

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  
28

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

MENSAH LOKOSSOU,

Plaintiff,

v.

SERVICSOURCE INTERNATIONAL  
INC.,

Defendant.

Case No. [15-cv-04892-JD](#)

**ORDER RE MOTION TO DISMISS**

Re: Dkt. No. 51

Before the Court is defendant’s motion to dismiss plaintiff’s second amended complaint. Dkt. No. 51. The Court dismissed plaintiff’s prior amended complaint with leave to amend. Dkt. No. 48. Because the second amended complaint falls short for the same reasons as before, the motion is granted.

Plaintiff’s basic contentions have not changed. Proceeding pro se, plaintiff alleges a claim in four sub-parts: for discrimination based on national origin; “harassment, hostile work environment”; retaliation; and “pay & benefit discrimination.” Dkt. No. 49 at 9-12. He continues to state that his action is “brought pursuant to Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 for employment discrimination.” *Id.* at 1, 12-13. As the Court previously noted and as plaintiff acknowledges, Title VII prohibits certain types of discriminatory conduct by employers when undertaken “because of [an] individual’s race, color, religion, sex or national origin.” Dkt. No. 48 at 2 (quoting 42 U.S.C. § 2000e-2(a)(1)); Dkt. No. 49 at 12-13 (same).

While the current iteration of plaintiff’s complaint contains some additional details, the fatal flaw remains -- the non-conclusory, factual allegations in it do not establish a plausible link between the conduct complained of and plaintiff’s national origin or race. For example, plaintiff now alleges that out of a sample list of 70 employees, he was “the only African immigrant

1 worker.” Dkt. No. 49 at 3; *see also id.* at 4 (only 2 African immigrants out of approximately 600  
2 employees working from the Tennessee Branch in 2012-2013). This made plaintiff, who is a  
3 citizen of Benin, a “minority within the ‘Black employees’ minority group,” and put him at “an  
4 obvious disadvantage from a numerical perspective and more vulnerable to attacks.” *Id.* Plaintiff  
5 goes on to allege that his fellow employee aggressors were “White Caucasian,” “Asian/White,” or  
6 “African American.” *Id.* at 4-5. But plaintiff’s own motion to dismiss opposition brief  
7 underscores the disconnect and deficiency in his complaint allegations. In the brief, he asks,  
8 “what else, other than a racial animus could motivate a co-worker to insult the plaintiff . . . without  
9 cause . . . ?” Dkt. No. 52 at 7. And “[w]hat else, if not racial hate could motivate a supervisor to  
10 place his foot with dirty shoes on the plaintiff’s table supposedly to tie his shoe laces while yelling  
11 at him?” *Id.* What plaintiff fails to accept is that there are many equally plausible possible  
12 answers to the questions he poses, albeit rhetorically. And to say -- without additional, more  
13 specific factual allegations -- that “racial animus” or “racial hate” are the only possible answers is  
14 nothing more than speculation.

15 As the Supreme Court held in *Bell Atlantic Corporation v. Twombly*, to get across the  
16 plausibility bar under Rule 8(a)(2), “[f]actual allegations must be enough to raise a right to relief  
17 above the speculative level.” 550 U.S. 544, 555 (2007) (quoting 5 C. Wright & A. Miller, *Federal*  
18 *Practice and Procedure* § 1216, pp. 235-236 (3d ed. 2004), for proposition that “the pleading must  
19 contain something more . . . than . . . a statement of facts that merely creates a suspicion [of] a  
20 legally cognizable right of action”). Plaintiff’s complaint continues to fail that bar. Because of  
21 that key defect that cuts across all of his claims, and for all of the additional reasons identified by  
22 defendant’s motion, Dkt. No. 51, the Court concludes that plaintiff again has not adequately  
23 alleged an actionable claim. This includes plaintiff’s claim for retaliation. *See Learned v. City of*  
24 *Bellevue*, 860 F.2d 928, 932 (9th Cir. 1988) (the conduct that the employee allegedly opposed  
25 “must fairly fall within the protection of Title VII to sustain a claim of unlawful retaliation,” or if  
26 basis of claim is that employee participated in investigation or proceeding involving charges of  
27 discrimination, “the underlying discrimination must be reasonably perceived as discrimination  
28 prohibited by Title VII”).

