SUMMONS (CITACION JUDICIAL)

NOTICE TO DEFENDANT: (AVISO AL DEMANDADO):

City of Ojai, a public entity; DOES 1 through 50, inclusive Received City of Olal

YOU ARE BEING SUED BY PLAINTIFF: (LO ESTÁ DEMANDANDO EL DEMANDANTE):

Renee Mora, an individual

JUL 18 2025

City Clerk

FOR COURT USE ONLY (SOLO PARA USO DE LA CORTE)

ELECTRONICALLY FILED
Superior Court of California
County of Ventura

06/23/2025

K. Bieker Executive Officer and Clerk

Deputy Clerk loan Foster

NOTICE! You have been sued. The court may decide against you without your being heard unless you respond within 30 days. Read the information below.

You have 30 CALENDAR DAYS after this summons and legal papers are served on you to file a written response at this court and have a copy served on the plaintiff. A letter or phone call will not protect you. Your written response must be in proper legal form if you want the court to hear your case. There may be a court form that you can use for your response. You can find these court forms and more information at the California Courts Online Self-Help Center (www.courtinfo.ca.gov/selfhelp), your county law library, or the courthouse nearest you. If you cannot pay the filing fee, ask the court clerk for a fee waiver form. If you do not file your response on time, you may lose the case by default, and your wages, money, and property may be taken without further warning from the court.

There are other legal requirements. You may want to call an attorney right away. If you do not know an attorney, you may want to call an attorney referral service. If you cannot afford an attorney, you may be eligible for free legal services from a nonprofit legal services program. You can locate these nonprofit groups at the California Legal Services Web site (www.lawhelpcalifornia.org), the California Courts Online Self-Help Center (www.courtinfo.ca.gov/selfhelp), or by contacting your local court or county bar association. NOTE: The court has a statutory lien for waived fees and costs on any settlement or arbitration award of \$10,000 or more in a civil case. The court's lien must be paid before the court will dismiss the case. ¡AVISO! Lo han demandado. Si no responde dentro de 30 días, la corte puede decidir en su contra sin escuchar su versión. Lea la información a continuación.

Tiene 30 DÍAS DE CALENDARIO después de que le entreguen esta citación y papeles legales para presentar una respuesta por escrito en esta corte y hacer que se entregue una copia al demandante. Una carta o una llamada telefónica no lo protegen. Su respuesta por escrito tiene que estar en formato legal correcto si desea que procesen su caso en la corte. Es posible que haya un formulario que usted pueda usar para su respuesta. Puede encontrar estos formularios de la corte y más información en el Centro de Ayuda de las Cortes de California (www.sucorte.ca.gov), en la biblioteca de leyes de su condado o en la corte que le quede más cerca. Si no puede pagar la cuota de presentación, pida al secretario de la corte que le dé un formulario de exención de pago de cuotas. Si no presenta su respuesta a tiempo, puede perder el caso por incumplimiento y la corte le podrá quitar su sueldo, dinero y bienes sin más advertencia.

Hay otros requisitos legales. Es recomendable que llame a un abogado inmediatamente. Si no conoce a un abogado, puede llamar a un servicio de remisión a abogados. Si no puede pagar a un abogado, es posible que cumpla con los requisitos para obtener servicios legales gratuitos de un programa de servicios legales sin fines de lucro. Puede encontrar estos grupos sin fines de lucro en el sitio web de California Legal Services, (www.lawhelpcalifornia.org), en el Centro de Ayuda de las Cortes de California, (www.sucorte.ca.gov) o poniéndose en contacto con la corte o el colegio de abogados locales. AVISO: Por ley, la corte tiene derecho a reclamar las cuotas y los costos exentos por imponer un gravamen sobre cualquier recuperación de \$10,000 ó más de valor recibida mediante un acuerdo o una concesión de arbitraje en un caso de derecho civil. Tiene que pagar el gravamen de la corte antes de que la corte pueda desechar el caso.

The name and address of the court is:	
(El nombre y dirección de la corte es):	
Ventura Hall of Justice	
800 South Victoria Avenue	

CASE NUMBER: (Número del Caso):

2025CUWT046231

The name, address, and telephone number of plaintiffs attorney, or plaintiff without an attorney, is: (El nombre, la dirección y el número de teléfono del abogado del demandante, o del demandante que no tiene abogado, es):

Johnny Rundell (SBN 289480)

16255 Ventura Blvd., Suite 1205 Encino, CA 91436

DATE: (Fecha) 06/23/2025 (310) 929-2190

(Secretario)

Clerk, by

Joan Foster John Storten

K. Bieker

, Deputy (Adjunto)

(For proof of service of this summons, use Proof of Service of Summons (form POS-010).)

(Para prueba de entrega de esta citatión use el formulario Proof of Service of Summons, (POS-010)). NOTICE TO THE PERSON SERVED: You are served



1. 2.	as an individual defendant. as the person sued under the fictitious name of (s	pecify)	:
3.	on behalf of (specify): City of Ojai, a public en	tity	
	under: CCP 416.10 (corporation) CCP 416.20 (defunct corporation) CCP 416.40 (association or partnership) other (specify): 416.50 (public entity)		CCP 416.60 (minor) CCP 416.70 (conservatee) CCP 416.90 (authorized person)

by personal delivery on (date):

Page 1 of 1

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 3.740 or a complex case, this cover sheet will be used for statistical purposes only.

INSTRUCTIONS ON HOW TO COMPLETE THE COVER SHEET

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.

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

Negligent 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)

CASE TYPES AND EXAMPLES Contract

Breach of Contract/Warranty (06) Breach of Rental/Lease

> Contract (not unlawful detainer or wronaful 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

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 drugs, 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 Received City of Ojai Claim

Other Civil Petition

JUL 18 2025

Ventura Superior Court transmitted through eFiling 06/23/2025 03:47:16 PM 22 23 24

25

26

27

28

ELECTRONICALLY FILED
Superior Court of California
County of Ventura

06/23/2025

00/20/2020	
K. Bieker	
Executive Officer and	Clerk

2 3 4	Johnny Rundell (SBN: 289480) HERSHEY LAW, P.C. 16255 Ventura Blvd, Suite 1205 Encino, CA 91436 Tel: (310) 929-2190 Fax: (818) 301-4918	By: Deputy Clerk Joan Foster	
3	Encino, CA 91436 Tel: (310) 929-2190	Yoan Foster	
	1el: (310) 929-2190 Fax: (818) 301-4918		
4			
	Email:bhershey@hersheylaw.com, jrundell@	hersheylaw.com	
5	Attorneys for Plaintiff RENEE MORA		
6			
7			
8	SUPERIOR COURT OF	THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA	
9			
	FOR THE COUNTY OF VENTURA		
10	RENEE MORA, an individual,	Case No. 2025CUWT046231	
11	**		
12	Plaintiff,	PLAINTIFF'S COMPLAINT FOR DAMAGES	
4.0	vs.		
12	1	1 D 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	
13	CITY OF OJAI, a public entity, and DOES 1	Discrimination on the Basis of Medical Condition in Violation of the FEHA.	
13 14	CITY OF OJAI, a public entity, and DOES 1 through 50, inclusive.	Condition in Violation of the FEHA. 2. Discrimination on the Basis of Race in	
		Condition in Violation of the FEHA.	
14 15	through 50, inclusive.	Condition in Violation of the FEHA. 2. Discrimination on the Basis of Race in Violation of the FEHA. 3. Failure to Make a Reasonable Accommodation. 4. Failure to Prevent Discrimination in Violation	
14 15 16	through 50, inclusive.	Condition in Violation of the FEHA. 2. Discrimination on the Basis of Race in Violation of the FEHA. 3. Failure to Make a Reasonable Accommodation.	
14 15	through 50, inclusive.	 Condition in Violation of the FEHA. Discrimination on the Basis of Race in Violation of the FEHA. Failure to Make a Reasonable Accommodation. Failure to Prevent Discrimination in Violation of the FEHA. Retaliation in Violation of the FEHA. Whistleblower Retaliation in Violation of 	
14 15 16	through 50, inclusive.	 Condition in Violation of the FEHA. Discrimination on the Basis of Race in Violation of the FEHA. Failure to Make a Reasonable Accommodation. Failure to Prevent Discrimination in Violation of the FEHA. Retaliation in Violation of the FEHA. Whistleblower Retaliation in Violation of Labor Code § 1102.5. Wrongful Termination in Violation of the 	
14 15 16 17	through 50, inclusive.	 Condition in Violation of the FEHA. Discrimination on the Basis of Race in Violation of the FEHA. Failure to Make a Reasonable Accommodation. Failure to Prevent Discrimination in Violation of the FEHA. Retaliation in Violation of the FEHA. Whistleblower Retaliation in Violation of Labor Code § 1102.5. Wrongful Termination in Violation of the FEHA. 	
14 15 16 17 18 19	through 50, inclusive.	 Condition in Violation of the FEHA. Discrimination on the Basis of Race in Violation of the FEHA. Failure to Make a Reasonable Accommodation. Failure to Prevent Discrimination in Violation of the FEHA. Retaliation in Violation of the FEHA. Whistleblower Retaliation in Violation of Labor Code § 1102.5. Wrongful Termination in Violation of the FEHA. Wrongful Termination in Violation of Public Policy. 	
14 15 16 17 18	through 50, inclusive.	Condition in Violation of the FEHA. 2. Discrimination on the Basis of Race in Violation of the FEHA. 3. Failure to Make a Reasonable Accommodation. 4. Failure to Prevent Discrimination in Violation of the FEHA. 5. Retaliation in Violation of the FEHA. 6. Whistleblower Retaliation in Violation of Labor Code § 1102.5. 7. Wrongful Termination in Violation of the FEHA. 8. Wrongful Termination in Violation of Public	

Received City of Ojai

JUL 18 2025

City Clerk

COMPLAINT FOR DAMAGES

Plaintiff, Renee Mora, alleges on the basis of personal knowledge and/or information and belief:

SUMMARY

This is an action by Plaintiff, Renee Mora, ("Mora"), against City of Ojai, ("City of Ojai") and Defendant DOES 1 through 50, inclusive, hereafter collectively referred to as "Defendants".

This case exemplifies how a dedicated employee faced retaliation and wrongful termination after standing up against workplace safety violations and supporting her supervisor who enforced proper policies and procedures. Plaintiff brings this action against Defendants for economic, non-economic, compensatory, and pre-judgment interest pursuant to Code of Civil Procedure section § 3291, and costs and reasonable attorneys' fees pursuant to Government Code section § 12965(b) and Code of Civil Procedure section § 1021.5.

PARTIES

- 1. Plaintiff: Plaintiff Mora is, and at all times mentioned in this Complaint was, a resident of the County of Ventura, California.
- 2. Defendant: Defendant City of Ojai is, and at all times in this Complaint was, authorized to operate by the State of California and the United States government and authorized and qualified to do business in the County of Ventura. City of Ojai's principal place of business, where the following causes of action took place, was and is located in the County of Ventura at 401 South Ventura Street, Ojai, California 92023.
- Doe Defendants: DOES 1 to 50, inclusive, are sued under fictitious names

 pursuant to Code of Civil Procedure section § 474. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and on that

 basis alleges, and on that basis alleges, that each of the Defendants sued under fictitious names

 are in some manner responsible for the wrongs and damages alleged below, in so acting were

 functioning as the agents, servants, partners, and employees of the Co-Defendants, and in taking

 the actions mentioned below were acting within the course and scope of their authority as such

 agent, servant, partner, and employee, with the permission and consent of the co-defendants. The 2025

 City Clerk

9

10

11

12

13 14

15

16

17 18

19

20

21 22

23

24 25

26

27

28

named Defendants and DOE Defendants are sometimes hereafter referred to, collectively and/or individually, as "Defendants".

- 4. Relationship of Defendants: All Defendants compelled, coerced, aided, and/or abetted the retaliation and harassment alleged in this Complaint, which conduct is prohibited under California Government Code section § 12940(i). All Defendants were responsible for the events and damages alleged herein, including on the following bases: (a) Defendants, committed the acts alleged; (b) at all relevant times, one or more of the Defendants was the agent or employee, and/or acted under the control or supervision, of one or more of the remaining defendants, and in committing the acts alleged, acted within the course and scope of such agency and employment and/or is or are otherwise liable for Plaintiff's damages. Defendants exercised domination and control over one another to such an extent that any individuality or separateness of Defendants, does not, and at all times herein mentioned did not, exist. Adherence to the fiction of the separate existence of Defendants would permit abuse of the corporate privilege and would sanction fraud and promote injustice. All actions of all defendants were taken by employees, supervisors, executives, officers, and directors during employment with all Defendants, were taken on behalf of all Defendants, and were engaged in, authorized, ratified, and approved of by all other Defendants.
- Defendants both directly and indirectly employed Plaintiff, as defined in the Fair 5. Employment and Housing Act ("FEHA") at Government Code section § 12926(d).
- 6. In addition, Defendants compelled, coerced, aided, and abetted the harassment, which is prohibited under California Government Code section § 12940(i).
- Finally, at all relevant times mentioned herein, all Defendants acted as agents of 7. all other Defendants in committing the acts alleged herein.
 - 8. Jurisdiction and venue: Jurisdiction and venue are proper in this court because:
- At all relevant times, the unlawful employment practices occurred in Ojai, a. California, where Defendant City of Ojai Recreation Department operates and conducts business Received City of Ojai at 510 Park Road, Ojai, California 93023.

JUL 18 2025

_.

9. Plaintiff's hiring: Mora was hired on or about April 15, 2025 as a Recreation Leader.

- 10. Plaintiff's protected status:
- a. Plaintiff is a Mexican-American female who suffers from dyslexia, a recognized disability requiring reasonable accommodations.
 - 11. Plaintiff's protected activity:
- a. Plaintiff engaged in protected activity by reporting workplace safety violations regarding alcohol consumption at softball games, supporting her supervisor's enforcement of policies, and reporting discrepancies in the gymnastics program.
 - 12. Defendants' adverse employment actions and behavior:
- a. Plaintiff Renee Mora began her employment with the City of Ojai Recreation Department on April 15, 2024, as a Recreation Leader. Based on her exemplary performance, she was promoted to Office Specialist II in September 2024, with a salary increase to \$23.98 per hour.
- b. During her initial employment as Recreation Leader and Field Supervisor from May to August 2024, Plaintiff was responsible for supervising adult softball leagues and ensuring compliance with City policies. In May 2024, Plaintiff reported to her supervisor, Matt Davis, that participants were consuming excessive amounts of alcohol during games, violating the Ojai Recreation Softball code of conduct. After Mr. Davis sent an email reinforcing the alcohol prohibition policy, Plaintiff began experiencing harassment from players who would make hostile comments such as "Watch out, here comes that Bitch" and "Fucking Snitch."
- c. The situation escalated in August 2024 when Brian Taylor, a softball player, became aggressive toward Plaintiff and other staff members. Taylor made discriminatory comments including "Fuck you Mexicans" and physically confronted Plaintiff, culminating in him chest-bumping her. Despite reporting this incident to City Manager Ben Harvey, the City failed to take appropriate corrective action, instead suggesting personal charges against Taylor.

 JUL 18 2025

City Clerk

- d. In November 2024, after Mr. Davis was pressured to either resign or repair relationships with parents regarding gymnastics program issues, Plaintiff advocated on his behalf to City Manager Ben Harvey. Following this protected activity, Plaintiff began experiencing retaliation. The new interim manager, Kristy Rivera, excluded Plaintiff from communications about office procedures and recreation activities.
- e. When Plaintiff requested disability accommodations for her dyslexia, including repetitive explanations and written instructions, the City failed to engage in the interactive process or provide reasonable accommodations. Instead, management used her disability against her, questioning her work performance despite her previous positive reviews.
- f. The retaliation intensified when Plaintiff reported discrepancies in activity money processing to Kristy Rivera. Former employee Jeff Jones urged Plaintiff to quit, while colleague Brianna Soliz made unfounded accusations about Plaintiff exchanging sexual favors for promotions.
- g. On December 17, 2024, after Plaintiff voiced concerns to HR about being retaliated against and sabotaged, Kristy Rivera reminded Plaintiff of her probationary status and suggested she could leave if unhappy. Shortly thereafter, on January 10, 2025, Plaintiff was abruptly terminated during a brief meeting with HR, with the only explanation being her "probationary" status, despite her history of positive performance.
- h. The City employs more than five employees and operates the Recreation Department, which provides recreational programs and activities to the Ojai community.
- 13. Economic damages: As a consequence of Defendants' conductPlaintiff has suffered and will suffer economic harm, including but not limited to: (1) lost past and future income; (2) lost employment benefits; (3) damage to their career prospects and earning capacity; (4) lost wages and overtime compensation; (5) unpaid expenses; and (6) statutory penalties, as well as interest on unpaid wages at the legal rate from and after each payday on which those wages should have been paid, all in amounts to be proven at trial.

 Received City of Oja
- 14. Non-economic damages: As a consequence of Defendants' conduct, Plaintiff has

 JUL 1 8 2025
 suffered and will continue to suffer non-economic damages, including but not limited to: (1)

 City Clerk

psychological and emotional distress; (2) humiliation; (3) mental anguish; (4) physical pain and suffering; and (5) loss of enjoyment of life, all in amounts to be proven at trial.

- 15. Attorneys' fees: Plaintiff has incurred and continues to incur substantial legal expenses and attorneys' fees in the prosecution of this action and is entitled to an award of reasonable attorneys' fees and costs pursuant to applicable law, including but not limited to Government Code section § 12965(b) and Code of Civil Procedure section § 1021.5.
- all administrative prerequisites and exhausted all required administrative remedies by: (a) filing timely administrative complaints with the California Civil Rights Department ("CRD") and receiving Right to Sue notices for all FEHA-based claims; (b) timely filing a written government claim with Defendant public entity pursuant to Government Code §§ 910 et seq. for all tort claims, ; and (c) exhausting any applicable internal administrative grievance procedures as required by Defendant public entity's policies and procedures. Plaintiff has complied with all statutory prerequisites to filing this action against a public entity.

FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION

Discrimination on the Basis of Medical Condition in Violation of FEHA (By Plaintiff Mora Against Defendants City of Ojai; and DOES 1 through 50)

- 17. Plaintiff hereby incorporates by reference the preceding paragraphs of this complaint as if fully alleged herein.
- 18. At all times herein mentioned, California Government Code § 12940 et seq., was in full force and effect and were binding on Defendants, as Defendants regularly employed five (5) or more persons.
- 19. California Government Code § 12940(a) prohibits employers from discriminating against any person in compensation or in terms, conditions, or privileges of employment because of Medical Condition and Race.
- 20. Plaintiff is a member of a protected class based on Plaintiff's Medical Condition and Race.

 Received City of Ojai
 - 21. Plaintiff was qualified for the position Plaintiff held and was performed 25

 City Clerk

- 22. Plaintiff suffered an adverse employment action.
- 23. The circumstances surrounding the adverse employment actions suggest that Plaintiff's Medical Condition and Race was a substantial motivating reason for Defendants' decisions.
- 24. Similarly situated employees not in Plaintiff's protected class were treated more favorably and/or were not subjected to similar adverse employment actions.
- 25. Defendants have failed to articulate a legitimate, non-discriminatory reason for the adverse employment action taken against Plaintiff. Even if Defendants were to articulate such a reason, such reason would be pretextual.
- 26. As a proximate result of the aforesaid acts of Defendants, Plaintiff has suffered actual, consequential and incidental financial losses, including without limitation, loss of salary and benefits, and the intangible loss of employment related opportunities in Plaintiff's field and damage to Plaintiff's professional reputation, all in an amount subject to proof at the time of trial. Plaintiff claims such amounts as damages pursuant to California Government Code § 3287 and/or § 3288 and/or any other provision of law providing for prejudgment interest.
- As a proximate result of the wrongful acts of Defendants, Plaintiff has suffered and continues to suffer emotional distress, humiliation, mental anguish and embarrassment, as well as the manifestation of physical symptoms. Plaintiff is informed and believes and thereupon alleges that Plaintiff will continue to experience said physical and emotional suffering for a period in the future not presently ascertainable, all in an amount subject to proof at the time of trial.
- 28. As a proximate result of the wrongful acts of Defendants, Plaintiff has been forced to hire attorneys to prosecute Plaintiff's claims herein and has incurred and is expected to continue to incur attorneys' fees and costs in connection therewith. Plaintiff is entitled to recover attorneys' fees and costs under California Government Code § 12965(b).

SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION

Discrimination on the Basis of Race in Violation of FEHA

Received City of Ojai

(By Plaintiff Mora Against Defendants City of Ojai; and DOES 1 through 50) UL 18 2025

City Clerk

City Clerk

28

1	continues to s	uffer emotional distress, humiliation, mental anguish and embarrassm	ent, as well as
2	the manifestat	ion of physical symptoms. Plaintiff is informed and believes and ther	eupon alleges
3	that Plaintiff v	will continue to experience said physical and emotional suffering for a	a period in the
4	future not pres	sently ascertainable, all in an amount subject to proof at the time of tri	al.
5	40.	As a proximate result of the wrongful acts of Defendants, Plaintiff ha	as been forced
6	to hire attorne	ys to prosecute Plaintiff's claims herein and has incurred and is expect	ed to continue
7	to incur attorn	eys' fees and costs in connection therewith. Plaintiff is entitled to reco	over attorneys'
8	fees and costs under California Government Code § 12965(b).		
9	THIRD CAUSE OF ACTION		
10	Failure to Make Reasonable Accommodation in Violation of FEHA (Gov't Code § 12940(m))		§ 12940(m))
11	(By Plaintiff Mora Against Defendants City of Ojai; and DOES 1 through 50)		
12	41.	Plaintiff hereby incorporates by reference the preceding parag	raphs of this
13	Complaint as if fully alleged herein.		
14	42.	At all times herein mentioned, California Government Code § 12940	et seq. was in
15	full force and	effect and was binding on Defendants, as Defendants regularly employed	yed five (5) or
16	more persons.		
17	43.	California Government Code § 12940(m)(1) makes it an unlawfu	l employment
18	practice for a	n employer "to fail to make reasonable accommodation for the know	vn physical or
19	mental disabil	lity of an applicant or employee."	
20	44.	Plaintiff had a physical and/or mental disability that was known to D	efendants.
21	45.	Plaintiff was able to perform the essential functions of the job with	ith reasonable
22	accommodation	on.	
23	46.	Defendants failed to provide reasonable accommodation for Plaintiff	
24	47.	Providing reasonable accommodation would not have imposed an u	ndue hardship
25	on Defendant	s' operation.	
26	48.	As a direct and proximate result of Defendants' unlawful conduct	, Plaintiff has eceived City of Oja
27	suffered and v	vill continue to suffer damages, including lost wages and benefits, emot	nonai distress,
28	and other dan	nages in an amount to be proven at trial.	JUL 18 2025
			City Clerk

As a proximate result of Defendants' conduct, Plaintiff has been forced to 118 r 2025

City Clerk

27

28

2.

1	attorneys to prosecute the claims asserted herein and has incurred and is expected to continue to		
2	incur attorneys' fees and costs in connection therewith. Plaintiff is entitled to recover attorneys'		
3	fees and costs pursuant to California Government Code § 12965.		
4	FIFTH CAUSE OF ACTION		
5	Retaliation in Violation of FEHA (Gov't Code § 12940(h))		
6	(By Plaintiff Mora Against Defendants City of Ojai; and DOES 1 through 50)		
7	54. Plaintiff hereby incorporates by reference the preceding paragraphs of this		
8	Complaint as if fully alleged herein.		
9	55. At all times herein mentioned, California Government Code § 12940 et seq. was in		
10	full force and effect and was binding on Defendants, as Defendants regularly employed five (5) or		
11	more persons.		
12	56. California Government Code § 12940(h) prohibits an employer from retaliating		
13	against an employee based upon the employee's opposition to practices forbidden under the Fair		
14	Employment and Housing Act, or for filing a complaint, testifying, or assisting in any proceeding		
15	under the FEHA.		
16	57. Plaintiff engaged in protected activity under the FEHA.		
17	58. Defendants were aware of Plaintiff's protected activity.		
18	59. After Plaintiff engaged in protected activity, Defendants subjected Plaintiff to		
19	adverse employment action.		
20	60. A causal connection exists between Plaintiff's protected activity and the adverse		
21	employment action taken by Defendants. The adverse employment action occurred within a short		
22	time after Plaintiff engaged in protected activity and/or other circumstances suggest a retaliatory		
23	motive.		
24	61. As a proximate result of Defendants' conduct, Plaintiff has suffered and will		
25	continue to suffer actual, consequential and incidental damages, including but not limited to, loss		
26	of wages and benefits, and the intangible loss of employment related opportunities in Plaintiff's		
27	field and damage to Plaintiff's professional reputation, all in an amount subject to professional city of O		
28	of trial. Plaintiff claims such amounts as damages pursuant to California Civil Code § 3287 and/or 1 8 2025		

COMDI AINT EOD DAMACEC

City Clerk

§ 3288 and/or any other provisions of law providing for prejudgment interest.

- 62. As a proximate result of Defendants' conduct, Plaintiff has suffered and will continue to suffer emotional distress, humiliation, mental anguish and embarrassment, as well as the manifestation of physical symptoms. Plaintiff is informed and believes and thereupon alleges that Plaintiff will continue to experience said physical and emotional suffering for a period in the future not presently ascertainable, all in an amount subject to proof at trial.
- 63. As a proximate result of Defendants' conduct, Plaintiff has been forced to hire attorneys to prosecute the claims asserted herein and has incurred and is expected to continue to incur attorneys' fees and costs in connection therewith. Plaintiff is entitled to recover attorneys' fees and costs pursuant to California Government Code § 12965.

SIXTH CAUSE OF ACTION

Whistleblower Retaliation in Violation of Labor Code § 1102.5

(By Plaintiff Mora Against Defendants City of Ojai; and DOES 1 through 50)

- 64. Plaintiff hereby incorporates by reference the preceding paragraphs of this complaint as if fully alleged herein.
- 65. California Labor Code § 1102.5(b) prohibits employers from retaliating against an employee where the employee has disclosed information, or the employer believes that the employee disclosed or may disclose information, to a government or law enforcement agency, to a person with authority over the employee or another employee who has the authority to investigate, discover, or correct the violation or noncompliance, if the employee has reasonable cause to believe that the information discloses a violation of state or federal statute, or a violation or noncompliance with a local, state or federal rule or regulation, regardless of whether disclosing the information is part of the employee's job duties.
- 66. California Labor Code § 1102.5(c) also forbids retaliation "against an employee for refusing to participate in an activity that would result in a violation of state or federal statute, or a violation of or noncompliance with a local, state, or federal rule or regulation."
 - 67. Plaintiff engaged in protected activity under Labor Code § 1102. Received City of Ojal
 - 68. Plaintiff had reasonable cause to believe that the information disclosed evil and 2025

a violation of state or federal statute, or a violation or noncompliance with a local, state or federal rule or regulation.

- 69. In response to Plaintiff's protected activity, Defendants subjected Plaintiff to adverse employment action.
- 70. A causal connection exists between Plaintiff's protected whistleblowing activity and the adverse employment action taken by Defendants. Plaintiff's protected activity was a contributing factor in Defendants' decision to take adverse employment action against Plaintiff."
- 71. Defendants' adverse employment action against Plaintiff constitutes unlawful retaliation on account of Plaintiff's protected activity in violation of Labor Code § 1102.5.
- 72. Under Labor Code § 1102.6, once Plaintiff demonstrates by a preponderance of the evidence that retaliation was a contributing factor in the adverse employment action, the burden shifts to Defendants to demonstrate by clear and convincing evidence that they would have taken the same action for legitimate, independent reasons even had Plaintiff not engaged in protected activity.
- 73. As a proximate result of Defendants' conduct, Plaintiff has suffered and continues to suffer damages in terms of lost wages, lost bonuses, lost benefits, and other pecuniary loss according to proof. Plaintiff has also suffered and will continue to suffer physical and emotional injuries, including nervousness, humiliation, depression, anguish, embarrassment, fright, shock, pain, discomfort, fatigue, and anxiety. The amount of Plaintiff's damages will be ascertained at trial.
- 74. Plaintiff is entitled to recover a civil penalty of \$10,000 for each violation, to be awarded to the employee who suffered the violation.
 - 3. Plaintiff is entitled to reasonable attorney fees pursuant to Labor Code § 1102.5(j).

SEVENTH CAUSE OF ACTION

Retaliation for Complaints About Workplace Safety and Health in Violation of Labor Code

§ 6310

(By Plaintiff Mora Against Defendants City of Ojai; and DOES 1 through City of Ojai

75. Plaintiff hereby incorporates by reference the preceding paragraphs of this 2025

83.

84.

4.

action.

and costs.

benefits caused by Defendants' acts.

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

Plaintiff is entitled to reinstatement and reimbursement for lost wages and work

Plaintiff is not required to exhaust administrative remedies before bringing this

Plaintiff seeks all available remedies, including but not limited to reinstatement,

reimbursement for lost wages and work benefits, compensatory damages, interest Received City of Ojai

EIGHTH CAUSE OF ACTION

Wrongful Termination in Violation of the FEHA

(By Plaintiff Mora Against Defendants City of Ojai; and DOES 1 through 50)

- 85. Plaintiff hereby incorporates by reference the preceding paragraphs of this Complaint as if fully alleged herein.
- 86. At all times herein mentioned, California Government Code § 12940 et seq. was in full force and effect and was binding on Defendants, as Defendants regularly employed five (5) or more persons. California Government Code § 12940(a) provides that it is unlawful for an employer, because of a protected characteristic or protected activity, to discharge a person from employment.
- 87. Plaintiff was terminated and the circumstances surrounding Plaintiff's termination suggest that Plaintiff's protected characteristics and/or protected activity was a substantial motivating reason for Defendants' decision.
- 88. As a proximate result of the aforesaid acts of Defendants, Plaintiff has suffered actual, consequential and incidental financial losses, including without limitation, loss of salary and benefits, and the intangible loss of employment related opportunities in Plaintiff's field and damage to Plaintiff's professional reputation, all in an amount subject to proof at the time of trial. Plaintiff claims such amounts as damages pursuant to California Government Code § 3287 and/or § 3288 and/or any other provision of law providing for prejudgment interest.
- 89. As a proximate result of the wrongful acts of Defendants, Plaintiff has suffered and continues to suffer emotional distress, humiliation, mental anguish and embarrassment, as well as the manifestation of physical symptoms. Plaintiff is informed and believes and thereupon alleges that Plaintiff will continue to experience said physical and emotional suffering for a period in the future not presently ascertainable, all in an amount subject to proof at the time of trial.
- 5. As a proximate result of the wrongful acts of Defendants, Plaintiff has been forced to hire attorneys to prosecute Plaintiff's claims herein and has incurred and is expected to continue Received City of Oja to incur attorneys' fees and costs in connection therewith. Plaintiff is entitled to recover attorneys' fees and costs under California Government Code § 12965(b).

NINTH CAUSE OF ACTION

Wrongful Termination in Violation of Public Policy

(By Plaintiff Mora Against Defendants City of Ojai; and DOES 1 through 50)

- 90. Plaintiff hereby incorporates by reference the preceding paragraphs of this Complaint as if fully alleged herein.
- 91. To establish a claim for wrongful discharge in violation of public policy, Plaintiff must prove: (a) an employer-employee relationship; (b) termination or other adverse employment action; (c) the termination violated public policy; (d) the termination was a legal cause of Plaintiff's damage; and (e) the nature and extent of Plaintiff's damage.
- 92. At all times herein mentioned, the public policy of the State of California is to prohibit employers from engaging in the conduct alleged herein. This public policy is fundamental, substantial, and well-established in constitutional or statutory provisions. This public policy is designed to protect all employees and to promote the welfare and well-being of the community at large, not merely to serve the interests of the individual Plaintiff. Accordingly, the actions of Defendants, and each of them, in terminating Plaintiff, on the grounds alleged herein were wrongful and in contravention of the express public policy of the State of California.
- 93. The public policy basis for this claim is firmly established in fundamental statutory or constitutional provisions, including but not limited to: The California Fair Employment and Housing Act (Gov. Code § 12940 et seq.), which prohibits discrimination, harassment, and retaliation based on protected characteristics; California Labor Code § 1102.5, which prohibits retaliation against whistleblowers; California Labor Code § 6310, which prohibits retaliation for complaints about workplace safety and health; California Health & Safety Code § 1278.5, which prohibits retaliation against healthcare workers who report patient safety concerns; and California Labor Code §§ 201, 203, 226, 226.7, and 1194, which protect employees' rights to timely payment of wages, accurate wage statements, meal and rest breaks, and overtime compensation.
- 94. Plaintiff engaged in protected activity. Plaintiff need not prove an actual violation of law; it is sufficient that Plaintiff had a reasonable and good faith belief that the law of old violated.

 JUL 18 2025

- 95. Defendants were aware of Plaintiff's protected activity.
- 96. Defendants terminated Plaintiff's employment in retaliation for Plaintiff's protected activity.
- 97. As a proximate result of Defendants' conduct, Plaintiff has suffered and will continue to suffer actual, consequential and incidental damages, including but not limited to loss of wages and benefits, and the intangible loss of employment related opportunities in Plaintiff's field and damage to Plaintiff's professional reputation, all in an amount subject to proof at the time of trial. Plaintiff claims such amounts as damages pursuant to California Civil Code §§ 3287 and/or 3288 and/or any other provisions of law providing for prejudgment interest.
- 98. As a proximate result of Defendants' conduct, Plaintiff has suffered and will continue to suffer emotional distress, humiliation, mental anguish and embarrassment, as well as the manifestation of physical symptoms. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and thereupon alleges, that Plaintiff will continue to experience said physical and emotional suffering for a period in the future not presently ascertainable, all in an amount subject to proof at trial.
- 99. Plaintiff also incurred and continues to incur legal expenses and attorneys' fees. Plaintiff is presently unaware of the precise amount of these expenses and fees. Plaintiff requests attorneys' fees pursuant to Government Code § 12965.
- 100. The statute of limitations for this wrongful termination in violation of public policy claim is two years pursuant to CCP § 335.1, even when the limitations period for the underlying policy is one year.
- 6. This claim is not preempted by the Workers' Compensation Act, as wrongful termination in violation of public policy is one type of claim not barred by the exclusive remedy provisions of the Workers' Compensation Act.

DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL

Plaintiff hereby demands a trial by jury on all issues so triable.

PRAYER FOR RELIEF

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff prays for judgment against Defendants as follow Received City of Ojai

1. For compensatory damages in an amount according to proof.

JUL 18 2025

1	2. For special damages in an amount according to proof.			
2	3. For general damages in an amount according to proof.			
3	4. For penalties under the Labor Code in an amount according to proof.			
4	5. For statutory penalties, according to proof.			
5	6. For injunctive relief, including employment, reinstatement, and promotion.			
6	7. For declaratory relief, declaring the amounts of damages, penalties, equitable relief,			
7	costs, and attorney's fees to which Plaintiff is entitled.			
8	8. For reasonable attorney's fees and expenses pursuant to Government Code			
9	§ 12965(b), Labor Code §§ 218.5, 1194, and other applicable statutes.			
10	9. For costs of the suit herein incurred.			
11	10. For pre-judgment and post-judgment interest; and			
12	11. For such other and further relief as this court may deem just and proper.			
13				
14	DATED: J	Tune 23, 2025 HERSHEY LAW, P.C.		
15		/ /		
16		By: Brennan Hershey		
17		Johnny Rundell Attorneys for Plaintiff RENEE		
18		MORA MORA		
19				
20				
21				
22				
23				
24				
25				
26		Received City of Ojai		
27		JUL 18 2025		
28		20L 19 2072		

COMDI AINT EOD DAMACEC

City Clerk

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA COUNTY OF VENTURA

800 South Victoria Avenue Ventura, CA 93009 (805) 289-8525 www.ventura.courts.ca.gov

NOTICE OF CASE ASSIGNMENT AND MANDATORY APPEARANCE

Your case has been assigned for all purposes to the judicial officer indicated below.

A copy of this Notice of Case Assignment and Mandatory Appearance shall be served by the filing party on all named Defendants/Respondents with the Complaint or Petition, and with any Cross-Complaint or Complaint in Intervention that names a new party to the underlying action.

Case Number: 2025CUWT04623	Location: Hall of Justice		
Assigned Judicial Officer: Carla J. Ortega		Department: 41	
Hearing: MANDATORY APPEARANCE CMC/Order to Show Cause Re Sanctions/Dismissal for Failure to File Proof of Service/Default			
Event Date: 12/16/2025	Event Time: 8:35 AM	Event Department: 41	

Scheduling Information

Judicial Scheduling Information: The above hearing is MANDATORY. Each party is ordered to file a Case Management Statement no later than 15 calendar days prior to the hearing and serve it on all parties. If your Case Management Statement is untimely, it may NOT be considered by the court (CRC 3.725) and you may be sanctioned for noncompliance with a court order (CCP 177.5). If proof of service and/or request for entry of default have not been filed: At the above hearing you are ordered to show cause why you should not be compelled to pay sanctions and/or why your case should not be dismissed (CCP 177.5, Local Rule 3.17).

Advanced Jury Fee Requirement: At least one party demanding a jury trial on each side of a civil case must pay a non-refundable jury fee of \$150. The non-refundable jury fee must be paid timely pursuant to Code of Civil Procedure section 631.

Noticed Motions/Ex Parte Matters: To set an ex parte hearing, contact the judicial secretary in the assigned department. Contact the clerk's office to reserve a date for a law and motion matter.

Remote Appearances: Remote appearances by CourtCall at the Mandatory Case Management Conference are permitted pursuant to CRC 3.722, 3.672, Local Rule 7.06, and may be permitted by Zoom per the applicable department rules and policies. To schedule a CourtCall appearance, a party must pre-register with CourtCall at https://courtcall.com/support/faq/registration or call 888-882-6878. To appear by Zoom, consult the rules and procedures of the civil department to which your matter is assigned at https://www.ventura.courts.ca.gov/assignments-vent.html.

	Clerk of the Court,		
Date: 06/30/2025	Joan Gosten		
Jale. 00/00/2020	Joan Foster	Received City of Ojai	
		JUL 1 8 2025	

NTC535 (Rev. 12/19/2024)