaliation for reporting misconduct.
5. Suspension and Termination
- o On [March 20, 2025], PC received a phone call while off duty. The Administrator notified PC of a suspension over an allegation of being intoxicated on the job on [March 1, 2025].
  - o PC stated the Facility provided no formal proof, no drug/alcohol test, and did not follow standard investigation procedures for suspected intoxication.
  - o PC believes this accusation was fabricated or heavily influenced by the Quality Assurance Nurse, given the prior complaint PC filed against him.
  - o HR personnel from corporate were present on the day PC was formally terminated. PC indicated that the decision seemed aligned with the Quality Assurance Nurse's ongoing attempts to have PC fired.
6. FMLA / Medical Leave / Performance Plan
- o PC did not mention using FMLA or any other medical leave, nor was there discussion of a specific Performance Plan in place.
  - o PC did not indicate any workplace injuries or health conditions requiring leave.

---

## CONCLUSION

From PC's statements, there appear to be potential claims related to Discrimination, Retaliation, and Wrongful Termination under California law (FEHA, Labor Code §1102.5, public policy violations), as well as a potential defamation element concerning the intoxication allegation. Further review of evidence (documents, witness statements, HR records) would be needed to assess the strength of these claims.

**Case Name: 2042 John Doe 6**

**Date of Call: March 15, 2025**

**State / City / County:** 1105 North Lincoln Street, Stockton, CA 95203

**Employer name and number of employees:** Dameron Hospital  
500+

**Last position held and wage paid:** Payroll Coordinator  
Hourly at approximately \$29.98-\$29.99

**Hire date:** 01/05/2021

**Fire date:** 02/04/2025

**Potential Violations:**

- Discrimination
- Retaliation
- Wrongful Termination
- Other: Employer denied reasonable accommodation and presented PC with an ultimatum (resign or be fired)

## Case Summary

SUMMARY (in Chronological Order, Using Third Person, with Confidential Caller Name as "PC")

- Name: John Doe (caller from Employee Advocate Services)
- Name: PC (the individual seeking assistance; original caller's name replaced for confidentiality)
- Name: John Doe 2 (PC's previous supervisor)

### 1. Start Date (January 2021)

- PC began employment in January 2021 as a Payroll Coordinator. They worked on-site at a hospital in California for approximately 40 hours per week, earning an hourly rate near \$29.98-\$29.99.

### 2. Diagnosis and First Medical Leave (End of 2023 – October 15, 2024)

- PC was diagnosed with cancer at the end of 2023.
- PC took FMLA leave beginning around November 8, 2023, for surgery, chemotherapy, and radiation.
- The leave lasted nearly a year, and PC returned to work on October 15, 2024.

### 3. Second Surgery and Termination (January – February 4, 2025)

- In January 2025, PC informed the employer they required a second surgery, which would necessitate another short leave.
- The employer stated PC had already exhausted FMLA and could not be accommodated again. Although it was a short leave.
- The employer told PC to either forgo surgery, resign, or be terminated. PC declined to resign, as the surgery was medically necessary.
- On February 4, 2025, the employer terminated PC. PC's final paycheck and paperwork were provided on the same day.

### 4. Final Surgery Date (February 5, 2025)

- PC had the second surgery on February 5, 2025.

## Case Name: 2042 John Doe 6

### KEY TERMS & DETAILS

- FMLA: PC initially took FMLA leave for cancer treatment but was denied additional leave for a second surgery.
- Medical Leave: The second surgery was required in February 2025, but no additional leave was granted.
- Termination: Effective February 4, 2025, after the employer refused further accommodation.
- HR Involvement: PC was moved under the HR department upon returning from the first leave, but no formal complaint was filed with HR.
- Discrimination / Harassment: PC did not report or perceive overt harassment or discrimination based on a protected characteristic (aside from the leave accommodation issue).
- Write-Ups / Performance Plan: PC did not mention any formal write-ups or performance improvement plans.
- Retaliation: No explicit claim of retaliation was made, though PC felt forced to choose between essential medical care and continued employment.

---

This summary is based solely on PC's statements during the call. It does not constitute legal advice. Further analysis by a qualified attorney would be necessary to determine the viability and strength of any legal claims.

**Case Name: 2136 John Doe 7**

**Date of Call: March 19, 2025**

**State / City / County:** 8626 Elder Creek Road, Sacramento, CA 95828

**Hire date:** 02/01/2024

**Employer name and number of employees:** ASG, 25-50

**Fire date:** 04/08/2024

**Last position held and wage paid:** Level One Field Tech  
Hourly, at a rate of \$21/hour

**Potential Violations:**

- Retaliation
- Wage & hour disputes
- Wrongful Termination
- Hurt on the job

## Case Summary

Below is a concise summary of the phone call in chronological order. All names and dates appear highlighted to ensure clarity and easy reference. Throughout the summary, the caller is referred to as PC to maintain confidentiality. The narration is in the third person, focusing on key incidents, dates, and any potential legal violations based on California wrongful termination laws.

---

### Chronological Summary

#### 1. Initial Contact

- [NAME: John Doe] from Employee Advocate Services contacted PC on a recorded line on [DATE OF CALL: Not Specified in Transcript].

- John Doe explained their role is to gather information about potential employment disputes and share it with attorneys in the network. PC consented to have the information shared.

#### 2. Employment Details

- PC stated they worked for [NAME: ASG Allstate Sales Group], a fiber optic company in Sacramento, California, located at [ADDRESS REDACTED].

- PC was employed full-time, approximately 40 to 55 hours per week, at an hourly rate of \$21 as a Level One Field Tech.

- PC believes the start date was in [DATE: Late January or Early February 2024].

- PC was terminated in [DATE: April 2024].

#### 3. Workplace Injury

- PC reported being injured on the job on [DATE: April 1 or 2, 2024], when an air compressor hose struck them in the groin.

- PC took two days off and then attempted to return to work. PC contacted the safety manager, their boss, and the temp agency to discuss light duty and their return.

## Case Name: 2136 John Doe 7

### 4. Termination Circumstances

- After about a week of back-and-forth regarding light duty, PC was informed they were terminated for being a no call, no show.
- PC disputes this, claiming to have text messages and emails proving they maintained regular contact with management and the temp agency.
- PC never received any workers' compensation paperwork despite requesting it.

### 5. Wages and Final Pay

- PC stated they did not receive their final paycheck.
- PC also mentioned the employer had initially approved paid sick leave (two or three days) but then took it back.
- PC has written evidence indicating approval and subsequent revocation of sick pay.

### 6. Witnesses

- PC mentioned three coworkers—[NAME: John Doe 2], [NAME: John Doe 3], and [NAME: John Doe 4]—are aware of the situation and may be willing to provide statements.

### 7. Other Matters

- PC denied experiencing discrimination or harassment while working; however, PC now questions whether the termination may have involved unfair treatment.
- PC confirmed they did not file any HR or supervisor complaints prior to being fired.
- PC indicated they were represented briefly by another law firm, which later decided not to proceed without providing detailed reasons.

### 8. Consent for Attorney Review

- PC gave consent for John Doe to share details of the case with attorneys who specialize in California employment law.

---

### Conclusion

In summary, PC worked at [NAME: ASG Allstate Sales Group] from [DATE: Late January or Early February 2024] until [DATE: April 2024], sustained an on-the-job injury on [DATE: April 1 or 2, 2024], attempted to return under light duty, and was ultimately terminated for alleged no call, no show. PC disputes this reason, notes missing final pay, and highlights unaddressed workers' compensation procedures. Although PC did not explicitly claim discrimination or harassment, there are possible wage and hour and retaliation issues related to the workplace injury and final pay.

**Case Name: 2136 John Doe 7**

Should you need to explore these or any other additional legal avenues, the documented communication (emails, texts) and witnesses ([NAME: John Doe 2], [NAME: John Doe 3], [NAME: John Doe 4]) could be pivotal. If no other protected factors or legal violations come to light, the primary concerns remain non-payment of final wages, potential retaliation for a workplace injury, and sick-pay violations.

**Case Name:** 2142 Jane Doe 5

**Date of Call:** March 21, 2025

**State / City / County:** 2515 Venture Oaks Way, Suite 200, Sacramento, CA 95833

**Hire date:** 05/02/2019

**Fire date:** 06/23/2023

**Employer name and number of employees:** CCPOA BTF, 25-50

**Last position held and wage paid:** Dental Claims Processor / Representative  
Hourly, \$35 per hour

**Potential Violations:**

- Discrimination
- Hostile work environment
- Wrongful Termination

## Case Summary

### Chronology of Events

#### 1. Medical/Disability Issues

- o PC developed severe hip tears (both hips), experiencing difficulty sitting for prolonged periods. (the injury not work related)
- o PC also faced hemorrhoid complications, ultimately leading to a colonoscopy.
- o PC's doctor recommended medical leave for necessary surgeries and recovery.

#### 2. Transition to Medical Leave

- o Around May 2023, PC agreed—together with the employer—to take disability leave because PC's condition prevented sitting eight hours daily.
- o PC intended to undergo surgery and then return to work.

#### 3. Coworker & Supervisor Conflicts Before Termination

- o Two coworkers, Jane Doe and Jane Doe 2, worked on the "disability side" of claims. Jane Doe befriended PC on Instagram, but PC later removed Jane Doe, prompting tension.
- o PC verbally complained to two supervisors—Jane Doe 3 and Jane Doe 4—about Jane Doe and Jane Doe2's gossiping or inattention to work. PC reports no formal written complaint was made; the supervisors took minimal action.

#### 4. Snapchat Incident

- o Another coworker, Jane Doe6, briefly stayed at PC's home for personal reasons about one week before PC's termination. During that visit, Jane Doe6 recorded a 5-second Snapchat video showing PC moving their arms while seated in the kitchen.
- o The employer later used this footage to allege PC was "lying" about hip-related pain.

## Case Name: 2142 Jane Doe 5

5. Termination (June 2023)
  - o Roughly 1–2 months into PC's disability leave, the employer abruptly fired PC.
  - o Management claimed the Snapchat video proved PC did not truly require leave.
  - o PC offered doctor's notes, MRI scans, and other medical documentation, but the employer refused further discussion, stating "no need" for additional proof.
6. Final Pay & Insurance
  - o PC received the final paycheck the same day of termination.
  - o PC lost employer-based health coverage but managed to switch onto a spouse's insurance to complete the required surgery.

---

### Conclusion

Based on the transcript, PC contends they were wrongfully terminated after taking medical leave for severe hip issues. Relevant California employment claims may include:

- Disability Discrimination / Failure to Accommodate (ADA/FEHA)
- Wrongful Termination under FMLA/CFRA if the leave qualified for protection and was improperly denied or cut short
- Retaliation for using or intending to use disability/medical leave