# IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLORADO

V	
v.	
THE CITY OF FLORENCE, a municipal corporation; and MICHAEL PATTERSON, an individual,	
Defendants.	

Plaintiff Jessica Hill ("Ms. Hill" or "Plaintiff"), by and through counsel, Leventhal Lewis Kuhn Taylor Swan PC, submits her Complaint and Jury Demand ("Complaint") against The City of Florence and Michael Patterson as follows:

### **PARTIES**

- 1. Ms. Hill is an individual who is domiciled in the State of Colorado.
- 2. Defendant City of Florence (the "City") is a statutory city within the State of Colorado.
- 3. Defendant Michael Patterson ("Mr. Patterson") is an individual who is domiciled in the State of Colorado.
  - 4. The City and Mr. Patterson are referred to collectively as "the Defendants."

### **JURISDICTION AND VENUE**

- 5. This Court has original federal question jurisdiction pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1331 because this action is brought, in part, under Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 ("Title VII").
- 6. This Court has supplemental jurisdiction over Ms. Hill's state law claims pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1367 because they are so related to the Title VII claims that they form part of the same case or controversy.
- 7. This Court has personal jurisdiction over the City because, among other things, the action arises out of events that occurred in the State of Colorado.
- 8. This Court has personal jurisdiction over Mr. Patterson because, among other things, the action arises out of events that occurred in the State of Colorado.
- 9. Venue is proper in this Court pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1391(b) because the unlawful conduct complained of herein arose and occurred in the District of Colorado.
- 10. Plaintiff exhausted her administrative remedies by timely filing a Complaint of Discrimination with the Colorado Civil Rights Division ("CCRD") (and by extension the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission) and filing this action with 90 days of receipt of a right to sue. A copy of the Notice of Early Right to Sue is attached hereto as **Exhibit 1**.

#### **GENERAL ALLEGATIONS**

- 11. On or about January 28, 2018, Ms. Hill began working for the City. Ms. Hill's most recent job title was, and continues to be, the Florence City Clerk.
  - 12. Since late 2011, Mr. Patterson was employed as the Florence City Manager.
- 13. From the beginning of Ms. Hill's employment up to and until Mr. Patterson was finally terminated on or about August 31, 2021, Ms. Hill reported directly to Mr. Patterson.

Mr. Patterson has a history of inappropriate behavior predating his employment by the City.

- 14. Mr. Patterson previously worked as the City Manager of the City of Redmond, Oregon.
- 15. During his employment by the City of Redmond, Oregon, Mr. Patterson was charged with one count of felony fourth-degree assault and one count of misdemeanor fourth-degree assault against a woman with whom he was in a romantic relationship. *See* https://www.oregonlive.com/news/2008/12/former\_redmond\_city\_manager\_se.html.

The City knew of Mr. Patterson's misconduct and hired him nonetheless.

- 16. In or around 2011, prior to hiring Mr. Patterson, the City performed a background check that contained information about Mr. Patterson's misconduct. The City knew about Mr. Patterson's history of misconduct before the City hired him.
- 17. Evidence of Mr. Patterson's behavior and related complaints and charges are and were readily available with a simple internet search. *See Kevin S. Curtis v. City of Redmond and Michael Patterson*; Case No. CV-01525-TC (D. Ore.).

The City was aware of serious allegations against Mr. Patterson but allowed him to maintain his employment.

- 18. In recent statements, the City attempts to assert that Mr. Patterson's conduct took City government by surprise. *See* https://theflorencecitizen.com/2022/01/21/city-council-releases-new-statement-regarding-former-city-manager/. This is false.
- 19. In or around late 2019, Tammy Kibler ("Ms. Kibler"), another employee of the City, was sexually harassed by Mr. Patterson and then-Police Chief Mike DeLaurentis ("Mr. DeLaurentis").
  - 20. Ms. Kibler brought this harassment to the attention of the City. Ms. Kibler was

terminated in retaliation for reporting this sexual harassment.

- 21. In or around November 13, 2019, the City settled the claim brought by Ms. Kibler. *See id.*
- 22. Ms. Kibler was far from the only woman to be sexually harassed by Mr. Patterson. On information and belief, prior claims had been made against Mr. Patterson prior to 2019 of which the City was aware.
- 23. Even after the City was made aware of Mr. Patterson's practice of abusing women, the City did not implement any supervisory protocol over him in an attempt to prevent his predatory behavior. The City allowed Mr. Patterson's abusive behavior to continue.
- 24. Mr. Patterson did not experience any tangible adverse employment action after his abuse was brought to light. In fact, he was promoted, given pay raises, and hidden perks.
- 25. Matthew Krob ("Mr. Krob") is the Florence City Attorney. He has held this position for a number of years, including during the pendency of Ms. Kibler's complaint.
- 26. Mr. Krob failed to adequately address, much less prevent, future abuse after Ms. Kibler's and others' complaints.
- 27. Mr. Krob's loyalty was to Mr. Patterson. As a further violation of his duty to the City, Mr. Krob secretly fed Mr. Patterson information about and reports made against Mr. Patterson. Perhaps this is unsurprising as Mr. Krob and Mr. Patterson often socialized outside of work.
- 28. Since Mr. Krob was aware that Mr. Patterson was the primary decisionmaker on whether Mr. Krob kept his contract, Mr. Krob's primary focus was protecting Mr. Patterson.
  - 29. Mr. Krob is not alone. The City enabled Mr. Patterson's system of abuse. Mr.

Patterson's abuse occurred during working hours at City Hall. In fact, at Mr. Patterson's request, the City paid for and installed blinds in his office so as to allow him to engage in predatory behavior in his office.

- 30. As Mr. Patterson was a supervisor in City government (in fact, as City Manager, he was the highest-ranking non-elected supervisor), the City is strictly liable for Mr. Patterson's abuse.
- 31. The City did not take reasonable care to prevent and correct promptly any of Mr. Patterson's behavior.
- 32. The City failed to provide corrective opportunities or take reasonable steps to prevent further illegal conduct on the part of Mr. Patterson.
- 33. During his employment, Mr. Patterson had a pattern and practice of sexually abusing and harassing female employees. Ms. Hill is just one of many victims of Mr. Patterson's harassment and the City's knowing failure to respond.

Ms. Hill was sexually harassed by Mr. Patterson.

- 34. During Ms. Hill's employment with the City, Mr. Patterson sexually harassed her via text messages and verbal comments.
- 35. The text messages ran the gamut from fantasizing about Ms. Hill's attractiveness to explicitly asking her to have sex with him.
- 36. As just one example, Mr. Patterson sent Ms. Hill a text message saying "You are so hot and yet so cute. The hair, face, breasts...and how hardworking and focused you are."
- 37. Mr. Patterson asked Ms. Hill to have a threesome with him and his fiancé, Linda. He stated: "Linda has never been with a woman but loves to fantasize about having threesomes

with women and you have long been one of her favorite fantasies."

- 38. Despite Ms. Hill's insistence that she did not want to have a relationship with him, Mr. Patterson would send messages saying, for example, "Damn you're hot! I know that we have to be careful at work but I have full intention to kiss you tomorrow."
  - 39. Ms. Hill explicitly told Mr. Patterson to stop this behavior. He refused.
- 40. To make matters worse, in August 2021, Mr. Patterson sexually assaulted Ms. Hill. Mr. Patterson took Ms. Hill into his office, shut the door, closed the blinds (that the City had purchased at its expense at Mr. Patterson's request), pushed Ms. Hill against the door, and forced his hand down her pants onto her vagina.
- 41. After Ms. Hill again refused Mr. Patterson's advances, Mr. Patterson retaliated against her by making false claims, including grotesque claims that Ms. Hill was being sexually inappropriate. It is disturbingly ironic that Mr. Patterson accused Ms. Hill of sexually inappropriate behavior.
- 42. Ms. Hill engaged in a protected activity when she reported Mr. Patterson's inappropriate behavior.
- 43. City officials who worked alongside Ms. Hill and Mr. Patterson knew of the abuse for months. They did nothing.
- 44. Sean Garrett ("Mr. Garrett"), the former planning director and current interim city manager, knew of the abuse Ms. Hill was experiencing. Mr. Garrett knew of the abuse for several months. He did nothing to help Ms. Hill. Shockingly, Mr. Garrett is now the prime candidate to replace Mr. Patterson as the permanent city manager.
  - 45. Since Ms. Hill's claims have been made, Mr. Garrett has repeatedly exclaimed that

Mr. Patterson's victims of sexual harassment and sexual assault need to "move on" and "get over it."

- 46. Lori Cobler ("Ms. Cobler"), the budget director and human resources director, also knew of the abuse Ms. Hill was experiencing from Mr. Patterson. Ms. Cobler knew of the abuse for several months. She failed to help Ms. Hill and failed to come forward.
- 47. Shane Prickett, the current Florence Police Chief ("Chief Prickett") has known for years of Mr. Patterson's predatory behavior. In fact, Mr. Patterson targeted Mr. Prickett's wife. Evidence of this and other abuse is kept on cell phones used for city business.
- 48. Despite actual knowledge of the abuse, Chief Prickett did nothing. He was more interested in rising through the ranks to become police chief than protecting women, including his own wife.
- 49. On November 3, 2021, Mr. Patterson was charged with four criminal offenses: two counts of stalking emotional distress (Colo. Rev. Stat. § 18-3-602(1)(c)), sexual contact no consent (Colo. Rev. Stat. § 18-3-404(1)(a)), and providing alcohol to minors (Colo. Rev. Stat. § 44-3-901(1)(b)). Some of these criminal offenses are felonies.

In or around September 2021, Ms. Hill retained counsel to represent her in her claims against Defendants.

- 50. Ms. Hill hoped to remedy this situation and continue her employment with the City. When counsel was first retained, they were in communication with Mr. Krob.
- 51. Counsel sent Mr. Krob a letter on September 8, 2021 wherein Counsel outlined the harassment and assault Ms. Hill had suffered at the hands of Mr. Patterson. Mr. Krob was initially responsive.
  - 52. Mr. Krob then abruptly ceased all communication with counsel.

- 53. Despite counsel's repeated attempts to contact him and resolve this matter, Mr. Krob failed to address the City's significant liability. He let the abuse fester.
- 54. On October 29, 2021, Ms. Hill, through counsel, sent the requisite Colorado Governmental Immunity Act ("CGIA") Notice to Mr. Krob. Mr. Krob ignored it.
- 55. Ms. Hill's attorneys filed the requisite Complaint of Discrimination with the CCRD on November 8, 2021. Mr. Krob ignored it.
  - 56. On January 20, 2022, Ms. Hill received a notice of right to sue from the CCRD.
- 57. On January 20, 2022, Counsel emailed Mr. Krob to confirm that he was authorized to accept service of process on behalf of the City. Mr. Krob ignored it.
- 58. Counsel has sent nearly a dozen evidence preservation demand letters to Mr. Krob. Other than a brief mention on January 28, 2022 stating that he will "address them individually," Mr. Krob ignored them.
- 59. On information and belief, the City has already failed to preserve and protect the relevant evidence (despite express requests therefor) for which spoliation sanctions will be sought.
- 60. Counsel sent two letters informing Mr. Krob of the unlawful retaliation Ms. Hill was experiencing at the hands of the City. Rather than addressing the substance of these reports, Mr. Krob joined the City in attempting to blame the victim.

Defendants have retaliated against Ms. Hill.

- 61. After Ms. Hill repeatedly turned down Mr. Patterson's advances, he began making false statements about her.
- 62. The City has never denied that Ms. Hill is good at her job. Furthermore, the City has not denied that Ms. Hill is a victim of Mr. Patterson.

- 63. After Ms. Hill engaged in a protected activity by reporting Mr. Patterson's behavior, the City has retaliated against Ms. Hill.
- 64. Without any legitimate proof, the City has accused Ms. Hill of leaking information discussed in executive sessions. This allegation if false. The allegedly leaked information is known by at least a dozen other City employees and elected officials.
- 65. During the entirety of her employment, Ms. Hill has rarely been excluded from City Council executive sessions. After she complained about Mr. Patterson's sexual harassment, Ms. Hill has been frequently excluded from executive sessions without any explanation.
- 66. This exclusion inhibits Ms. Hill's professional development and her ability to do her job. On information and belief, the City is restricting Ms. Hill's access to meetings and inhibiting her ability to perform her job duties in an effort to manufacture reasons to terminate Ms. Hill's employment.

*The City has a pattern and practice of condoning inappropriate, sexually harassing behavior.* 

- 67. On information and belief, newly elected Mayor Paul Villagrana ("Mayor Villagrana") makes sexually inappropriate comments about City employees. On one occasion, Mayor Villagrana stated that he enjoys watching Ms. Hill walk in front of him and often asks her to get coffee just so that he can do so.
- 68. City residents are understandably upset. They feel that their City officials have deceived them and refused to address serious abuse. The residents are correct.
- 69. Mr. Patterson's abuse and the City's apathetic response thereto has been a frequent topic of discussion at City Council meetings. Mr. Krob's failure to respond to the allegations by Ms. Hill and other victims of Mr. Patterson's abuse has likewise been a topic of discussion at City

Council meetings.

70. City Council members themselves are upset by the way the abuse has been handled by certain City officials, including Mr. Krob. By way of example, on January 3, 2022, Councilmember Allen Knisley stated on record that "Matt [Krob] has misled us several times." *See* https://theflorencecitizen.com/2022/01/05/city-council-meeting-1-3-22/.

#### FIRST CLAIM FOR RELIEF

Discrimination Under Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 (42 U.S.C. § 2000e-2(a)) Against All Defendants

- 71. Ms. Hill incorporates by reference all preceding paragraphs of this Complaint.
- 72. At all relevant times, the City was an employer within the meaning of Title VII.
- 73. 42 U.S.C. § 2000e-2(a) provides that: "It shall be an unlawful employment practice for an employer (1) to fail or refuse to hire or to discharge any individual, or otherwise to discriminate against any individual with respect to his compensation, terms, conditions, or privileges of employment, because of such individual's race, color, religion, sex, or national origin; or (2) to limit, segregate, or classify his employees or applicants for employment in any way which would deprive or tend to deprive any individual of employment opportunities or otherwise adversely affect his status as an employee, because of such individual's race, color, religion, sex, or national origin."
- 74. Ms. Hill is a member of a group of persons protected under Title VII. Namely, she is a female.
  - 75. Ms. Hill is competent and qualified for her position of City Clerk.
  - 76. Ms. Hill has suffered and is suffering harassment by Defendants.
  - 77. The disparity in treatment between Ms. Hill and her male coworkers is based, at

least in part, on Ms. Hill's gender.

### **SECOND CLAIM FOR RELIEF**

Sexual Harassment Under Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 (42 U.S.C. § 2000e-2(a)) Against All Defendants

- 78. Plaintiff incorporates by reference all preceding paragraphs of this Complaint.
- 79. At all relevant times, the City was an employer within the meaning of Title VII.
- 80. 42 U.S.C. § 2000e-2(a) provides that: "It shall be an unlawful employment practice for an employer (1) to fail or refuse to hire or to discharge any individual, or otherwise to discriminate against any individual with respect to his compensation, terms, conditions, or privileges of employment, because of such individual's race, color, religion, sex, or national origin; or (2) to limit, segregate, or classify his employees or applicants for employment in any way which would deprive or tend to deprive any individual of employment opportunities or otherwise adversely affect his status as an employee, because of such individual's race, color, religion, sex, or national origin."
- 81. Ms. Hill is a member of a group of persons protected under Title VII. Namely, she is a female.
  - 82. Ms. Hill was sexually harassed by Mr. Patterson.
  - 83. The harassment Ms. Hill experienced was based, at least in part, on Ms. Hill's sex.
  - 84. The harassment was unwelcomed.
  - 85. The harassment was severe and pervasive.

# THIRD CLAIM FOR RELIEF

Retaliation Under Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 (42 U.S.C. § 2000e-3(a)) Against All Defendants

- 86. Plaintiff incorporates by reference all preceding paragraphs of this Complaint.
- 87. At all times relevant to this Complaint, the City was an employer within the meaning of Title VII.
- 88. 42 U.S.C. § 2000e-3(a) provides that: "It shall be an unlawful employment practice for an employer to discriminate against any of his employees or applicants for employment, for an employment agency, or joint labor-management committee controlling apprenticeship or other training or retraining, including on-the-job training programs, to discriminate against any individual, or for a labor organization to discriminate against any member thereof or applicant for membership, because he has opposed any practice made an unlawful employment practice by this title, or because he has made a charge, testified, assisted, or participated in any manner in an investigation, proceeding, or hearing under this title."
  - 89. Ms. Hill is competent and qualified for the position of City Clerk.
- 90. Ms. Hill engaged in a protected activity for purposes of 42 U.S.C. § 2000e-3(a) when she pursued her rights under Title VII.
- 91. Defendants have made false comments about Ms. Hill, including allegations that Ms. Hill is "leaking" information that was discussed in City Council meetings.
- 92. The retaliatory behavior by the City is sufficiently professionally detrimental to "dissuad[e] a reasonable worker from making or supporting a charge of discrimination." *Burlington N. & Santa Fe Ry. v. White*, 543 U.S. 53, 68 (2006).
  - 93. A causal connection between Ms. Hill's protected activity and the adverse action

can be inferred based on temporal proximity because Defendants began this retaliatory behavior immediately after Ms. Hill complained of Mr. Patterson's harassment and the City's failure to address the problem.

94. The City's retaliatory conduct actually and proximately caused losses and injuries to Ms. Hill, including loss of income, in an amount to be proven at trial.

#### FOURTH CLAIM FOR RELIEF

### Colorado Anti-Discrimination Act Against All Defendants

- 95. Plaintiff incorporates by reference all preceding paragraphs of this Complaint.
- 96. Ms. Hill is a protected person under Colo. Rev. Stat. § 24-34-402 because of her status as a female.
- 97. In violation of the Colorado Anti-Discrimination Act, Defendants discriminated and retaliated against Ms. Hill as set forth in the preceding paragraphs of this Complaint.
- 98. Defendants' unlawful conduct in terminating and retaliating against Ms. Hill actually and proximately caused losses and injuries to Ms. Hill, including loss of income, in an amount to be proven at trial.

#### FIFTH CLAIM FOR RELIEF

## Outrageous Conduct/Intentional Infliction of Emotional Distress Against All Defendants

- 99. Plaintiff incorporates by reference all preceding paragraphs of this Complaint.
- 100. Defendants engaged in extreme and outrageous conduct by, among other things, subjecting Ms. Hill to defamation and the inability to complete her job duties. Such conduct includes, but is not limited to, the specific instances described above.
  - 101. Defendants engaged in such conduct recklessly or with the intent to cause Ms. Hill

severe emotional distress.

102. Ms. Hill has suffered damage as a result of Defendants' outrageous conduct in an amount to be proven at trial for which Defendants are liable.

#### SIXTH CLAIM FOR RELIEF

# Civil Assault Against Mr. Patterson

- 103. Plaintiff incorporates by reference all preceding paragraphs of this Complaint.
- 104. Mr. Patterson intended to cause an offensive or harmful contact with Ms. Hill or intended to place Ms. Hill in apprehension of such contact.
  - 105. Mr. Patterson placed Ms. Hill in apprehension of immediate physical contact.
  - 106. The contact was harmful and offensive to Ms. Hill.

#### SEVENTH CLAIM FOR RELIEF

# Civil Battery Against Mr. Patterson

- 107. Plaintiff incorporates by reference all preceding paragraphs of this Complaint.
- 108. Mr. Patterson's act resulted in physical contact with Ms. Hill.
- 109. Mr. Patterson intended to make harmful or offensive physical contact with Ms. Hill.
- 110. The contact was in fact harmful and offensive.

#### **EIGHTH CLAIM FOR RELIEF**

# False Imprisonment Against Mr. Patterson

- 111. Plaintiff incorporates by reference all preceding paragraphs of this Complaint.
- 112. During the incident when Mr. Patterson locked the door and sexually assaulted Ms. Hill in or around August 2021, Mr. Patterson intended to restrict Ms. Hill's freedom of movement.
  - 113. Mr. Patterson directly or indirectly restricted Ms. Hill's freedom of movement for

a period of time.

- 114. Ms. Hill was aware that her freedom of movement was restricted and felt like a hostage she was unable to safely leave Mr. Patterson's office.
- 115. Ms. Hill has suffered damage as a result of Mr. Patterson's false imprisonment of her in an amount to be proven at trial for which Defendants are liable.

#### NINTH CLAIM FOR RELIEF

# **Negligent Hiring Against the City**

- 116. Plaintiff incorporates by reference all preceding paragraphs of this Complaint.
- 117. Mr. Patterson was an employee of the City at the time he was harassing Ms. Hill.
- 118. The City owed its employees, including Ms. Hill, a duty of care.
- 119. The City breached its duty of care when it hired Mr. Patterson despite the fact that the City knew or should have known that Mr. Patterson had a history of abusing and sexually harassing women.
  - 120. Ms. Hill has been damaged as a result of the City's negligence.
  - 121. The City's decision to hire Mr. Patterson caused Ms. Hill's injury.
- 122. Ms. Hill has been damaged as a result of the City's negligence in an amount to be proven at trial for which the City is liable.

### TENTH CLAIM FOR RELIEF

# Negligent Supervision Against the City

- 123. Plaintiff incorporates by reference all preceding paragraphs of this Complaint.
- 124. Mr. Patterson was an employee of the City at the time he was harassing Ms. Hill.
- 125. The City had a duty to supervise Mr. Patterson.

- 126. The City did not supervise, or negligently supervised, Mr. Patterson.
- 127. The City's negligence caused Mr. Hill's injury.
- 128. Ms. Hill has been damaged as a result of the City's negligence in an amount to be proven at trial for which the City is liable.

#### **ELEVENTH CLAIM FOR RELIEF**

# Negligent Retention Against the City

- 129. Plaintiff incorporates by reference all preceding paragraphs of this Complaint.
- 130. Mr. Patterson was an employee of the City at the time he was harassing Ms. Hill.
- 131. The City owed a duty of care to its employees, including Ms. Hill.
- 132. The City breached that duty by retaining Mr. Patterson even though the City knew or should have known of Mr. Patterson's dangerous sexual practices.
- 133. The City had actual knowledge of Mr. Patterson's practice of sexual harassment after the City settled claims with Ms. Kibler in or around 2019.
  - 134. The City's breach caused Ms. Hill's injuries.
- 135. Ms. Hill has been damaged as a result of the City's negligence in an amount to be proven at trial for which the City is liable.

#### TWELFTH CLAIM FOR RELIEF

# Defamation Against Mr. Patterson

- 136. Plaintiff incorporates by reference all preceding paragraphs of this Complaint.
- 137. Mr. Patterson made defamatory statements about Ms. Hill (including, among others, that she was in a sexual relationship with an officer of the Florence Police Department) and have published false information about Ms. Hill's conduct to numerous individuals in Florence.

- 138. The false statements have resulted in actual damage to Ms. Hill.
- 139. At the time of publication, Mr. Patterson knew the statements were false or Mr. Patterson made the statements and allegations with reckless disregard to their falsity.
- 140. As a result of the defamatory acts on the part of Mr. Patterson, Ms. Hill has suffered significant damages including, but not limited to, reputational harm, emotional distress, and nominal damages.

#### THIRTEENTH CLAIM FOR RELIEF

# Defamation Per Se Against Mr. Patterson

- 141. Plaintiff incorporates by reference all preceding paragraphs of this Complaint.
- 142. Mr. Patterson made defamatory statements about Ms. Hill and has published false information concerning Ms. Hill's conduct.
  - 143. The false statements have resulted in actual damage to Ms. Hill.
- 144. At the time of publication, Mr. Patterson knew that the statements were false or Mr. Patterson made the statements and allegations with reckless disregard to their falsity.
- 145. The statements were defamatory as to Ms. Hill's profession and thus constitute defamation *per se*.

#### **PRAYER FOR RELIEF**

WHEREFORE, Ms. Hill requests this Court grant the following relief:

- 1. Judgment in her favor on her claims for relief;
- 2. Nominal, pecuniary, actual, and compensatory damages;
- 3. Costs and expenses of this action along with attorneys' and experts' fees; and
- 4. Punitive and/or exemplary damages.

### **DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL**

Ms. Hill hereby demands a jury trial on all issues so triable.

Respectfully submitted this 31st day of January, 2022.

LEVENTHAL | LEWIS KUHN TAYLOR SWAN PC

/s/ Andrew E. Swan

Michael D. Kuhn, #42784 Andrew E. Swan, #46665 Hannah E. Herbst, #56418 620 North Tejon Street, Suite 101 Colorado Springs, CO 80903

Telephone: (719) 694-3000 Facsimile: (866) 515-8628 Email: aswan@ll.law

> mkuhn@ll.law hherbst@ll.law

Attorneys for Plaintiff

<u>Plaintiff's Address</u>: 824 West 2<sup>nd</sup> Street Florence, CO 81226

JS 44 (Rev. 10/20) District of Colorado

# **CIVIL COVER SHEET**

The JS 44 civil cover sheet and the information contained herein neither replace nor supplement the filing and service of pleadings or other papers as required by law, except as provided by local rules of court. This form, approved by the Judicial Conference of the United States in September 1974, is required for the use of the Clerk of Court for the purpose of initiating the civil docket sheet.

\*\*SFE INSTRUCTIONS ON NEXT PAGE OF THIS FORM.]

purpose of initiating the civil of	ocket sneet. (SEE INSTRUC	CTIONS ON NEXT PAGE (	JF THIS F						
I. (a) PLAINTIFFS				DEFENDANT	ΓS				
Jessica Hill						ce, a municipal an individual.	l corporatio	n; and	
(b) County of Residence of	of First Listed Plaintiff F	remont County				irst Listed Defendar	nt Fremon	t County	
. ,	XCEPT IN U.S. PLAINTIFF C.				(I	N U.S. PLAINTIFF CA	ASES ONLY)		
				NOTE: IN LAND THE TRA	CONDE CT OF I	EMNATION CASES, LAND INVOLVED.	USE THE LOCA	TION OF	
(c) Attorneys (Firm Name,				Attorneys (If Know	vn)				
	Kuhn Taylor Swan	, PC							
620 N. Tejon Sti									
Colorado Sprino									
II. BASIS OF JURISD	f ICTION (Place an "X" in	One Box Only)	III. C	TIZENSHIP OF		CIPAL PART	•		, ,,
1 U.S. Government	x 3 Federal Question			(For Diversity Cases Onl	PTF	DEF	ana Une B	ox for Defendan PTF	DEF
Plaintiff	(U.S. Government	Not a Party)	Citiz	en of This State	<b>X</b> 1		d or Principal Pla	ice 4	<b>¥</b> 4
						of Busine	ess In This State		
2 U.S. Government	4 Diversity		Citiz	en of Another State	☐ 2		d and Principal P		□ 5
Defendant	(Indicate Citizensh	hip of Parties in Item III)				of Busine	ess In Another St	ate	
				•	☐ 3	3 Foreign Na	tion	□ 6	□ 6
III NATIDE OF CHI			F	oreign Country	- Oli		50 1.0	5 101	
IV. NATURE OF SUIT		ORTS	Tr	ORFEITURE/PENALTY		ck here for: Natur		<u>e Descriptio</u> THER STATU	
110 Insurance	PERSONAL INJURY	PERSONAL INJUR		25 Drug Related Seizure	<u> </u>	422 Appeal 28 USC 1		False Claims A	
120 Marine	310 Airplane	365 Personal Injury -		of Property 21 USC 88	31 <b>H</b>	423 Withdrawal	376	Qui Tam (31 U	
130 Miller Act 140 Negotiable Instrument	315 Airplane Product Liability	Product Liability 367 Health Care/	□6	90 Other		28 USC 157		3729(a)) State Reapporti	on-ont
150 Recovery of Overpayment	320 Assault, Libel &	Pharmaceutical				PROPERTY RIGHT		Antitrust	Jument
& Enforcement of Judgment	t Slander	Personal Injury				820 Copyrights	430	Banks and Bank	aing
151 Medicare Act 152 Recovery of Defaulted	330 Federal Employers' Liability	Product Liability  368 Asbestos Persona	1		Н	830 Patent 835 Patent - Abbrevia		Commerce Deportation	
Student Loans	340 Marine	Injury Product	.			New Drug Applie	cation 470	Racketeer Influ	
(Excludes Veterans)  153 Recovery of Overpayment	345 Marine Product Liability	Liability PERSONAL PROPER	TV -	L.ABOR	$\dashv$	840 Trademark 880 Defend Trade Se		Corrupt Organia Consumer Cred	
of Veteran's Benefits	350 Motor Vehicle	370 Other Fraud		10 Fair Labor Standards		Act of 2016		(15 USC 1681	
160 Stockholders' Suits	355 Motor Vehicle	371 Truth in Lending		Act	_	200111 200101		Telephone Cons	sumer
190 Other Contract 195 Contract Product Liability	Product Liability  360 Other Personal	380 Other Personal Property Damage	_	20 Labor/Management Relations		861 HIA (1395ff)		Protection Act Cable/Sat TV	
196 Franchise	Injury	385 Property Damage	7	40 Railway Labor Act		862 Black Lung (923)	850	Securities/Com	nodities/
	362 Personal Injury - Medical Malpractice	Product Liability	7ب ⊢	51 Family and Medical Leave Act	Н	863 DIWC/DIWW (4 864 SSID Title XVI		Exchange Other Statutory	Actions
REAL ROPERTY	CIVIL RIGHTS	PRISONER PETITIO	NS 7	90 Other Labor Litigation	Ħ	865 RSI (405(g))	891	Agricultural Ac	ets
210 Land Condemnation 220 Foreclosure	440 Other Civil Rights	Habeas Corpus:	<b>∐</b> 7	91 Employee Retirement		PE DED AT TAY OU		Environmental l Freedom of Info	
230 Rent Lease & Ejectment	441 Voting  x 442 Employment	463 Alien Detainee 510 Motions to Vacat	e	Income Security Act		FE DERAL TAX SUI 870 Taxes (U.S. Plain		Act	mauon
240 Torts to Land	443 Housing/	Sentence				or Defendant)	896	Arbitration	
245 Tort Product Liability 290 All Other Real Property	Accommodations  445 Amer. w/Disabilities	530 General 535 Death Penalty	<u> </u>	IMMIGRATION		871 IRS—Third Party 26 USC 7609	_	Administrative : Act/Review or A	
	Employment	Other:		62 Naturalization Applicat	tion	=======================================	L	Agency Decisio	n
	446 Amer. w/Disabilities Other	540 Mandamus & Oth 550 Civil Rights	ier 4	65 Other Immigration Actions				Constitutionalit State Statutes	y of
	448 Education	555 Prison Condition		rodons				State Statutes	
		560 Civil Detainee - Conditions of							
		Confinement							
V. ORIGIN (Place an "X" i									
	moved from 3 te Court	Remanded from Appellate Court		nstated or 5 Tran pened Anot (spec	ther Dis	strict Litig	tidistrict gation - nsfer	8 Multid Litigat Direct	ion -
		atute under which you a				unless diversity):		20.00	
VI. CAUSE OF ACTIO	ON Title VII of the Civil Rig Brief description of c	ghts Act of 1964; 28 USC ause:	§ 1331					AP Doc	ket
THE BESTIES									
VII. REQUESTED IN		S IS A CLASS ACTION	N I	EMAND \$			only if demar		
COMPLAINT: UNDER RULE 23, F.R.Cv.P. JURY DEMAND: Yes No									
VIII. RELATED CASE(S) IF ANY    See instructions): JUDGE									
DATE		SIGNATURE OF AT	TORNEY	OF RECORD	61				
01/31/2022				19	Elwas				
FOR OFFICE USE ONLY									
RECEIPT # Al	MOUNT	APPLYING IFP		JUDGE	E	MA	.G. JUDGE		



January 20, 2022

Jessica Hill 824 West 2nd St. Florence, CO 81226

Charge Number: E2200014039

CCRD Complaint Number: E2200014039 - Jessica Hill v. City of Florence

#### Notice of Early Right to Sue

Dear Jessica Hill,

This letter is to inform you that your charge, captioned above, is being dismissed effective the date shown herein for the following reasons:

You have requested an Early Right to Sue letter from the Colorado Civil Rights Division.

Pursuant to C.R.S. 24-34-306 (15), if a claimant makes a request for a notice of right to sue prior to the expiration of one hundred eighty days following the filing of the charge, said request shall be granted upon a determination by the Commission, a commissioner, or an administrative law judge that the investigation of the charge will not be completed within the one hundred eighty days following the filing of the charge.

If you wish to file a civil action in a district court in this state, which action is based on the alleged discriminatory or unfair practice that was the subject of the charge you filed with the commission, you must do so within ninety days of the date of the mailing of this notice. If the Complainant does not file an action within the time limits specified above, such action will be barred and no district court shall have jurisdiction to hear such action. C.R.S. 24-34-306 (2)(b)(I)(B)(C).

Please be advised that the issuance of a notice of right to sue at any time shall terminate all further processing of any charge by the division; shall cause jurisdiction of the commission to cease; shall constitute final agency action; and exhaustion of administrative remedies and proceedings pursuant to Part 3 of Article 34 of Title 24, C.R.S. Neither the Division nor the Commission will provide assistance in assessing the claim or providing legal assistance in the filing or framing of any legal action.

If you have any questions regarding this decision, feel free to contact this office at (303) 894-2997.

Sincerely,

Aubrey Elenis, Director

Subrey D

Colorado Civil Rights Division



THE WOLTMAN BUILDING 620 NORTH TEJON STREET, SUITE 101 COLORADO SPRINGS, COLORADO 80903 TELEPHONE: (719) 694-3000

PTARMIGAN AT CHERRY CREEK 3773 CHERRY CREEK NORTH DRIVE, SUITE 710 DENVER, COLORADO 80209

> TELEPHONE: (720) 699-3000 FACSIMILE: (866) 515-8628

WWW.LL.LAW

Andrew E. Swan Email: aswan@ll.law

January 8, 2022

Via email only (osasu.edoigiawerie@state.co.us)

Osasu Edoigiawerie Denver District EEOC Office 303 East 17<sup>th</sup> Avenue, Suite 410 Denver, CO 80203

Re: Jessica Hill v. City of Florence (EEOC Charge No. 32A-2022-00101); Request for

Notice of Right to Sue

To Whom It May Concern:

This firm represents Jessica Hill in connection with several claims she has against the City of Florence related to her employment. Ms. Hill jointly filed her Complaint of Discrimination with the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission ("EEOC") and the Colorado Civil Rights Division ("CCRD") on November 8, 2021. Pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 2000e, *et seq.* ("Title VII"), please consider this Ms. Hill's request for a notice of a right to sue letter.

The perpetrator of the abuse, Michael Patterson, has been arrested and charged with several felonies. *See People v. Michael Thomas Patterson* (Fremont County District Court; 2021CR528). The criminal charges are related to the exact conduct alleged in Ms. Hill's complaint of discrimination. Therefore, we see no reason for the CCRD to continue with the investigation. Continuing the EEOC's investigation into Mr. Patterson's conduct in light of these criminal charges constitutes an unnecessary, duplicitous effort.

In light of the above, Ms. Hill respectfully requests termination of the EEOC's investigation and prompt issuance of a right to sue letter.

Sincerely,

Andrew E. Swan

AES/nd

CC: Michael D. Kuhn, Esq. Hannah E. Herbst, Esq.

# LEVENTHAL | LEWIS

Osasu Edoigiawerie January 7, 2022 Page 2 of 2

Client

# **CERTIFICATE OF E-MAILING**

This is to certify that on <u>January 20, 2022</u> a true and exact copy of the Closing Action of the below-referenced charge was e-mailed addressed to the parties and/or representatives listed below.

CCRD Case Number: **E2200014039** 

EEOC Case Number: **32A-2022-00101** 

aswan@II.law

hherbst@II.law

matt@kroblaw.com



David L. Martinez

Division of Civil Rights

1560 Broadway, Suite 825

Denver, CO 80202

www.dora.state.co.us

UNITED STATE	S DISTRICT COURT
D	istrict of
Plaintiff(s)  V.  Defendant(s)	) ) ) ) (Civil Action No. ) ) ) ) )
SUMMONS II	N A CIVIL ACTION
To: (Defendant's name and address)	
are the United States or a United States agency, or an off P. 12 (a)(2) or (3) — you must serve on the plaintiff an a	you (not counting the day you received it) — or 60 days if you icer or employee of the United States described in Fed. R. Civ. nswer to the attached complaint or a motion under Rule 12 of tion must be served on the plaintiff or plaintiff's attorney,
If you fail to respond, judgment by default will be You also must file your answer or motion with the court.	be entered against you for the relief demanded in the complaint.  CLERK OF COURT
Deter	
Date:	

Signature of Clerk or Deputy Clerk

AO 440 (Rev. 06/12) Summons in a Civil Action (Page 2)

Civil Action No.

### PROOF OF SERVICE

(This section should not be filed with the court unless required by Fed. R. Civ. P. 4 (l))

This summons for (n	ame of individual and title, if any)		
ceived by me on (date)	·		
☐ I personally serve	ed the summons on the individual at	(place)	
		on (date)	; or
☐ I left the summon	s at the individual's residence or us	ual place of abode with (name)	
		of suitable age and discretion who re	sides there,
on (date)	, and mailed a copy to th	e individual's last known address; or	
☐ I served the sumn	nons on (name of individual)		, who i
designated by law to	accept service of process on behalf		
		on (date)	; or
☐ I returned the sun	nmons unexecuted because		; 01
☐ Other (specify):			
My fees are \$	for travel and \$	for services, for a total of \$	
I declare under penal	Ity of perjury that this information is	s true.	
Table 1	y FJy		
		Server's signature	
		Printed name and title	
		Server's address	
		server s address	

Additional information regarding attempted service, etc:

United Stati	ES DISTRICT COURT for the
I	District of
Plaintiff(s) V.  Defendant(s)	) ) ) ) ) Civil Action No. ) ) )
CIMMONG	IN A CIVIL ACTION
To: (Defendant's name and address)	EVA CIVIL ACTION
A lawsuit has been filed against you.	
are the United States or a United States agency, or an of P. 12 (a)(2) or (3) — you must serve on the plaintiff an	n you (not counting the day you received it) — or 60 days if you ficer or employee of the United States described in Fed. R. Civ. answer to the attached complaint or a motion under Rule 12 of otion must be served on the plaintiff or plaintiff's attorney,
If you fail to respond, judgment by default will You also must file your answer or motion with the court	be entered against you for the relief demanded in the complaint.
	CLERK OF COURT
Date:	

Signature of Clerk or Deputy Clerk

AO 440 (Rev. 06/12) Summons in a Civil Action (Page 2)

Civil Action No.

### PROOF OF SERVICE

(This section should not be filed with the court unless required by Fed. R. Civ. P. 4 (l))

	This summons for (name	e of individual and title, if any)					
was re	ceived by me on (date)						
	☐ I personally served	the summons on the indiv	idual at (place)				
			on (date)	; or			
	☐ I left the summons a	at the individual's residen	ce or usual place of abode with (name)				
	, a person of suitable age and discretion who resides there,						
	on (date), and mailed a copy to the individual's last known address; or						
	☐ I served the summo	ns on (name of individual)		, who is			
	designated by law to a	accept service of process of	on behalf of (name of organization)				
			on (date)	; or			
	☐ I returned the summ	nons unexecuted because		; or			
	☐ Other ( <i>specify</i> ):						
	My fees are \$	for travel and \$	for services, for a tot	al of \$			
	I declare under penalty	of perjury that this inform	mation is true.				
Date:							
			Server's signature				
			Printed name and titl	Te			
			Server's address				

Additional information regarding attempted service, etc: