THE FELDMAN LAW FIRM PROFESSIONAL LAW CORPORATION

Stuart Cohen (SBN 213810) FELDMAN BROWNE OLIVARES, APC 12400 Wilshire Boulevard, Suite 1100 Los Angeles, California 90025 Telephone: (310) 207-8500 Fax: (310) 207-8515 Email: lee@leefeldmanlaw.com Attorneys for Plaintiff, LINDSAY BUCKLEY LINDSAY BUCKLEY, an individual, Plaintiff, v. SOULCYCLE, INC., a New York corporation; EQUINOX HOLDINGS, INC., a New York Corporation: ANGELA DAVIS, an individual and DOES 1 through 100, Inclusive. Defendants. 27

Lee Feldman (SBN 171628)

Superior Court Of California County Of Los Angeles

MAY 30 2017

Sherri R. Carter, Executive Officer/Clerk

SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA **COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES**

BC 6 6 3 1 8 8 CASE NO.

COMPLAINT FOR DAMAGES FOR

- HARASSMENT IN VIOLATION OF THE FAIR EMPLOYMENT AND HOUSING ACT ("FEHA") [GOV. CODE. § 12940(j)(1)];
- 2. RETALIATION IN VIOLATION OF FEHA [GOV. CODE. § 12940(h)];
- VIOLATIONS OF CALIFORNIA'S PREGNANCY DISABILITY LEAVE LAW ("PDLL") [GOV. CODE. § 12945, et. seq.l;
- RACE AND PREGNANCY DISCRIMINATION IN VIOLATION OF FEHA [GOV CODE § 12940(a)];
- **FAILURE TO PREVENT** HARASSMENT, DISCRIMANA FION AND RETALIATION IN VIOLATION
- INTENTIONAL INFLICTION **EMOTIONAL DISTRESS**;
- **DEFAMATION** 7.
- **FALSE LIGHT**

DEMAND FOR JURY TRIALE

*** 288

COMPLAINT FOR DAMAGES AND DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL

Plaintiff LINDSAY BUCKLEY alleges as follows:

GENERAL ALLEGATIONS

- 1. Plaintiff LINDSAY BUCKLEY (hereinafter referred to as "BUCKLEY" or "Plaintiff") is, and at all times herein mentioned was an individual residing in Los Angeles County, and working at Defendants' Los Angeles County locations, in the State of California.
- 2. Defendant SOULCYCLE, INC. ("SOULCYCLE"), is, and at all relevant times herein mentioned was a corporation headquartered in New York which is and was authorized to and conducting business in California.
- 3. Defendant EQUINOX HOLDINGS, INC. ("EQUINOX"), is, and at all relevant times herein mentioned was a corporation headquartered in New York which is and was authorized to and conducting business in California.
- 4. Upon information and belief, Defendant SOULCYCLE, INC. and EQUINOX HOLDINGS, INC. (hereinafter collectively referred to as "Defendants" or "SOULCYCLE/EQUINOX") were joint employers of Plaintiff and constitute an integrated enterprise, sharing labor and Human Resources functions for employees of SOULCYCLE like Plaintiff. At all relevant times, SOULCYCLE/EQUINOX and Does 1-50, inclusive, and each of them, were "employers" within the meaning of Gov. Code, sections 12926(d) and 12940 (The Fair Employment and Housing Act, or "FEHA"), in that they regularly employed five or more persons at all times relevant to this lawsuit.
- 5. Defendant ANGELA DAVIS is, and at all times herein mentioned was an individual residing in Los Angeles County, and working at defendants' Los Angeles County locations, in the State of California.
- 6. Plaintiff is ignorant of the true names and capacities of Defendants sued herein as DOES 1 through 100, inclusive, and therefore sues these Defendants by such fictitious names. Plaintiff will amend this complaint to allege their true names and capacities when ascertained. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and thereon alleges that each of the fictitiously named Defendants is responsible for the alleged occurrences and injuries to Plaintiff.
 - 7. Unless otherwise alleged in this complaint, Plaintiff is informed and believes, and on

that basis alleges, that each Defendant acted in concert with each and every other Defendant, intended to and did participate in events, acts, practices and courses of conduct alleged herein, and was a proximate cause of the damages and injury thereby to Plaintiff, as alleged herein.

8. Venue is proper under California Government Code section 12965(b) and California Code of Civil Procedure section 395 in that Defendants reside within this jurisdiction, Plaintiff's injuries were incurred within this jurisdiction, and the acts giving rise to this action occurred, in whole or in substantial part, in the County of Los Angeles, in the State of California. Sub-venue is also proper in the Central District pursuant to Los Angeles Superior Court Local Rule 2.0(c).

EXHAUSTION OF ADMINISRATIVE PROCEEDINGS

9. Plaintiff exhausted her administrative remedies by timely filing complaints against each of the named defendants with the California Department of Fair Employment & Housing ("DFEH"), and thereafter receiving "Right to Sue" letters from the DFEH.

COMMON FACTUAL ALLEGATIONS

- 10. Plaintiff, LINDSAY BUCKLEY was literally the "Poster Girl" and head cheerleader for defendant SOULCYCLE; she was featured in their advertising posters and was given a stipend to purchase and wear their clothing and market the brand on social media. She was a loyal and devoted employee from June 2013 until her wrongful termination on January 23, 2017. Her hard work, dedication and contribution to the company were recognized through annual raises, ongoing praise from management; Plaintiff was also a model instructor for other SOULCYCLE instructors. Less than two weeks before her termination she was promoted to Senior Instructor, a position shared by defendant ANGELA DAVIS.
- 11. Plaintiff received consistent praise and accolades at SOULCYCLE until shortly after the November 2016 Presidential election. Around November 10, 2016, days after the Presidential election that had caused many west-side riders to become depressed, Plaintiff made her usual positive "pep talk" in class, hoping to inspire people to see the good in their own lives and bodies.
- 12. Upon information and belief, one of defendant DAVIS' friends was in the class that day and told DAVIS what Plaintiff had said immediately after leaving the class. DAVIS (erroneously) took Plaintiff's comments as "pro-Trump" and concluded that Plaintiff was racist.

DAVIS immediately called the front desk at the studio where Plaintiff was working and told the front desk person (who was Hispanic) that she had heard what Plaintiff had said in class and was outraged. DAVIS told the front desk person: "You don't know what it's like to be a minority – you need to relay to LINDSAY [BUCKLEY] that she needs to shut up; she's offending people."

- she was judging Plaintiff a racist Trump supporter simply because she was a blonde, Caucasian woman from Orange County who dared to say something positive and inspirational in her class a couple days after the election. Stunned and dismayed by DAVIS' conduct, which was relayed to her by the front desk person, Plaintiff drove to SOULCYCLE's West Coast corporate office in Culver City and spoke with Heather Leckie, the Company's Los Angeles HR Manager and Caitlin Grams, the Regional Manager. Plaintiff recounted DAVIS' conduct and said she felt ANGELA had (falsely) presumed she was a Trump supporter and attacked her "because of the color of my skin." Ms. Leckie responded: "This is typical Angela; *I will talk to her*." But Plaintiff's complaint to Ms. Leckie (and Ms. Grams) only exacerbated the situation. At each opportunity, DAVIS continued her false allegations of racism and, in retaliation for Plaintiff's racial harassment complaint against her, she mounted a racially motivated smear campaign to get rid of Plaintiff, even if DAVIS' smear campaign was based on false information.
- 14. On or about January 12, 2017, the company received complaint/s mistakenly alleging that Plaintiff had used an explicit lyric, the n-word, contained in a Rihanna song that was playing during class. The company investigated and learned from many SOULCYCLE riders in the class that Plaintiff did not say any such thing and that it would have been completely out of character for her to do so. Accordingly, SOULCYCLE's Director of Programming verbally counseled Plaintiff on January 13, 2017 and told her, "if we hear feedback like this *again*, it will result in a written warning and possible suspension". DAVIS apparently did not like the company's response; upon information and belief, DAVIS actively solicited customers, friends and coworkers to falsely accuse Plaintiff of making racially offensive comments in class (and being a racist), including asking at least one customers to lie to the company about what Plaintiff said in class.

- 15. Upon information and belief, DAVIS learned of the discipline Defendants had decided to impose and launched a campaign to pressure Defendants to fire Plaintiff, including telling instructors and customers alike that Plaintiff is "racist" and recruiting other instructors and customers to advocate for firing Plaintiff. Upon information and belief, DAVIS also called on other minority instructors to boycott work if Plaintiff was reinstated and told a customer who was actually present in the class in question that Plaintiff had used the n-word. Although that customer replied: "No. She didn't. I was there", DAVIS persisted in slandering Plaintiff with false accusations of using the n-word and being racist.
- 16. After DAVIS started interfering in and influencing the company's investigation, Plaintiff's verbal counseling suddenly morphed into a 5 day suspension (from January 15-20, 2017), in part for playing music with explicit lyrics, including the n-word, even though minority Instructors, including DAVIS herself, not only routinely played songs containing the n-word, but also posted those songs on their playlists on SOULCYCLE's corporate website. Upon information and belief, DAVIS was never disciplined for playing songs with the "n-word" in them or posting those songs on the company's website. Apparently, Defendants only selectively enforce their written "zero-tolerance" policy for playing such "explicit lyrics" based on the race of the employee violating the policy.
- 17. While Plaintiff was serving her suspension, she heard that DAVIS was seeking to influence the investigation and was telling people she was a racist. Plaintiff spoke to HR Manager Amy Toppen and reminded Ms. Toppen of her November 2016 complaint to HR manager Heather Leckie. Plaintiff told Ms. Toppen that DAVIS had verbally attacked her (to another employee) because she was Caucasian and DAVIS had (falsely) assumed she must be a Trump supporter and a racist. Plaintiff said to Toppen that perhaps DAVIS was still angry over Plaintiff's complaint to Leckie and the aftermath of that complaint. Thus, if she hadn't known before, Toppen was now well-aware that DAVIS' animosity against Plaintiff likely stemmed from Plaintiff's prior accusation of racial bias against DAVIS in November of 2016.
- 18. Also during Plaintiff's suspension, riders from Plaintiff's class told SOULCYCLE that Plaintiff had never used any racial language, much less the n-word, in class (on 1/12 or any other

occasion). One African American male customer told SOULCYCLE that he was present in the 1/12/17 class and Plaintiff never used the n-word or said anything even remotely racial. This customer told SOULCYCLE that he had been asked to lie by one of DAVIS' friends. This rider also told SOULCYCLE that even after he told DAVIS' friend that Plaintiff never said the word, she replied (in sum and substance): "We need you to say you heard it." This African American rider also told SOULCYCLE that the campaign to railroad Plaintiff was "reverse discrimination."

19. The only other African American rider in Plaintiff's class on the day she was accused of using the n-word told Soul Cycle:

I felt the need to send this email because of the terrible accusations made against one of your teachers, Lindsey Buckley. I attended the class in question that she was allegedly accused of using the "N" word. I can tell you right now that absolutely is NOT TRUE. I was riding front row and never once did she ever use that word. I think people may have gotten confused because there was a particular Rihanna song that she was playing and that word is used in that song. I pay attention to everything my instructors say I n class because that is a huge part of the soul cycle experience. Had she said that word i would have definitely known and would have been equally offended especially because i am an African American woman and would never tolerate that word being used from anyone. Lindsay Buckley is an inspirational instructor who has always preached positivity and equality for all people. It is one of the main reasons why i love taking her class. ...

20. Despite being told by both African American riders who attended the class in question that Plaintiff never said the word and they would not have tolerated any such language if she had, and despite being told by one of those African American riders that a friend of Angela Davis' friends had asked him to falsely accuse Plaintiff, SOULCYCLE never investigated the possibility that DAVIS was behind the complaints and false accusations about Plaintiff. SOUL CYCLE and EQUINOX never asked those who advocated for Plaintiff's dismissal whether they had been contacted by DAVIS and pressured to lie. SOULCYCLE and EQUINOX simply accepted DAVIS' slanderous racism accusations, bowed to her threats and demands, and fired Plaintiff for the same conduct for which she had already received lesser discipline. Apart from DAVIS' threats and baseless second and third hand accusations, SOULCYCLE learned nothing inculpatory from the time it had decided to give Plaintiff a verbal warning until the time they decided to fire her. In fact, the only actual new information that SOULCYCLE received were first hand exculpatory accounts from

percipient witnesses and a statement from an African American rider that ANGELA's friend had asked him to lie to get Plaintiff fired.

FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION FOR HARASSMENT IN VIOLATION OF GOVERNMENT CODE 12940(j)(1) (As Against All Defendants)

- 21. Plaintiff repeats and repleads all allegations contained in paragraphs 1 through 19 inclusive, above, as though fully set forth in this cause of action.
- As set forth above, Plaintiff was subjected to a campaign of racially motivated harassment orchestrated and perpetrated by defendant DAVIS, which was severe or pervasive enough to create a hostile or abusive work environment, including but not limited to slanderous accusations of racism (made to numerous customers, colleagues and managers at SOULCYCLE) directed at Plaintiff solely because she is a Blonde Caucasian woman from Orange County whom DAVIS (wrongly) perceived as a Donald Trump supporter.
- 23. A reasonable person in Plaintiff's circumstances would have considered the work environment to be hostile or abusive.
- 24. As set forth above, management was aware of the harassing conduct and failed to take immediate and corrective action.
- 25. That as a proximate result of the acts of Defendants, and each of them, as described above, Plaintiff has suffered and will continue to suffer economic damages, including lost wages, lost benefits, loss of promotional opportunity, medical expenses, and other compensatory damages in an amount to be ascertained at the time of trial.
- 26. That as a direct and proximate result of the acts of Defendants, and each of them, as alleged above, Plaintiff has suffered and will continue to suffer mental, emotional, and physical distress, including but not limited to humiliation, anxiety, nervousness, depression, sleeplessness, and has been generally damaged in an amount to be ascertained at the time of trial and will necessarily expend sums in the future for the treatment of the physical, emotional and mental injuries sustained by Plaintiff as a result of said Defendants' acts in an amount to be ascertained at the time of trial. Upon information and belief, the aforementioned stress and anxiety caused by unlawful

harassment, discrimination, retaliation and slander during Plaintiff's pregnancy contributed to Plaintiff's loss of her unborn child.

- 27. That as a direct and proximate result of the conduct of Defendants, and each of them, Plaintiff was forced to incur substantial costs and attorney's fees; that under Gov. Code § 12965(b), Plaintiff is entitled to recover reasonable attorney's fees according to proof at the time of trial.
- 28. That the acts of Defendants, and each of them, which were carried out by managing agents, were intentional, willful and malicious and done in conscious disregard of Plaintiff's rights, safety and well-being and with the intent to vex, injure and annoy Plaintiff, as such Plaintiff requests that exemplary and punitive damages be assessed against each of these defendants in an amount sufficient to punish Defendants and to deter others from engaging in similar conduct. For example, Defendants' conduct in fabricating pretextual reasons for a termination motivated by discrimination and retaliatory animus, constitutes malicious conduct in conscious disregard of Plaintiff's rights and safety. In particular, the corporate defendants had ample information from which to conclude that DAVIS was falsely accusing Plaintiff of racism and encouraging others to lie in order to get Plaintiff fired, but failed and refused to conduct a fair, thorough and competent investigation to ascertain the truth before acceding to DAVIS' demands and firing Plaintiff.

SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION FOR RETALIATION IN VIOLATION OF GOVERNMENT CODE 12940(h) (As Against SOULCYCLE/EQUINOX and DOES 1-50)

- 29. Plaintiff repeats and repleads all allegations contained in paragraphs 1 through 27 inclusive, above, as though fully set forth in this cause of action.
- 30. Plaintiff engaged in protected activity under FEHA by, amongst other things, opposing perceived racial harassment by DAVIS in November of 2016 in her meeting with Heather Leckie and Caitlin Grams. She engaged in additional protected activity in January of 2017. Between 1/12/17 and 1/20/17, when Plaintiff learned that DAVIS was accusing her of racism and pressuring SOULCYCLE to terminate her, Plaintiff spoke to HR Manager Amy Toppen and reminded her of her November 2016 complaint to HR manager Heather Leckie. Plaintiff told Ms. Toppen that DAVIS had verbally attacked her (to another employee) because she was Caucasian and DAVIS had

2

3

4

5

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

(falsely) assumed she must be a Trump supporter and a racist. Plaintiff said to Toppen that perhaps DAVIS was still angry over Plaintiff's complaint to Leckie and the aftermath of that complaint. A few days later, Ms. Toppen informed Plaintif she was being fired.

- Defendants retaliated against Plaintiff by disciplining her for conduct for which employees of other races were not subjected to discipline or were subjected to lesser discipline. Defendants further retaliated against Plaintiff by firing her for conduct they had not bothered to fully, fairly or competently investigate despite having ample evidence that DAVIS had recruited employees and customers to lie and falsely accuse Plaintiff of racism.
- 32. Plaintiff is informed and believes that her above-mentioned FEHA-protected complaint/s were a substantial motivating reason for Defendants' decision to terminate plaintiff in violation of Gov. Code, § 12940(h) and 2 Cal. Code of Regs., § 7287.8.
- 33. That as a proximate result of the acts of Defendants, and each of them, as described above, Plaintiff has suffered and will continue to suffer economic damages, including lost wages, lost benefits, loss of promotional opportunity, medical expenses, and other compensatory damages in an amount to be ascertained at the time of trial.
- 34. That as a direct and proximate result of the acts of Defendants, and each of them, as alleged above, Plaintiff has suffered and will continue to suffer mental, emotional, and physical distress, including but not limited to humiliation, anxiety, nervousness, depression, sleeplessness, and has been generally damaged in an amount to be ascertained at the time of trial and will necessarily expend sums in the future for the treatment of the physical, emotional and mental injuries sustained by Plaintiff as a result of said Defendants' acts in an amount to be ascertained at the time of trial. Upon information and belief, the aforementioned stress and anxiety caused by unlawful harassment, discrimination, retaliation and slander during Plaintiff's pregnancy contributed to Plaintiff's loss of her unborn child.
- 35. That as a direct and proximate result of the conduct of Defendants, and each of them, Plaintiff was forced to incur substantial costs and attorney's fees; that under Gov. Code § 12965(b), Plaintiff is entitled to recover reasonable attorney's fees according to proof at the time of trial.

///

///

36. That the acts of Defendants, and each of them, which were carried out by managing agents, were intentional, willful and malicious and done in conscious disregard of Plaintiff's rights, safety and well-being and with the intent to vex, injure and annoy Plaintiff, as such Plaintiff requests that exemplary and punitive damages be assessed against each of these defendants in an amount sufficient to punish Defendants and to deter others from engaging in similar conduct. For example, Defendants' conduct in fabricating pretextual reasons for a termination motivated by discrimination and retaliatory animus, constitutes malicious conduct in conscious disregard of Plaintiff's rights and safety. In particular, the corporate defendants had ample information from which to conclude that DAVIS was falsely accusing Plaintiff of racism and encouraging others to lie in order to get Plaintiff fired, but failed and refused to conduct a fair, thorough and competent investigation to ascertain the truth before acceding to DAVIS' demands and firing Plaintiff.

THIRD CAUSE OF ACTION FOR VIOLATIONS OF CALIFORNIA'S PREGNANCY DISABILITY LEAVE LAW (PDLL) (GOVERNMENT CODE §12945 ET SEQ.) (As Against SOULCYCLE/EQUINOX and DOES 1-50)

- 37. Plaintiff repeats and repleads, and incorporates herein by this reference, paragraphs 1 through 35 above, inclusive, as though fully set forth herein.
- 38. As detailed above, Plaintiff was initially issued a verbal warning based on complaints about her either playing or saying explicit lyrics during a 1/12/17 class. Thereafter, she disclosed to Human Resources that she was pregnant. Within days she was terminated based on the same complaints that had previously been used to justify a verbal warning.
- 39. Upon information and belief, Defendants knew that Plaintiff would need pregnancy-related accommodations and time off guaranteed by the PDLL (Gov. Code Section 12945 and Cal. Code Regs. tit. 2, § 11042) at the time it terminated her employment.
- 40. It is an unlawful employment practice under Gov. Code, § 12945(a)(4) "[f]or an employer to interfere with, restrain, or deny the exercise of, or the attempt to exercise, any right

provided under this section."

- 41. In violation of Government Code § 12940(h) and 12945(a), Defendants terminated Plaintiff in substantial part to avoid giving her the pregnancy-related accommodation/s and leave she would have been entitled to under PDLL and, in doing so, interfered with her rights under the PDLL, and discriminated and retaliated against Plaintiff because she put Defendants on notice that she would be exercising her rights under the PDLL.
- 42. That as a proximate result of the acts of Defendants, and each of them, as described above, Plaintiff has suffered and will continue to suffer economic damages, including lost wages, lost benefits, loss of promotional opportunity, medical expenses, and other compensatory damages in an amount to be ascertained at the time of trial.
- 43. That as a direct and proximate result of the acts of Defendants, and each of them, as alleged above, Plaintiff has suffered and will continue to suffer mental, emotional, and physical distress, including but not limited to humiliation, anxiety, nervousness, depression, sleeplessness, and has been generally damaged in an amount to be ascertained at the time of trial and will necessarily expend sums in the future for the treatment of the physical, emotional and mental injuries sustained by Plaintiff as a result of said Defendants' acts in an amount to be ascertained at the time of trial. Upon information and belief, the aforementioned stress and anxiety caused by unlawful harassment, discrimination, retaliation and slander during Plaintiff's pregnancy contributed to Plaintiff's loss of her unborn child.
- 44. That as a direct and proximate result of the conduct of Defendants, and each of them, Plaintiff was forced to incur substantial costs and attorney's fees; that under Gov. Code § 12965(b), Plaintiff is entitled to recover reasonable attorney's fees according to proof at the time of trial. That the acts of Defendants, and each of them, which were carried out by managing agents, were intentional, willful and malicious and done in conscious disregard of Plaintiff's rights, safety and well-being and with the intent to vex, injure and annoy Plaintiff, as such Plaintiff requests that exemplary and punitive damages be assessed against each of these defendants in an amount sufficient to punish Defendants and to deter others from engaging in similar conduct. For example, Defendants' conduct in fabricating pretextual reasons for a termination motivated by discrimination

.1

and retaliatory animus, constitutes malicious conduct in conscious disregard of Plaintiff's rights and safety. In particular, the corporate defendants had ample information from which to conclude that DAVIS was falsely accusing Plaintiff of racism and encouraging others to lie in order to get Plaintiff fired, but failed and refused to conduct a fair, thorough and competent investigation to ascertain the truth before acceding to DAVIS' demands and firing Plaintiff.

FOURTH CAUSE OF ACTION FOR RACE AND PREGNANCY DISCRIMINATION IN VIOLATION OF GOVERNMENT CODE 12940(a) (As Against SOULCYCLE/EQUINOX and DOES 1-50)

- 45. Plaintiff repeats, repleads, and incorporates by reference Paragraphs 1-43, inclusive, above, as though fully set forth in this cause of action.
- 46. As detailed above, in retaliation for Plaintiff's prior race complaint against her and because of her own racial bias against Plaintiff, whom she regarded as a racist Donald Trump supporter simply because she is a Blonde, Caucasian Orange County woman, defendant DAVIS instituted a campaign of slander and disinformation designed to pressure SOULCYLE to fire Plaintiff. Defendants SOULCYCLE, INC and EQUINOX HOLDINGS, INC., permitted themselves to be used as as DAVIS' "cat's paw" in acceding to her demands and firing Plaintiff based on the same alleged customer complaints for which they had previously decided to issue her a "verbal warning." In adopting and condoning DAVIS' racial animus and firing Plaintiff based on DAVIS' demands and false information, Defendants, and each of them, violated FEHA's prohibition against racial discrimination. As such, Plaintiff's race was a substantial motivating factor in the decision to fire her.
- 47. Plaintiff is also informed and believes and thereon alleges that her pregnancy was a substantial motivating factor in her discharge.
- 48. That as a proximate result of the acts of Defendants, and each of them, as described above, Plaintiff has suffered and will continue to suffer economic damages, including lost wages, lost benefits, loss of promotional opportunity, medical expenses, and other compensatory damages in an amount to be ascertained at the time of trial.

- 49. That as a direct and proximate result of the acts of Defendants, and each of them, as alleged above, Plaintiff has suffered and will continue to suffer mental, emotional, and physical distress, including but not limited to humiliation, anxiety, nervousness, depression, sleeplessness, and has been generally damaged in an amount to be ascertained at the time of trial and will necessarily expend sums in the future for the treatment of the physical, emotional and mental injuries sustained by Plaintiff as a result of said Defendants' acts in an amount to be ascertained at the time of trial. Upon information and belief, the aforementioned stress and anxiety caused by unlawful harassment, discrimination, retaliation and slander during Plaintiff's pregnancy contributed to Plaintiff's loss of her unborn child.
- 50. That as a direct and proximate result of the conduct of Defendants, and each of them, Plaintiff was forced to incur substantial costs and attorney's fees; that under Gov. Code § 12965(b), Plaintiff is entitled to recover reasonable attorney's fees according to proof at the time of trial.
- agents, were intentional, willful and malicious and done in conscious disregard of Plaintiff's rights, safety and well-being and with the intent to vex, injure and annoy Plaintiff, as such Plaintiff requests that exemplary and punitive damages be assessed against each of these defendants in an amount sufficient to punish Defendants and to deter others from engaging in similar conduct. For example, Defendants' conduct in fabricating pretextual reasons for a termination motivated by discrimination and retaliatory animus, constitutes malicious conduct in conscious disregard of Plaintiff's rights and safety. In particular, the corporate defendants had ample information from which to conclude that DAVIS was falsely accusing Plaintiff of racism and encouraging others to lie in order to get Plaintiff fired, but failed and refused to conduct a fair, thorough and competent investigation to ascertain the truth before acceding to DAVIS' demands and firing Plaintiff.

FIFTH CAUSE OF ACTION FOR FAILURE TO PREVENT HARASSMENT, DISCRIMINATION, AND RETALIATION IN VIOLATION OF GOV. CODE § 12940(k) (As Against SOULCYCLE/EQUINOX and DOES 1-50)

52. Plaintiff repeats and repleads and incorporates by this reference, paragraphs 1 through 50, inclusive, above, as though fully set forth herein.

- 53. An employer has an affirmative duty to take all reasonable steps necessary to prevent discrimination, and retaliation from occurring. (Gov. Code §12940(k); *Taylor v. City of Los Angeles Dept. of Water & Power* (2006) 144 Cal.App.4th 1216, 1240, disapproved on other grounds in *Torrey v. The Lodge at Torrey Pines Partnership* (2008) 42 Cal.4th 1158.) Such steps include discipline of harassers, training, adopting an anti-discrimination and anti-retaliation policy, and implementing those policies.
- 54. As set forth above, Plaintiff was harassed and discriminated against because of her race and/or pregnancy and she was retaliated against for engaging in protected activity.
- 55. As further set forth above, Defendants failed to take reasonable steps to prevent the harassment, discrimination and retaliation. Defendants also failed to adequately investigate evidence that DAVIS was seeking to orchestrate Plaintiff's dismissal because of her race and in retaliation for Plaintiff's protected complaint to HR about her in November of 2016.
- 56. In doing so, Defendants blatantly ignored their duty to prevent harassment, discrimination and retaliation and instead condoned and encouraged such unlawful conduct.
- 57. Defendants' breach of its duty to take all reasonable steps to prevent harassment, discrimination and retaliation from occurring was a substantial factor in causing Plaintiff's harm.
- 58. That as a proximate result of the acts of Defendants, and each of them, as described above, Plaintiff has suffered and will continue to suffer economic damages, including lost wages, lost benefits, loss of promotional opportunity, medical expenses, and other compensatory damages in an amount to be ascertained at the time of trial.
- 59. That as a direct and proximate result of the acts of Defendants, and each of them, as alleged above, Plaintiff has suffered and will continue to suffer mental, emotional, and physical distress, including but not limited to humiliation, anxiety, nervousness, depression, sleeplessness, and has been generally damaged in an amount to be ascertained at the time of trial and will necessarily expend sums in the future for the treatment of the physical, emotional and mental injuries sustained by Plaintiff as a result of said Defendants' acts in an amount to be ascertained at the time of trial. Upon information and belief, the aforementioned stress and anxiety caused by unlawful

harassment, discrimination, retaliation and slander during Plaintiff's pregnancy contributed to Plaintiff's loss of her unborn child.

Plaintiff was forced to incur substantial costs and attorney's fees; that under Gov. Code § 12965(b), Plaintiff is entitled to recover reasonable attorney's fees according to proof at the time of trial. That the acts of Defendants, and each of them, which were carried out by managing agents, were intentional, willful and malicious and done in conscious disregard of Plaintiff's rights, safety and well-being and with the intent to vex, injure and annoy Plaintiff, as such Plaintiff requests that exemplary and punitive damages be assessed against each of these defendants in an amount sufficient to punish Defendants and to deter others from engaging in similar conduct. For example, Defendants' conduct in fabricating pretextual reasons for a termination motivated by discrimination and retaliatory animus, constitutes malicious conduct in conscious disregard of Plaintiff's rights and safety. In particular, the corporate defendants had ample information from which to conclude that DAVIS was falsely accusing Plaintiff of racism and encouraging others to lie in order to get Plaintiff fired, but failed and refused to conduct a fair, thorough and competent investigation to ascertain the truth before acceding to DAVIS' demands and firing Plaintiff.

SIXTH CAUSE OF ACTION FOR INTENTIONAL INFLICTION OF EMOTIONAL DISTRESS (As Against all Defendants)

- 61. Plaintiff repeats and repleads and incorporates by this reference, paragraphs 1 through 59, inclusive, above, as though fully set forth herein.
- 62. The conduct set forth above is extreme and outrageous, exceeding the bounds of decency normally tolerated in a civilized society.
- 63. As set forth above, Defendants engaged in this conduct knowing it would cause Plaintiff extreme emotional distress or with conscious disregard of the likelihood of such an outcome.
- 64. As a further proximate result of the acts of Defendants, and each of them, as alleged above, Plaintiff has suffered and will continue to suffer severe emotional distress, including but not limited to humiliation, anxiety, nervousness, depression, sleeplessness, and has been generally

damaged in an amount to be ascertained at the time of trial and will necessarily expend sums in the future for the treatment of the physical, emotional and mental injuries sustained by Plaintiff as a result of said Defendants' acts in an amount to be ascertained at the time of trial.

- 65. That as a proximate result of the acts of Defendants, and each of them, as described above, Plaintiff has suffered and will continue to suffer economic damages, including lost wages, lost benefits, loss of promotional opportunity, medical expenses, and other compensatory damages in an amount to be ascertained at the time of trial.
- by managing agents, were intentional, willful and malicious and done in conscious disregard of Plaintiff's rights, safety and well being and with the intent to vex, injure and annoy Plaintiff, as such Plaintiff requests that exemplary and punitive damages be assessed against each of these Defendants in an amount sufficient to punish said Defendants and to deter others from engaging in similar conduct.

12 |

SEVENTH CAUSE OF ACTION FOR DEFAMATION

(As Against all Defendants)

- 67. Plaintiff repeats and repleads, and incorporates herein by this reference, paragraphs 1 through 65 above, inclusive, as though fully set forth herein.
- 68. Defendant DAVIS, as detailed above, repeatedly made false statements to SOULCYCLE and its customers and employees about Plaintiff, including *but not limited to*:
 - a. That she used the n-word in class; and
 - b. That she is a racist.
- 69. The aforementioned statements were and are false and DAVIS made the statements knowing they were false or with reckless disregard for their truth. In particular, upon information and belief DAVIS published these statements to persons who were actually in Plaintiff's class on the date

on which she allegedly used the n-word and those people told DAVIS (and/or her surrogates) that Plaintiff had said no such thing. Nevertheless, DAVIS disregarded the firsthand eyewitness accounts of those who were in attendance and continued to repeat the canard that Plaintiff had used the n-word and was a racist who had used the n-word in class.

- 70. In an effort to clear her name and avoid being fired, Plaintiff was also compelled to self-publish Davis' accusations to witnesses who could attest to their falsity.
- 71. Defendants SOULCYCLE and EQUINOX failed and refused to conduct a fair and reasonable investigation before bending to DAVIS' pressure, accepting her slanderous statements about Plaintiff as true and firing Plaintiff. As detailed above, SOULCYCLE and EQUINOX had information strongly suggesting that DAVIS had solicited false corroboration for her narrative that Plaintiff was a racist who used the n-word in class, but failed and refused to investigate the possibility that DAVIS had encouraged others to lodge false complaints against Plaintiff in retaliation for Plaintiff's prior racial harassment complaint against her to HR in November of 2016 and because of Plaintiff's race.
- 72. In firing Plaintiff based on DAVIS' false accusations of racism and threats to "boycott" work at SOULCYCLE, without conducting a reasonable and fair investigation—and despite clear evidence that DAVIS solicited false testimony against plaintiff—SOUL CYCLE and EQUINOX acted in conscious disregard of Plaintiff's rights and safety and acted with malice sufficient to defeat any privilege which may otherwise apply to the accusations of racism made against Plaintiff.
- 73. That as a proximate result of the acts of Defendants, and each of them, as described above, Plaintiff has suffered and will continue to suffer economic damages, including lost wages, lost benefits, loss of promotional opportunity, medical expenses, and other compensatory damages in an amount to be ascertained at the time of trial.
- 74. As a further proximate result of the acts of Defendants, and each of them, as alleged above, Plaintiff has suffered and will continue to suffer mental, emotional, and physical distress, including but not limited to humiliation, anxiety, nervousness, depression, sleeplessness, and has

been generally damaged in an amount to be ascertained at the time of trial and will necessarily expend sums in the future for the treatment of the physical, emotional and mental injuries sustained by Plaintiff as a result of said Defendants' acts in an amount to be ascertained at the time of trial.

75. That the acts of Defendants, and each of them, which were carried out by managing agents, were intentional, willful and malicious and done in conscious disregard of Plaintiff's rights, safety and well being and with the intent to vex, injure and annoy Plaintiff, as such Plaintiff requests that exemplary and punitive damages be assessed against each of these defendants in an amount sufficient to punish Defendants and to deter others from engaging in similar conduct.

EIGHTH CAUSE OF ACTION FOR FALSE LIGHT PUBLICITY

(Against all defendants)

- 76. Plaintiff refers to the allegations contained in paragraphs 1 through 73, inclusive, of this Complaint, and by reference thereto incorporate the same herein as though fully set forth.
- 77. Upon information and belief, from November of 2016 through the present, Defendants, and each of them, have publicized information or material regarding Plaintiff that cast Plaintiff in a false light. To wit, defendant DAVIS stated to SOULCYCLE customers and employees that Plaintiff is a racist and used the n-word in class, both of which paint Plaintiff in a false light.
- 78. DAVIS, who was not present, intentionally mischaracterized the context and content of Plaintiff's statements in class on the date in question in order to paint Plaintiff as a racist and get her fired because of her race, her accusation to HR that DAVIS herself was engaging in racial discrimination/harassment, and because she (wrongly) perceived Plaintiff as the stereotypical Caucasian, Blonde Orange County conservative who supported Donald Trump.
- 79. The publication of this information was intended to (and did) create a false, negative impression about Plaintiff that substantially contributed to defendants' decision to fire her.
- 80. The false light created by these publications would be highly offensive to a reasonable person in Plaintiff's position.
- 81. Defendants knew that these publications would create a false impression about Plaintiff, or acted with reckless disregard for the truth, or were negligent in determining the truth of the information or whether a false impression would be created by these publications.

28

1

2

3

82. Plaintiff suffered substantial economic and emotional harm as a result of Defendants' conduct, in an amount according to proof at time of trial. Defendants' publications of information regarding Plaintiff that showed Plaintiff in a false light was malicious and was made in conscious disregard of Plaintiff's rights.

Plaintiff prays for judgment as against Defendants, and each of them, as follows:

AS TO THE FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION (As Against All Defendants)

- 1. For general damages against Defendants according to proof;
- 2. For special damages against Defendants according to proof;
- 3. For declaratory and injunctive relief;
- 4. For reasonable attorney's fees and costs of suit; and
- 5. For exemplary damages; and
- 6. For such other and further relief as the court deems just and proper.

AS TO THE SECOND, THIRD, FOURTH AND FIFTH CAUSES OF ACTION (As Against SOULCYLE/EQUINOX and DOES 1-50)

- 1. For general damages against Defendants according to proof;
- 2. For special damages against Defendants according to proof;
- 3. For declaratory and injunctive relief;
- 4. For reasonable attorney's fees and costs of suit;
- 5. For exemplary damages; and
- 6. For such other and further relief as the court deems just and proper.

ON THE SIXTH, SEVENTH AND EIGHTH CAUSES OF ACTION

(As Against All Defendants)

	,				
1	1. For general da	amages against Defendants according to proof;			
. 2	2. For special da	2. For special damages against Defendants according to proof;			
3	3. For declarator	For declaratory and injunctive relief;			
4	4. For costs of su	For costs of suit incurred herein; and			
5	5. For exemplary	and punitive damages, according to proof.			
6		· •			
7	Dated: May 30, 2017	FELDMAN BROWNE OLIVARES, APC.			
8		Rv.			
9		By:			
10		STUART COHEN Attorneys for Plaintiff,			
11		LINDSAY BUCKLEY			
12					
13		DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL			
14	Plaintiff hereby dema	nds a trial by jury of the causes of action and claims asserted herein.			
		nus a utal by fully of the causes of action and cialins asserted herein.			
15					
15 16	Dated: May 30, 2017	FELDMAN BROWNE OLIVARES, APC.			
		FELDMAN BROWNE OLIVARES, APC.			
16		FELDMAN BROWNE OLIVARES, APC. By: LEE FELDMAN			
16 17		FELDMAN BROWNE OLIVARES, APC. By:			
16 17 18		FELDMAN BROWNE OLIVARES, APC. By: LEE FELDMAN STUART COHEN			
16 17 18 19		By: LEE FELDMAN STUART COHEN Attorneys for Plaintiff,			
16 17 18 19 20		By: LEE FELDMAN STUART COHEN Attorneys for Plaintiff,			
16 17 18 19 20 21		By: LEE FELDMAN STUART COHEN Attorneys for Plaintiff,			
16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24		By: LEE FELDMAN STUART COHEN Attorneys for Plaintiff,			
16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23		By: LEE FELDMAN STUART COHEN Attorneys for Plaintiff,			
16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24		By: LEE FELDMAN STUART COHEN Attorneys for Plaintiff,			
16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25		By: LEE FELDMAN STUART COHEN Attorneys for Plaintiff,			

· ~	NPICINIA.	CM-010			
ATTORNEY OR PARTY WITHOUT ATTORNEY (Name, State B. Lee Feldman (SBN 171628) Stuart Cohen (SBN 213810) Feldman Browne Olivares APC 12400 Wilshire Blvd., Suite 1100	ar number, and address):	FOR COURT USE ONLY			
Los Angeles, CA 90025 TELEPHONE NO.: (310)207-8500 ATTORNEY FOR (Name): Plaintiff Lindsay Br	FAX NO.: (310)207-8515 uckley	FILED Superior Court Of California County Of Los Angeles			
SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA, COUNTY OF L STREET ADDRESS: 111 North Hill Street MAILING ADDRESS: 111 North Hill Street CITY AND ZIP CODE: LOS Angeles, Califor	MAY 30 2017				
BRANCH NAME: CENTRAL DISTRIC CASE NAME: Lindsay Buckley v. So	Sherri R. Carter, Executive Officer/Clerk By Charlie L. Coleman Deputy				
ON THE CASE COVER SHEET	Complex Case Designation				
CIVIL CASE COVER SHEET X Unlimited Limited (Amount (Amount	Counter Joinder Filed with first appearance by defenda	CASE NUMBER: BC 6 6 3 1 8 8			
demanded demanded is exceeds \$25,000) \$25,000 or less)	(Cal. Rules of Court, rule 3.402)	DEPT:			
Items 1-6 i	below must be completed (see instructions	on page 2).			
1. Check one box below for the case type th	at best describes this case:	·			
Auto Tort	Contract	Provisionally Complex Civil Litigation (Cal. Rules of Court, rules 3.400-3.403)			
Auto (22)	Breach of contract/warranty (06)	Antitrust/Trade regulation (03)			
Uninsured motorist (46) Other PI/PD/WD (Personal Injury/Property	Rule 3.740 collections (09)	Construction defect (10)			
Damage/Wrongful Death) Tort	Other collections (09) Insurance coverage (18)	Mass tort (40)			
Asbestos (04)	Other contract (37)	Securities litigation (28)			
Product liability (24)	Real Property	Environmental/Toxic tort (30)			
Medical malpractice (45)	Eminent domain/Inverse	Insurance coverage claims arising from the			
Other PI/PD/WD (23)	condemnation (14)	above listed provisionally complex case			
Non-PI/PD/WD (Other) Tort	Wrongful eviction (33)	types (41)			
Business tort/unfair business practice (0	7) Other real property (26)	Enforcement of Judgment			
Civil rights (08)	Unlawful Detainer	Enforcement of judgment (20)			
Defamation (13)	Commercial (31)	Miscellaneous Civil Complaint			
Fraud (16)	Residential (32)	RICO (27)			
Intellectual property (19)	Drugs (38)	Other complaint (not specified above) (42)			
Professional negligence (25)	Judicial Review	Miscellaneous Civil Petition			
Other non-PI/PD/WD tort (35)	Asset forfeiture (05)	Partnership and corporate governance (21)			
Employment	Petition re: arbitration award (11)	Other petition (not specified above) (43)			
X Wrongful termination (36)	Writ of mandate (02)				
Other employment (15)	Other judicial review (39)				
factors requiring exceptional judicial man	agement:	es of Court. If the case is complex, mark the			
	 a. Large number of separately represented parties b. Extensive motion practice raising difficult or novel e. Coordination with related actions pending in one or more courts 				
issues that will be time-consumi		es, states, or countries, or in a federal court			
c. Substantial amount of documen		stjudgment judicial supervision			
3. Remedies sought (check all that apply): a. X monetary b. X nonmonetary; declaratory or injunctive relief c. X punitive					
4. Number of causes of action (specify): Eight (8)					
5. This case isx is not a class action suit.					
6. If there are any known related cases, file and serve a notice of related case. (You may use form CM-015.)					
Date: May 30, 2017					
Lee Feldman (SBN 171628) (TYPE OR PRINT NAME)	(SIC	SNATURE OF PARTY OR ATTORNEY FOR PARTY)			
	NOTICE				
Plaintiff must file this cover sheet with the first paper filed in the action or proceeding (except small claims cases or cases filed under the Probate Code, Family Code, or Welfare and Institutions Code). (Cal. Rules of Court, rule 3.220.) Failure to file may result in sanctions.					
 File this cover sheet in addition to any cover sheet required by local court rule. If this case is complex under rule 3.400 et seq. of the California Rules of Court, you must serve a copy of this cover sheet on all other parties to the action or proceeding. 					
 Unless this is a collections case under rule 	ile 3.740 or a complex case, this cover she	et will be used for statistical purposes only.			

To Plaintiffs and Others Filing First Papers. If you are filing a first paper (for example, a complaint) in a civil case, you must complete and file, along with your first paper, the Civil Case Cover Sheet contained on page 1. This information will be used to compile statistics about the types and numbers of cases filed. You must complete items 1 through 6 on the sheet. In item 1, you must check one box for the case type that best describes the case. If the case fits both a general and a more specific type of case listed in item 1, check the more specific one. If the case has multiple causes of action, check the box that best indicates the primary cause of action. To assist you in completing the sheet, examples of the cases that belong under each case type in item 1 are provided below. A cover sheet must be filed only with your initial paper. Failure to file a cover sheet with the first paper filed in a civil case may subject a party, its counsel, or both to sanctions under rules 2.30 and 3.220 of the California Rules of Court.

To Parties in Rule 3.740 Collections Cases. A "collections case" under rule 3.740 is defined as an action for recovery of money owed in a sum stated to be certain that is not more than \$25,000, exclusive of interest and attorney's fees, arising from a transaction in which property, services, or money was acquired on credit. A collections case does not include an action seeking the following: (1) tort damages, (2) punitive damages, (3) recovery of real property, (4) recovery of personal property, or (5) a prejudgment writ of attachment. The identification of a case as a rule 3.740 collections case on this form means that it will be exempt from the general time-for-service requirements and case management rules, unless a defendant files a responsive pleading. A rule 3.740 collections case will be subject to the requirements for service and obtaining a judgment in rule 3.740.

To Parties in Complex Cases. In complex cases only, parties must also use the Civil Case Cover Sheet to designate whether the case is complex. If a plaintiff believes the case is complex under rule 3.400 of the California Rules of Court, this must be indicated by completing the appropriate boxes in items 1 and 2. If a plaintiff designates a case as complex, the cover sheet must be served with the complaint on all parties to the action. A defendant may file and serve no later than the time of its first appearance a joinder in the plaintiff's designation, a counter-designation that the case is not complex, or, if the plaintiff has made no designation, a designation that the case is complex. **CASE TYPES AND EXAMPLES**

Auto Tort

Auto (22)—Personal Injury/Property Damage/Wrongful Death Uninsured Motorist (46) (if the case involves an uninsured motorist claim subject to arbitration, check this item instead of Auto)

Other PI/PD/WD (Personal Injury/ Property Damage/Wrongful Death)

Asbestos (04)

Asbestos Property Damage Asbestos Personal Injury/ Wrongful Death

Product Liability (not asbestos or toxic/environmental) (24)

Medical Malpractice (45)

Medical Malpractice-

Physicians & Surgeons

Other Professional Health Care

Malpractice

Other PI/PD/WD (23)

Premises Liability (e.g., slip

and fall)

Intentional Bodily Injury/PD/WD

(e.g., assault, vandalism)

Intentional Infliction of

Emotional Distress

Nealigent Infliction of

Emotional Distress

Other PI/PD/WD

Non-PI/PD/WD (Other) Tort

Business Tort/Unfair Business

Practice (07)

Civil Rights (e.g., discrimination,

false arrest) (not civil

harassment) (08)

Defamation (e.g., slander, libel)

(13)

Fraud (16)

Intellectual Property (19)

Professional Negligence (25)

Legal Malpractice

©Other Professional Malpractice

(not medical or legal)

Other Non-PI/PD/WD Tort (35)

Employment

Wrongful Termination (36) Other Employment (15)

Contract

Breach of Contract/Warranty (06)

Breach of Rental/Lease

Contract (not unlawful detainer or wrongful eviction)

Contract/Warranty Breach—Seller Plaintiff (not fraud or negligence)

Negligent Breach of Contract/

Warranty

Other Breach of Contract/Warranty

Collections (e.g., money owed, open

book accounts) (09)

Collection Case—Seller Plaintiff
Other Promissory Note/Collections

Case Insurance Coverage (not provisionally

complex) (18)

Auto Subrogation

Other Coverage

Other Contract (37)

Contractual Fraud

Other Contract Dispute

Real Property

Eminent Domain/Inverse

Condemnation (14)

Wrongful Eviction (33)

Other Real Property (e.g., quiet title) (26)

Writ of Possession of Real Property

Mortgage Foreclosure

Quiet Title

Other Real Property (not eminent

domain, landlord/tenant, or

foreclosure)

Unlawful Detainer

Commercial (31)

Residential (32)

Drugs (38) (if the case involves illegal

druas, check this item; otherwise,

report as Commercial or Residential)

Judicial Review

Asset Forfeiture (05)

Petition Re: Arbitration Award (11)

Writ of Mandate (02)

Writ-Administrative Mandamus

Writ-Mandamus on Limited Court

Case Matter

Writ-Other Limited Court Case

Review

Other Judicial Review (39)

Review of Health Officer Order

Notice of Appeal-Labor

Commissioner Appeals

Provisionally Complex Civil Litigation (Cal. Rules of Court Rules 3.400-3.403)

Antitrust/Trade Regulation (03)

Construction Defect (10)

Claims Involving Mass Tort (40)

Securities Litigation (28)

Environmental/Toxic Tort (30)

Insurance Coverage Claims

(arising from provisionally complex

case type listed above) (41)

Enforcement of Judgment

Enforcement of Judgment (20)

Abstract of Judgment (Out of

County)

Confession of Judgment (non-

domestic relations)

Sister State Judgment Administrative Agency Award

(not unpaid taxes)

Petition/Certification of Entry of

Judgment on Unpaid Taxes

Other Enforcement of Judgment

Case

Miscellaneous Civil Complaint

RICO (27)

Other Complaint (not specified

above) (42)

Declaratory Relief Only

Injunctive Relief Only (non-

harassment)

Mechanics Lien

Other Commercial Complaint

Case (non-tort/non-complex)

Other Civil Complaint

(non-tort/non-complex)

Miscellaneous Civil Petition

Partnership and Corporate Governance (21)

Other Petition (not specified

above) (43)

Civil Harassment

Workplace Violence

Elder/Dependent Adult

Abuse

Election Contest

Petition for Name Change

Petition for Relief from Late Claim

Other Civil Petition

SHORT TITLE: Lindsay Buckley v. SoulCycle Inc. et al.

CASE NUMBER

BC 6 6 3 1 8 8

CIVIL CASE COVER SHEET ADDENDUM AND STATEMENT OF LOCATION (CERTIFICATE OF GROUNDS FOR ASSIGNMENT TO COURTHOUSE LOCATION)

This form is required pursuant to Local Rule 2.3 in all new civ	/il case filings in the Los Angeles Superior Court.		
Item I. Check the types of hearing and fill in the estimated length of hearing expected for this case:			
JURY TRIAL? X YES CLASS ACTION? YES LIMITED CASE? Y	ES TIME ESTIMATED FOR TRIAL 10 HOURS/ \overline{x} DAYS		
Item II. Indicate the correct district and courthouse location (4 steps	s – If you checked "Limited Case", skip to Item III, Pg. 4):		
Step 1: After first completing the Civil Case Cover Sheet form, case in the left margin below, and, to the right in Column A , the Column 	-		
Step 2: Check one Superior Court type of action in Column B	below which best describes the nature of this case.		
Step 3: In Column C , circle the reason for the court location ch checked. For any exception to the court location, see Local Rule	•••		
Applicable Reasons for Choosing Courthous	se Location (see Column C below)		
 Class actions must be filed in the Stanley Mosk Courthouse, central district. May be filed in central (other county, or no bodily injury/property damage). Location where cause of action arose. Location where bodily injury, death or damage occurred. Location where performance required or defendant resides. 	6. Location of property or permanently garaged vehicle. 7. Location where petitioner resides. 8. Location wherein defendant/respondent functions wholly. 9. Location where one or more of the parties reside. 10. Location of Labor Commissioner Office 11. Mandatory Filing Location (Hub Case)		

Step 4: Fill in the information requested on page 4 in Item III; complete Item IV. Sign the declaration.

•	A Civil Case Cover Sheet Category No.	B Type of Action (Check only one)	C Applicable Reasons - See Step 3 Above
o Tort	Auto (22)	A7100 Motor Vehicle - Personal Injury/Property Damage/Wrongful Death	1., 2., 4.
Auto	Uninsured Motorist (46)	A7110 Personal Injury/Property Damage/Wrongful Death – Uninsured Motorist	1., 2., 4.
Property eath Tort	Asbestos (04)	A6070 Asbestos Property Damage A7221 Asbestos - Personal Injury/Wrongful Death	2. 2.
	Product Liability (24)	A7260 Product Liability (not asbestos or toxic/environmental)	1., 2., 3., 4., 8.
nal Injury Pongful D	Medical Malpractice (45)	A7210 Medical Malpractice - Physicians & Surgeons A7240 Other Professional Health Care Malpractice	1., 4. 1., 4.
Other Personal Injury/ Property	Other Personal Injury Property Damage Wrongful Death (23)	A7250 Premises Liability (e.g., slip and fall) A7230 Intentional Bodily Injury/Property Damage/Wrongful Death (e.g., assault, vandalism, etc.) A7270 Intentional Infliction of Emotional Distress A7220 Other Personal Injury/Property Damage/Wrongful Death	1., 4. 1., 4. 1., 3. 1., 4.

SHORT TITLE: Lindsay Buckley v. SoulCycle Inc. et al. CASE NUMBER C Applicable Reasons - See Step 3 Above В Civil Case Cover Sheet Category No. Type of Action (Check only one) Business Tort (07) Non-Personal Injury/ Property Damage/ Wrongful Death Tort **Employment** Contract Real Property

Business Tort (07)	A6029 Other Commercial/Business Tort (not fraud/breach of contract)	1., 3.
Civil Rights (08)	A6005 Civil Rights/Discrimination	1., 2., 3.
Defamation (13)	A6010 Defamation (slander/libel)	1., 2., 3.
Fraud (16)	A6013 Fraud (no contract)	1., 2., 3.
Professional Negligence (25)	A6017 Legal Malpractice A6050 Other Professional Malpractice (not medical or legal)	1., 2., 3. 1., 2., 3.
Other (35)	A6025 Other Non-Personal Injury/Property Damage tort	2.,3.
Wrongful Termination (36)	X A6037 Wrongful Termination	1., 2., 3.
Other Employment (15)	A6024 Other Employment Complaint Case A6109 Labor Commissioner Appeals	1., 2., 3. 10.
Breach of Contract/ Warranty (06) (not insurance)	A6004 Breach of Rental/Lease Contract (not unlawful detainer or wrongful eviction) A6008 Contract/Warranty Breach -Seller Plaintiff (no fraud/negligence) A6019 Negligent Breach of Contract/Warranty (no fraud) A6028 Other Breach of Contract/Warranty (not fraud or negligence)	2., 5. 2., 5. 1., 2., 5. 1., 2., 5.
Collections (09)	A6002 Collections Case-Seller Plaintiff A6012 Other Promissory Note/Collections Case A6034 Collections Case-Purchased Debt (Charged Off Consumer Debt Purchased on or after January 1, 2014)	2., 5., 6, 11 2., 5, 11 5, 6, 11
Insurance Coverage (18)	A6015 Insurance Coverage (not complex)	1., 2., 5., 8.
† Other Contract (37)	A6009 Contractual Fraud A6031 Tortious Interference A6027 Other Contract Dispute(not breach/insurance/fraud/negligence)	1., 2., 3., 5. 1., 2., 3., 5. 1., 2., 3., 8.
Eminent Domain/Inverse Condemnation (14)	A7300 Eminent Domain/Condemnation Number of parcels	2.
Wrongful Eviction (33)	A6023 Wrongful Eviction Case	2., 6.
Other Real Property (26)	A6018 Mortgage Foreclosure A6032 Quiet Title A6060 Other Real Property (not eminent domain, landlord/tenant, foreclosure)	2., 6. 2., 6. 2., 6.
Unlawful Detainer-Commercial (31)	A6021 Unlawful Detainer-Commercial (not drugs or wrongful eviction)	2., 6.
Unlawful Detainer-Residential (32)	A6020 Unlawful Detainer-Residential (not drugs or wrongful eviction)	2., 6.
Unlawful Detainer- Post-Foreclosure (34)	A6020F Unlawful Detainer-Post-Foreclosure	2., 6.
Unlawful Detainer-Drugs (38)	A6022 Unlawful Detainer-Drugs	2., 6.

SHORT TITLE: Lindsay Buckley v. SoulCycle Inc. et al.

	A Civil Case Cover Sheet Category No.	B Type of Action (Check only one)	C Applicable Reasons - See Step 3 Above
	Asset Forfeiture (05)	A6108 Asset Forfeiture Case	2., 6.
<u>ie</u>	Petition re Arbitration (11)	A6115 Petition to Compel/Confirm/Vacate Arbitration	2., 5.
Judicial Review	Writ of Mandate (02)	A6151 Writ - Administrative Mandamus A6152 Writ - Mandamus on Limited Court Case Matter A6153 Writ - Other Limited Court Case Review	2., 8. 2. 2.
	Other Judicial Review (39)	A6150 Other Writ /Judicial Review	2., 8.
E O	Antitrust/Trade Regulation (03)	A6003 Antitrust/Trade Regulation	1., 2., 8.
itigati	Construction Defect (10)	A6007 Construction Defect	1., 2., 3.
Provisionally Complex Litigation	Claims Involving Mass Tort (40)	A6006 Claims Involving Mass Tort	1., 2., 8.
ly Con	Securities Litigation (28)	A6035 Securities Litigation Case	1., 2., 8.
sional	Toxic Tort Environmental (30)	A6036 Toxic Tort/Environmental	1., 2., 3., 8.
Provi	Insurance Coverage Claims from Complex Case (41)	A6014 Insurance Coverage/Subrogation (complex case only)	1., 2., 5., 8.
Enforcement of Judgment	Enforcement of Judgment (20)	A6141 Sister State Judgment A6160 Abstract of Judgment A6107 Confession of Judgment (non-domestic relations) A6140 Administrative Agency Award (not unpaid taxes) A6114 Petition/Certificate for Entry of Judgment on Unpaid Tax A6112 Other Enforcement of Judgment Case	2., 9. 2., 6. 2., 9. 2., 8. 2., 8. 2., 8., 9.
s	RICO (27)	A6033 Racketeering (RICO) Case	1., 2., 8.
Miscellaneous Civil Complaints	Other Complaints (Not Specified Above) (42)	A6030 Declaratory Relief Only A6040 Injunctive Relief Only (not domestic/harassment) A6011 Other Commercial Complaint Case (non-tort/non-complex) A6000 Other Civil Complaint (non-tort/non-complex)	1., 2., 8. 2., 8. 1., 2., 8. 1., 2., 8.
	Partnership Corporation Governance (21)	A6113 Partnership and Corporate Governance Case	2., 8.
Miscellaneous ₹ / 8 €civit Petitions	Other Petitions (Not Specified Above) (43)	A6121 Civil Harassment A6123 Workplace Harassment A6124 Elder/Dependent Adult Abuse Case A6190 Election Contest A6110 Petition for Change of Name A6170 Petition for Relief from Late Claim Law A6100 Other Civil Petition	2., 3., 9. 2., 3., 9. 2., 3., 9. 2. 2., 7. 2., 3., 4., 8. 2., 9.
(G)			

SHORT TITLE: Lindsay Buckley v. So	ulCycle Ind	c. et al.		CASE NUMBER
			• •	ence or place of business, performance, or other for filing in the court location you selected.
REASON: Check the appropriate box under Column C for the type of action this case.	that you have	e selected for		San Vicente Blvd.
CITY:	STATE:	ZIP CODE:		
Los Angeles	CA	90049		
and correct and that the above-ent	itled matter i	s properly filed	d for assignment t	o the State of California that the foregoing is true to the Stanley Mosk courthouse in the ngeles [Code Civ. Proc., § 392 et seq., and Local
Dated: <u>May 30, 2017</u>			•	GNATURE OF ATTORNEY/FILING PARTY) ee Feldman

CASE NUMBER

PLEASE HAVE THE FOLLOWING ITEMS COMPLETED AND READY TO BE FILED IN ORDER TO PROPERLY **COMMENCE YOUR NEW COURT CASE:**

- 1. Original Complaint or Petition.
- 2. If filing a Complaint, a completed Summons form for issuance by the Clerk.
- 3. Civil Case Cover Sheet, Judicial Council form CM-010.
- 4. Civil Case Cover Sheet Addendum and Statement of Location form, LACIV 109, LASC Approved 03-04 (Rev. 03/15).
- 5. Payment in full of the filing fee, unless fees have been waived.
- 6. A signed order appointing the Guardian ad Litem, Judicial Council form CIV-010, if the plaintiff or petitioner is a minor under 18 years of age will be required by Court in order to issue a summons.
- 7. Additional copies of documents to be conformed by the Clerk. Copies of the cover sheet and this addendum must be served along with the summons and complaint, or other initiating pleading in the case.