1 2 3 4 5 6 7 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT 8 9 FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA 10 11 DYWANE C. STONUM, No. 1:16-cv-01076-DAD-JLT 12 Plaintiff. 13 v. TENTATIVE PRETRIAL ORDER 14 COUNTY OF KERN, 15 Defendant. 16 17 On July 30, 2018, the court conducted a final pretrial conference in this action. Plaintiff 18 Dywane C. Stonum appeared telephonically on his own behalf, and Michael E. Lehman appeared 19 as counsel for defendant County of Kern. Having considered the parties' joint pretrial statement 20 and the views of the parties expressed at the conference, the court issues this tentative pretrial 21 order. 22 Plaintiff has brought this action under Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 ("Title VII'), 42 U.S.C. § 2000(e), et seq., alleging claims of race discrimination and retaliation during 23 24 his employment with the Kern County Department of Human Services between April 2013 and January 2014. Defendant disputes that plaintiff's termination was based upon racial 25 26 discrimination, retaliation, or anything other than plaintiff's performance. JURISDICTION/VENUE 27 I.

Jurisdiction is predicated on 28 U.S.C. §§ 1331 and 1343. Jurisdiction is not contested.

Venue is proper pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1391(b). Venue is not contested.

II. JURY

Plaintiff previously notified the court that he wished to waive his right to a jury trial, and in a scheduling order issued July 14, 2017, the court accepted plaintiff's jury waiver. (Doc. No. 43 at 2 n.1.) Defendant did not demand a jury trial. (*See* Doc. No. 28.) Therefore, the trial will be conducted as a bench trial.

III. UNDISPUTED FACTS

- 1. Plaintiff was employed by the County of Kern in the Department of Human Services between April 2013 and January 2014.
 - 2. Plaintiff's race is Black or African American.
 - 3. Plaintiff was not hired by Kern County as a Social Service Worker.
 - 4. Plaintiff is no longer employed by Kern County.
- 5. All named individual defendants (previously dismissed from this suit) were employees of the County of Kern during the time periods in which plaintiff was employed in the Kern County Department of Human Services.
- 6. Tracy Selph is the Assistant Program Director for the Kern County Department of Human Services.

IV. DISPUTED FACTUAL ISSUES

- 1. Whether plaintiff's termination was motivated by racial discrimination.
- 2. Whether plaintiff's termination was motivated by retaliation.

V. DISPUTED EVIDENTIARY ISSUES/MOTIONS IN LIMINE

The court does not encourage the filing of motions *in limine* unless they are addressed to issues that can realistically be resolved by the court prior to trial and without reference to the other evidence which will be introduced by the parties at trial. Any motions *in limine* the parties elect to file shall be filed no later than **21 days before trial**. Opposition shall be filed no later than **14 days before trial** and any replies shall be filed no later than **10 days before trial**. Upon receipt of any opposition briefs, the court will notify the parties if it will hear argument on any *motions in limine* prior to the first day of trial.

1 VI. SPECIAL FACTUAL INFORMATION 2 Special factual information as required under Local Rule 281(b)(6) is not applicable to 3 this action. 4 VII. **RELIEF SOUGHT** 5 1. Plaintiff seeks reinstatement to the position of Human Services Technician. 6 2. Plaintiff seeks a new interview and interview panel for Social Services Worker I 7 position. 3. 8 Plaintiff seeks lost wages and benefits accruing at about \$164.38 per day x 1,162 9 days = \$273,199.56 (as of July 23, 2018, before estimated offset adjustments of about 10 \$54.345.06). 11 4. Plaintiff seeks removal of adverse reviews, ratings, and interview panel scores 12 from his employee file. 5. 13 Plaintiff seeks punitive and/or exemplary damages for malicious and intentional 14 acts of discrimination and retaliation in the amount of \$2,000,000. 15 6. Plaintiff seeks any other damages or relief the court deems appropriate. 16 VIII. POINTS OF LAW 17 The claims and defenses arise under federal law. All of plaintiff's claims are brought 18 against the defendant, County of Kern. 19 1. The elements of, standards for, and burden of proof in a claim for race 20 discrimination under Title VII. 21 2. The elements of, standards for, and burden of proof in a claim for retaliation under 22 Title VII. 23 Trial briefs addressing the points of law implicated by these remaining claims shall be 24 filed with this court no later than **7 days before trial** in accordance with Local Rule 285. 25 ANY CAUSES OF ACTION OR AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSES NOT EXPLICITLY 26 ASSERTED IN THE PRETRIAL ORDER UNDER POINTS OF LAW AT THE TIME IT 27 BECOMES FINAL ARE DISMISSED, AND DEEMED WAIVED.

1 IX. ABANDONED ISSUES 2 None. 3 X. WITNESSES Plaintiff's witnesses shall be those listed in **Attachment A**. Defendant's witnesses shall 4 5 be those listed in **Attachment B**. Each party may call any witnesses designated by the other. 6 A. The court does not allow undisclosed witnesses to be called for any purpose, 7 including impeachment or rebuttal, unless they meet the following criteria: 8 (1) The party offering the witness demonstrates that the witness is for the 9 purpose of rebutting evidence that could not be reasonably anticipated at 10 the pretrial conference, or 11 The witness was discovered after the pretrial conference and the proffering (2) 12 party makes the showing required in paragraph B, below. 13 B. Upon the post pretrial discovery of any witness a party wishes to present at trial, 14 the party shall promptly inform the court and opposing parties of the existence of 15 the unlisted witnesses so the court may consider whether the witnesses shall be 16 permitted to testify at trial. The witnesses will not be permitted unless: 17 (1) The witness could not reasonably have been discovered prior to the 18 discovery cutoff; 19 (2) The court and opposing parties were promptly notified upon discovery of 20 the witness; 21 (3) If time permitted, the party proffered the witness for deposition; and 22 (4) If time did not permit, a reasonable summary of the witness's testimony 23 was provided to opposing parties. 24 XI. EXHIBITS, SCHEDULES, AND SUMMARIES 25 Plaintiff's proposed exhibits are listed in **Attachment C**. Defendant's proposed exhibits 26 are listed in **Attachment D**. However, as the court explained at the final pretrial conference, the 27 parties' exhibits must be described with sufficient specificity (e.g. including dates and/or Bates 28 stamped discovery numbers) so as to leave no doubt among the parties and the court about the

nature of the exhibit being offered into evidence. The parties are directed to submit amended exhibit lists within **14 days of the date of this order**.

No exhibit shall be marked with or entered into evidence under multiple exhibit numbers, and the parties are hereby directed to meet and confer for the purpose of designating any joint exhibits. All exhibits must be pre-marked as discussed below. At trial, joint exhibits shall be identified as JX and listed numerically, e.g., JX-1, JX-2. Plaintiff's exhibits shall be listed numerically and defendants' exhibits shall be listed alphabetically. All exhibits must be pre-marked. The parties must prepare three (3) separate exhibit binders for use by the court at trial, with a side tab identifying each exhibit in accordance with the specifications above. Each binder shall have an identification label on the front and spine. The parties must exchange exhibits no later than 28 days before trial. Any objections to exhibits are due no later than 14 days before trial. The final exhibits are due September 13, 2018. In making any objection, the party is to set forth the grounds for the objection. As to each exhibit which is not objected to, it shall be marked and received into evidence and will require no further foundation.

- A. The court does not allow the use of undisclosed exhibits for any purpose, including impeachment or rebuttal, unless they meet the following criteria:
 - (1) The party proffering the exhibit demonstrates that the exhibit is for the purpose of rebutting evidence that could not have been reasonably anticipated, or
 - (2) The exhibit was discovered after the issuance of this order and the proffering party makes the showing required in paragraph B, below.
- B. Upon the discovery of exhibits after the discovery cutoff, a party shall promptly inform the court and opposing parties of the existence of such exhibits so that the court may consider their admissibility at trial. The exhibits will not be received unless the proffering party demonstrates:
 - (1) The exhibits could not reasonably have been discovered earlier;
 - (2) The court and the opposing parties were promptly informed of their existence; and

1 (3) The proffering party forwarded a copy of the exhibits (if physically 2 possible) to the opposing party. If the exhibits may not be copied the 3 proffering party must show that it has made the exhibits reasonably 4 available for inspection by the opposing parties. 5 XII. DISCOVERY DOCUMENTS 6 Plaintiff and defendant may use the following discovery documents at trial: 7 1. Set one, plaintiff's request for production of documents and defendant's responses 8 to plaintiff's request for production of documents, set one. 9 2. Plaintiff's motion to compel production of documents and defendant's responses 10 to plaintiff's motion to compel production of documents (in re: plaintiff's request for production 11 of documents, set one). 3. 12 Set one, special interrogatories to plaintiff and plaintiff's responses to special 13 interrogatories, set one. 14 XIII. FURTHER DISCOVERY OR MOTIONS 15 None. 16 XIV. STIPULATIONS 17 None. XV. 18 AMENDMENTS/DISMISSALS 19 None. 20 XVI. SETTLEMENT 21 On June 22, 2018, the parties participated in a settlement conference with Magistrate 22 Judge Jennifer L. Thurston presiding. The case did not settle at that time and the parties have 23 been unable to reach a resolution of this matter. No further settlement conference will be 24 scheduled or required by the court absent a joint request for such conference by the parties. 25 XVII. JOINT STATEMENT OF THE CASE 26 The parties concur that an agreed statement of the facts is neither feasible nor advisable. 27 ///// 28 /////

XVIII. SEPARATE TRIAL OF ISSUES

None.

XIX. IMPARTIAL EXPERTS/LIMITATION OF EXPERTS

Plaintiff welcomes the court's appointment of an impartial expert witness to testify to the nature and quantity of plaintiff's damages. Defendant believes appointment by the court of impartial expert witnesses is not advisable, and that there should be no limitation of the number of properly disclosed expert witnesses.

The court declines to appoint an impartial expert witness pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 706. No motion for a court-appointed expert witness is currently pending before the court. Moreover, the court notes that the purpose of Rule 706 is to assist the court or the factfinder in analyzing complex issues, and not to assist parties in proving their cases. The court finds that none of the issues here are so complex as to warrant appointment by the court of an impartial expert witness.

XX. <u>ATTORNEYS' FEES</u>

Plaintiff, proceeding *pro se*, is not an attorney licensed to practice in any jurisdiction. Should plaintiff later obtain an attorney, or one is appointed by the court, plaintiff would seek reimbursement of legal and associated fees.

XXI. TRIAL PROTECTIVE ORDER AND REDACTION OF TRIAL EXHIBITS

No protective order is necessary.

XXII. MISCELLANEOUS

None.

XXIII. ESTIMATED TIME OF TRIAL/TRIAL DATE

A court trial is scheduled for **September 18, 2018**, at 8:30 a.m. in Courtroom 5 before the Honorable Dale A. Drozd. Trial is anticipated to last 3–5 days. The parties are directed to Judge Drozd's standard procedures available on his webpage on the court's website.

The parties are to call Judge Drozd's courtroom deputy, at (559) 499-5652, one week prior to trial to ascertain the status of the trial date.

28 /////

XXIV. TRIAL BRIEFS As noted above, trial briefs are due 7 days before trial. XXV. OBJECTIONS TO PRETRIAL ORDER Each party is granted **14 days from the date of this order** to file objections to the same. Each party is also granted **7 days thereafter** to respond to the other party's objections. If no objections are filed, the order will become final without further order of this court. The parties are reminded that pursuant to Rule 16(e) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure and Local Rule 283 of this court, this order shall control the subsequent course of this action and shall be modified only to prevent manifest injustice. IT IS SO ORDERED. Dated: **August 1, 2018**

1	ATTACHMENT A: Plaintiff's Witnesses
2	Adam Dupree
3	2829 20th Street West Rosamond, CA 93560
4	Alecia Lashon Jackson
5	8401 Dogwood Ave.
6	California City, CA 93505
7	Cordelia Neal 8561 Catalpa Ave.
8	California City, CA 93505
9	Craig L. Robbins
10	785 Tucker Rd., APT G119 Tehachapi, CA 93561
11	Debbie Spears
12	8907 Penticton Ct. Bakersfield, CA 93312
13	
14	Debra L. Davis (aka Debbie) 4600 Brewer Ave.
15	Bakersfield, CA 93306
16	Dena Marie Murphy 3401 Claremont Dr.
17	Bakersfield, CA 93306
18	Donald Burke
19	21047 Santa Barbara Dr., Apt D Tehachapi, CA 93561
20	Donna M. Foster
21	45135 Parkview Ln.
22	Lancaster, CA 93535
23	Dywane Stonum 4725 Panama Lane D3-246
24	Bakersfield, CA 93313
25	James A. McClellan 41721 Zinfandel Dr.
26	Palmdale, CA 93551
27	

1	James Neal, III 8561 Catalpa Ave. California City, CA 93505	
2		
3	Jayna R. Clark	
4	16193 H St., APT 109	
5	Mojave, CA 93501	
6	Judith Anne Brown 2300 State Highway 58	
7	Mojave, CA 93501	
8	Karissa Anne Tonoli	
9	21047 Santa Barbara Dr., Apt D Tehachapi, CA 93561	
10	Kimberly Rae Millovitsch	
11	21312 Woodford Tehachapi Rd. Tehachapi, CA 93561	
12	-	
13	Lorraine D. Kember 20394 Airway Blvd.	
14	California City, CA 93505	
15	Maria Gutierrez	
16	1410 N Oakdale Ave. Rialto, CA 92376	
17	Marion Santana	
18	217 West E St. Tehachapi, CA 93561	
19	1	
20	Melissa Callison 156 55th W St.	
21	Rosamond, CA 93560	
22	Michael Goulart	
23	12306 Marshfield Way Bakersfield, CA 93312	
24	Patricia Ann Gable	
25	21119 Kenniston St. California City, CA 93505	
26	Ramona Faucette	
27	2500 Dore Dr.	
28	Bakersfield, CA 93304	

1	Robert Gibson
2	1001 17th Street Bakersfield, CA 93301
3	Sean Robert Borden
4	5325 Cangas Dr. Agoura, CA 91301
5	
6	Shannon Lee Oastler 3906 Amherst Forest Rd.
7	Bakersfield, CA 93313
8	Sonya Hannon
9	15601 O St. Mojave, CA 93501
10	Tameika Marie Cannon
11	2600 Brookside Dr., Apt 31 Bakersfield, CA 93311
12	,
13	Tony Lopez County of Kern
14	1115 Truxtun Ave, First Floor Bakersfield, CA 93301
15	Tracy Henry
16	(Unknown at this time)
17	Kern County Area
18	Tracy Lynn Selph 803 James St.
19	Ridgecrest, CA 93555
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
26	
27	
28	
	II

ATTACHMENT B: Defendant's Witnesses

	WITNESS
1.	Patricia Gable
2.	Tracy Selph
3.	James McClellan
4.	Shannon Oastler
5.	Debbie Spears
6.	Debra Davis
7.	Mellissa Callison
8.	Michael Goulart

ATTACHMENT C: Plaintiff's Exhibits

Document Type	Description
Plaintiff's Initial Disclosures	Initial Disclosures, Dated July 30, 2017 with Proof of Service
Plaintiff's Initial Disclosures	Defendants Answer To Plaintiff's Complaint Of Title VII Retaliation And Discrimination (Disparate Treatment), Document 28, Dated April 14, 2017
Plaintiff's Initial Disclosures	Order Granting In Part And Denying In Part Defendants' Motion to Dismiss (Doc. No. 15), Document 26, Dated March 20, 2017
Plaintiff's Initial Disclosures	Order Granting Defendants' Motion for Judgment On The Pleadings (Doc No. 29), Doc 37, Dated June 15, 2017
Plaintiff's Initial Disclosures	Complaint for Employment Discrimination, Case No. 1:16 CV001076 DAD JLT, Jury Trial, Document 1, Filed 7/26/16
Plaintiff's Initial Disclosures	Dywane Stonum – County of Kern Notes – Beginning Jun 8, 2013 and Ending Jan 10, 2014. FILE NOTE Ending Jan 25, 2014.
Plaintiff's Initial Disclosures	UTC-GMT Time Conversion Chart
Plaintiff's Initial Disclosures	Plaintiff's Courtesy Notice of EEO Discrimination Complaint Filing with Kern County – 01/17/2014 to Robert Gibson, Union Representative, SEIU Local 521, Dated January 21, 2014
Plaintiff's Initial Disclosures	Plaintiff's Discrimination Complaint Questionnaire To Kern County Personnel Department – Equal Employment Opportunity Division (With Attachments) Received 4 JAN 17 PM 4:55
Plaintiff's Initial Disclosures	KCDHS: Trish Tracy Melissa James (Mojave) Unlawfu Discrimination Impact: BA v MO (Bakersfield v Mojave locations) – April 1, 2013 – January 3, 2014 (Chart by Plaintiff)
Plaintiff's Initial Disclosures	Kern DHS – Tracy – Trish and James – Impact of Unlawful Discrimination (Events and Comments Supporting Diagram by Plaintiff)
Plaintiff's Initial Disclosures	Loyola Marymount University – College of Liberal Arts (Plaintiff's Bachelor of Arts Degree)
Plaintiff's Initial Disclosures	County of Kern – Personnel Department – Cash Receipt 000914 – Dated 1/17/14 for Copy of EEO Division Complaint Filed with County of Kern
Plaintiff's Initial Disclosures	Employee Performance Evaluations for Plaintiff (04/11/2013, 04/26/2013, 05/13/2013, 05/24/2013)
Plaintiff's Initial Disclosures	Biweekly Conference Reports for Plaintiff (06/07/2013, 06/26/2013, 07/22/2013)

1	Plaintiff's Initial Disclosures	Kern County DHS – Memo of Concern – July 25, 2013
2	Plaintiff's Initial Disclosures	Biweekly Conference Report for Plaintiff – 09/12/2013
3	Plaintiff's Initial Disclosures	CalWORKS Training Attendance Form – Dated 8/17/2013
4	Plaintiff's Initial Disclosures	Handwritten Note by Human Services Supervisor, Patricia Gable, 09/12/13.
5	Plaintiff's Initial Disclosures	Biweekly Conference Report for Plaintiff – October 4, 2013
7	Plaintiff's Initial Disclosures	Plan of Action to Catch-Up – S31A – D. Stonum – 10-04-2013
8	Plaintiff's Initial Disclosures	Employee Performance Report for Dywane Stonum – Signed 10/11/2013 – Copy Received 12/13/2013 from HR
	Plaintiff's Initial Disclosures	Bi-Monthly Conference Reports (11/1/2013, 11/15/2013)
10 11	Plaintiff's Initial Disclosures	Conference With Dywane Stonum HST and Trish Gable HSS – Nov. 18, 2013
12	Plaintiff's Initial Disclosures	Monthly Conference Report for Plaintiff – 12/11/2013
13	Plaintiff's Initial Disclosures	County of Kern – Personnel Department – Human Services Technician Score for Dywane Stonum – 92.00%, Dated – Postmarked Nov 21, 2012
1415	Plaintiff's Initial Disclosures	Certification For Plaintiff From Civil Service Commission – Human Services Technician I – Mojave – RE: CERT. #48957 – Interview Appointment, Dated MAR 1, 2013
1617	Plaintiff's Initial Disclosures	Human Services Technician I – East Kern Exam No. 5624 – 08/20/12 (Job Bulletin)
18	Plaintiff's Initial Disclosures	Patricia Cheadle, Director of Human Services – Mojave Office Visit – E-mail Correspondence With Dywane Stonum (06/17/2013, 07/08/2013, 09/04/2013,
192021	Plaintiff's Initial Disclosures	Plaintiff's e-mail communications with Kern's Debbie Davis, Human Resources Manager, 09/04/2013, 09/27/2013, 09/30/2013) [Racial Discrimination, Disparate Treatment, Hostile Work Environment, Unlawful Practices)
22232425	Plaintiff's Initial Disclosures	Plaintiff's e-mail communication to Kern's Debbie Davis, Human Resources Manager, Unlawful Discrimination, Wrongful Termination, Hostile Work Environment, 01/16/2014; CC: Pat Cheadle, Director of Human Services; Robert Gibson, SEIU Local 521 Representative; Debbie Spears, HR Staff Development.
262728	Case Filings	All Documents For the Case of Dywane C. Stonum v. County of Kern, Case Number 1:16-CV-001076-DAD-JLT, Reflected In The Court's Docket and Other Related Communications From 07/26/2016 through 07/23/2018 and Continuing Until Final Disposition of This Case.

1		
1	Defendant's Initial Disclosures	Defendant's Initial Disclosures (Subject To Orders of the Court and Motion in Limine)
2	Disclosures	Defendant's Future Disclosures As May Be Ordered Or
2	Defendant's Future	Permitted By The Court, Federal Rules of Civil
3	Disclosures	Procedure, Federal Rules of Evidence or Other
4	Disclosures	Applicable Codes Or Regulations.
7		Plaintiff's Future Disclosures As May Be Ordered Or
5		Permitted By The Court, Federal Rules of Civil
	Plaintiff's Future Disclosures	Procedure, Federal Rules of Evidence or Other
6		Applicable Codes Or Regulations.
7		Plaintiff's e-mail to Trish (Patricia Gable, Human
7		Services Supervisor) regarding Tracy wanting portion of
8		evaluation removed, Gable wanting to shred signed
O	Plaintiff's Initial Disclosures	document, and Plaintiff's request to speak with
9		Department Head (Tony Lopez) about his concerns.
		Dated Fri, Oct 11, 2013 at 5:13 PM
10		Defendant's Documents Produced Responsive to the
11	Defendant's Disalogures	Subject Of Plaintiff's Motion to Compel – Document 56
11	Defendant's Disclosures	(In Re: Plaintiff's Request For Production – Set 1)
12		Kern's Examination Score 74% To Plaintiff. Social
12	Plaintiff's Initial Disclosures	
13		Service Worker I/II, Postmarked Jan 14, 2013 Kern's Certification Notice to Plaintiff. Social Service
	Plaintiff's Initial Disclosures	Worker I/II. Dated NOV 5, 2013,
14		Plaintiff's Typing Proficiency Certificate. Net Words Per
15	Plaintiff's Initial Disalogues	Minute 75. Dated 11/12/13. Kern County Superintendent
13	5 Plaintiff's Initial Disclosures N	Of Schools Office.
16		Kern's Social Service Worker I/II Exam No, 5691 – Job
	Plaintiff's Initial Disclosures	Bulletin – 11/05/12
17		Letter from KCDHS. Plaintiff not recommended for hire
18	Plaintiff's Initial Disclosures	for Social Service Worker I/II position.
10		Various Correspondence from Plaintiff: To: Debbie
19		Davis (Complaint of Discrimination and Retaliation
	Plaintiff's Initial Disclosures	regarding not hiring Plaintiff for Social Service I/II
20	Trainer S finda Disclosures	position) – 12/20/2013 (CC: Debbie Spears, DHS,
21		Robert Gibson, SEIU, Pat Cheadle, DHS)
21		Various Emails: Between Plaintiff and Debbie Spears.
22	Plaintiff's Initial Disclosures	Regarding SSWI/II position. Pulling of Panelist packets.
	1 10111111 0 11111111 2 10 10 01 00	01/02/2014
23		SIU Ride Along Emails and Schedule for Plaintiff and
2.4	Plaintiff's Initial Disclosures	Other Kern Employees
24		Kern's purported Employee Performance Report for
25	Plaintiff's Initial Disclosures	Plaintiff. Dated 1/3/14. (Gable, Selph)
23		Change of Employee Status – Effective 1/03/2014
26	Plaintiff's Initial Disclosures	(County of Kern – DHS) for Plaintiff
		Various emails between Plaintiff, Gable, Gibson,
27	Plaintiff's Initial Disclosures	Cheadle, Spears, Davis
	L	

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27

Plaintiff's Initial Disclosures	Paystub documents for Plaintiff
Plaintiff's Initial Disclosures	EEOC FOIA Document to Plaintiff
Plaintiff's Initial Disclosures	California Department of Fair Employment and Housing Documents Regarding EEOC Number 480-2014-01619C (Dywane C. Stonum)
Plaintiff's Initial Disclosures	Plaintiff's Retirement Plan Related Documents (while with County of Kern) (Including Employer Match Information)
Plaintiff's Initial Disclosures	Plaintiff's Health and Dental Care Related Information (while with County of Kern)
Plaintiff's Initial Disclosures	State of California – Department of Industrial Relations Related Documents (pertaining to County of Kern)
Plaintiff's Initial Disclosures	Plaintiff's Damage and Loss Claim Information pertaining to County of Kern

ATTACHMENT D: Defendant's Exhibits

	DOCUMENT TYPE	DOCUMENT DESCRIPTION
	DOCUMENT TIFE	DOCUMENT DESCRIPTION
1.	Employee Performance Reports	Employee Performance Reports. One signed by Plaintiff on June 28, 2013, one signed by Plaintiff on October 11, 2013, and one provided to Plaintiff on January 3, 2014.
2.	Personnel File	Personnel file for Plaintiff.
3.	Memorandum of Concern	July 25, 2013 Memorandum of Concern from Patricia Gable to Plaintiff.
4.	Plaintiff's Acknowledgment of receipt	Acknowledgement of receipt of instructions on how to access SEIU Memorandum of Understanding, and acknowledgement of understanding that he was a member of SEIU as of April 1, 2013.
5.	Facsimile	June 9, 2014 Facsimile from Plaintiff.
6.	Complaint	Internal Complaints of Discrimination from Plaintiff
7.	Responses	Internal responses to Plaintiff's Complaints
8.	Investigation Reports	Internal investigations reports related to Plaintiff's Complaints of discrimination
9.	Emails	 September 4, 2013 email exchange between D. Davis and Plaintiff in which D. Davis instructs Plaintiff how to submit complaint of discrimination. September 27, 2013 follow-up email to Plaintiff from D. Davis stating that D. Davis had not received any information from Plaintiff. September 30, 2013 email from Plaintiff to D. Davis stating that Plaintiff would be attempting to resolve issue through union. January 6, 2014 email from Plaintiff to SEIU regarding Plaintiff's termination. January 7, 2014 email between Plaintiff and D. Davis regarding Plaintiff's termination. January 16, 2014 email between Plaintiff and D. Davis in which D. Davis informs Plaintiff on how a formal complaint is filed with the county after termination. January 30, 2014 email between Plaintiff and D. Davis in which D. Davis tells Plaintiff that he will be receiving deferred compensation on February 7, 2014. Various Emails between Gable, Davis, Spears

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27

		and Plaintiff.
10.	Records Related To Work Performance	Plaintiff's EPRs, Supporting Documentation, and monthly counseling records.
11.	Application	Plaintiff's Application for Social Worker Position
12.	Notes	Panel's notes regarding Plaintiff's performance during interview and recommendations not to hire.
13.	Civil Service Rules	Civil Service Rule, 1800
14.	EEOC Response	August 22, 2014 Response to EEOC from County of Kern