#### UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT MIDDLE DISTRICT OF FLORIDA OCALA DIVISION

JESSICA HOWELL-GONZALEZ,	CASE NO.:
Plaintiff,	
V.	JURY TRIAL DEMANDED
THE CITY OF MOUNT DORA, FLORIDA,	
Defendant.	

#### VERIFIED COMPLAINT

Jessica Howell-Gonzalez ("Howell"), by and through her undersigned counsel, hereby files this Verified Complaint against The City of Mount Dora, Florida ("The City") for violation of her rights under Florida's Public Sector Whistleblower's Act, §§ 112.3187-112.31895, Fla. Stat. (2018) (the "FWA"), for violation of the Family Medical Leave Act ("FMLA"), and unlawful retaliation under the First Amendment of the U.S. Constitution, pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983 (the "First Amendment"), and in support states as follows:

### **NATURE OF ACTION**

- 1. This is an action arising from and seeking redress for The City's violations of:
  - a. the FWA;
  - b. FMLA; and
  - c. the First Amendment.

### JURISDICTION AND VENUE

2. This Court has jurisdiction because this action involves a claim for damages and reasonable attorneys' fees and costs under a federal statute, FMLA.

- 3. This Court possesses federal question jurisdiction over the claims asserted by Plaintiffs pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1331 because they arise under the First Amendment, enforced through 42 U.S.C. § 1983.
- 4. This Court has supplemental jurisdiction over Howell's FWA claim under 28 U.S.C. § 1367(a) as these claims are so related to claims in this action within such original jurisdiction that they form part of the same case or controversy under Article III of the United States Constitution.
- 5. Venue is proper under 28 U.S.C. § 1391(b)(2) because the events giving rise to Howell's claims occurred in the Middle District of Florida.

#### **PARTIES**

- 6. Howell is a resident of Eustis, Lake County, Florida, and formally a corporal with The City's police department ("MDPD").
- 7. At all material times herein, Howell was an "employee" of The City as defined by Section 112.3187(3)(b) of the FWA and 42 U.S.C. § 2000e(f).
- 8. MDPD's principal place of business is at 1300 N. Donnelly Street, Mt. Dora, Lake County, Florida 32757.

#### PROCEDURAL REQUIREMENTS

- 9. Employees protected under the FWA include those who disclose information on their own initiative in a written and signed complaint, those who refuse to participate in any adverse action prohibited by the FWA, or those who file "any written complaint to their supervisory officials." Section 112.3187(7), Fla. Stat. (2019).
  - 10. On August 27, 2019, Howell provided her written, signed complaint to The City.

11. Howell has satisfied all of the administrative procedures that were conditions precedent to filing her FWA claims.

#### FACTUAL BACKGROUND

12. Howell was a corporal with MDPD until her constructive discharge on October 17, 2019.

#### **FWA**

- 13. For several months, Howell complained about a co-worker and subordinate, Officer Ivy Severance ("Severance"), as a result of her failing to work and conducting personal business on the clock.
  - 14. This activity by Severance began in February 2019.
- 15. One specific instance was in mid-March where she took a civilian friend shopping and to run errands in her patrol vehicle on MDPD time while she was supposed to be taking an employee, Ashley Butler, out for uniforms.
- 16. A fellow co-worker, Deja Pollidore ("Pollidore"), complained about this event as well.
- 17. Howell made numerous complaints to Sgt K. Taylor regarding these chronic issues, who always advised her that he was told to leave Ofc. Severance alone at the instruction of then-Deputy Chief Robert Bell, who later became the MDPD police chief.
- 18. On April 4, 2019, Howell discussed the issues with Severance to Lt. Ken Hinman ("Hinman").

- 19. On April 10 and April 12, 2019, Howell again met with Hinman and complained about Severance incurring overtime (OT) she did not work and that she continued to perform personal errands and activities on MDPD time.
- 20. Howell raised these issues once more on April 15th to Hinman when an OT issue again arose after Severance told Howell she had no work and then "worked" OT hours from home.
  - 21. Despite the complaints and objections of Howell, this activity continued.
- 22. In retaliation for Howell's complaints and objections, she was transferred from her unit the week following her April 15<sup>th</sup> objection.
- 23. On June 20, 2019, Howell met with Bell, who at this time was the acting chief, and again raised the significant issues regarding Severance using company time to perform personal errands and incurring overtime for which she was not entitled.
- 24. In response, Bell became aggressive and moved close to Howell and falsely told her that Severance spends more time at MDPD than anyone, and that he takes his daughter to school while at work and asked Howell if she was also accusing him of stealing time.
- 25. In the same conversation, Bell also made it clear that because of Howell's objections regarding Severance's theft of time, Howell would never be back in the community relations unit.
- 26. Howell was the acting sergeant of the unit when she made her initial complaints, including her complaint to Hinman.
  - 27. Howell was a corporal in the unit when she made her complaints to Sgt. Taylor.
- 28. Based on Bell's demeanor and aggressive stance during their meeting, Howell felt intimidated and removed herself to avoid further attempts by Bell to intimidate and silence her.

4

- 29. Howell believed that her complaints related to activity that was detrimental to the taxpayers of Lake County.
- 30. Howell, by making her complaint, had hoped these activities would cease but it only became worse.
- 31. In fact, Severance has made a list of "villains" for which Howell was included as "Lady Tremaine," a reference to Cinderella's evil step-mom.
  - 32. Severance took a photograph of this list, which Howell obtained.
- 33. On August 27, 2019, Howell submitted her written complaint regarding these issues to City Manager Robin Hayes, Human Resources Director Sharon Kraynik and Bell.
- 34. In her written complaint, Howell explained that she was treated unfairly at work as a result of her objections and refusal to engage in these improper activities.
- 35. Howell asked that this activity cease immediately and that her concerns be immediately investigated.
- 36. Instead, in retaliation for her complaints concerning acts or suspected acts of gross mismanagement and gross neglect of duty, as well as violations or suspected violations of laws, MDPD callously did nothing and ignored requests made by Howell to conduct an investigation into her complaints.
- 37. Inexplicably, Howell was instead told that the IA investigation into Severance must first be completed.
  - 38. To that end, Howell was interviewed on Thursday, October 3, 2019.
  - 39. During the interview, Howell identified Pollidore as a witness.

- 40. On Monday, October 7, 2019, Pollidore received correspondence that was mailed anonymously, along with statements from Krystal Beasley, Karen Campbell, Jeff Biles and Victor Uvalle.
- 41. The correspondence was devoted entirely to Severance's interests, which is telling and provides significant guidance regarding the identity of its author.
- 42. The correspondence threatens Pollidore with a civil lawsuit for "defamation of character" and cautions her to "do the right thing."
- 43. It was clearly a threat and intended to dissuade Pollidore from providing information in the IA investigation.
  - 44. Howell reported this serious issue to the investigator.
- 45. However, tellingly, nobody followed up with either Howell or Pollidore regarding this serious issue.
- 46. Similarly, Captain Coy Hunter ("Hunter") solicited Sgt. Karen Dancel ("Dancel") to make a baseless complaint against Howell, to which she refused.
  - 47. As a result, Severance became upset regarding Dancel's refusal.
  - 48. After Dancel refused to lodge a complaint at Hunter's request, she alerted Howell.
- 49. A few days later, Hunter again asked Dancel if she had a complaint to file against Howell, and Dancel again told him no.
- 50. Thereafter, Howell asked Hunter why he would solicit Dancel to file a complaint against her.
  - 51. Hunter responded that it was "at the direction of Chief Bell."
  - 52. In turn, Howell called Bell regarding this serious issue.
  - 53. Bell claimed to not have any knowledge of Hunter's actions.

#### **FMLA**

- 54. In July 2019, Howell went on FMLA due to significant work stress.
- 55. During her time off, Bell repeatedly and falsely told staff that Howell was "abusing sick time."
- 56. Incredibly, she was penalized in her most recent evaluation for taking FMLA time.
- 57. For example, after receiving lower than usual points for "Dependability," the following comment was made, "During this evaluation period, Jessica used all of her available sick time and went without pay for several weeks."
  - 58. This is clear interference and retaliation under the FMLA.
- 59. Following her return to work from FMLA leave, Howell was to change to nightshift.
- 60. This would have meant that her exposure to Bell and Severance would have been minimal.
- 61. Instead, and in retaliation for taking FMLA leave, she was told right before she was to return that she would be back on dayshift, which has meant daily interactions with the individuals who are the subject of her FWA complaints.

#### **TERMINATION**

- 62. In light of the foregoing, it is apparent that MDPD created an entirely untenable situation in which no reasonable person would continue an employment relationship.
- 63. Therefore, as of October 17, 2019, Howell was constructively discharged from her employment with MDPD.

#### COUNT I: FLORIDA PUBLIC SECTOR WHISTLEBLOWER ACT

- 64. Howell incorporates by reference paragraphs 1(a), 2, 4-53, 62 and 63 of this Verified Complaint.
- 65. Howell disclosed information in her written, signed complaint to MDPD and The City on August 27, 2019, as well as verbally beginning in February 2019 and through her constructive discharge.
- 66. The information disclosed amounted to violations or suspected violations of state and local law, rule, or regulation committed by MDPD and The City, which created and presented a substantial and specific danger to the public's health, safety, and welfare.
- 67. Additionally, Howell disclosed information in her written, signed complaint to MDPD and The City regarding acts or suspected acts of gross mismanagement, malfeasance, misfeasance, and gross neglect of duty committed by MDPD and The City.
- 68. Howell suffered retaliatory actions because of the information disclosed by her through her written, signed complaint, as well as through her verbal complaints.
- 69. As a direct and proximate result of her protected activity, Howell was subjected to retaliatory personnel action by MDPD and The City.
- 70. MDPD's and The City's actions have created an entirely untenable situation in which no reasonable person would continue an employment relationship.
- 71. Howell was constructively discharged from her employment with MDPD and The City on October 17, 2019.
- 72. As a direct and proximate result of MDPD's and The City's actions, Howell suffered a loss of employment and related economic and emotional injuries.

73. The actions of MDPD and The City make reinstatement ineffective as a makewhole remedy, entitling Howell to front pay in lieu of reinstatement.

WHEREFORE, Howell demands judgment against The City for:

- a. Compensation for lost wages, benefits, and other remuneration;
- b. Front pay in lieu of reinstatement;
- c. Compensatory damages;
- d. Injunctive relief;
- e. Attorney's fees and costs pursuant to §§ 112.3187-112.31895, Fla. Stat. (2018);
- f. Prejudgment interest; and
- g. Such other relief as this Court deems just and proper.

# COUNT II: RETALIATION (FIRST AMENDMENT OF U.S. CONSTITUTION PURSUANT TO 42 U.S.C. § 1983) (In the alternative to Count I)

- 74. Howell incorporates by reference paragraphs 1(b), 2, 5-8, 12, and 54-63 of this Verified Complaint.
- 75. Howell brings this cause of action in the alternative to Count I, pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983.
- 76. The conduct of MDPD and The City complained of herein was taken under color of the laws of the State of Florida.
- 77. The persons who engaged in the conduct at issue were of such position and authority so that their acts may fairly be said to constitute the official expressions of MDPD and The City' custom, policy or usage.

9

- 78. Howell engaged in constitutionally protected conduct by making statements relating to matters of public interest.
- 79. Howell's statements relating to matters of public interest were made in her capacity as a private citizen and were beyond the scope of her job duties and responsibilities as a public employee for MDPD and The City.
- 80. Howell's statements involved matters of public concern that outweighed the interests of the MDPD and The City as an employer, as the public has a substantial interest in eliminating fraudulent practices that cause taxpayer funds to be misappropriated.
- 81. Howell's statements were the type traditionally covered under the First Amendment.
- 82. The adverse employment actions suffered by Howell were causally related to, and in retaliation for, Howell having engaged in constitutionally protected conduct by making statements relating to matters of public interest.
- 83. MDPD and The City' retaliatory conduct deprived Howell of her constitutionally-protected rights of free speech under the First Amendment.
- 84. No legitimate governmental interest was served in denying Howell her right to free speech.
- 85. As a direct, proximate, and foreseeable result of MDPD and The City' retaliatory actions, Howell has suffered past and future losses, emotional pain, suffering, embarrassment, humiliation, inconvenience, mental anguish, loss of enjoyment of life, loss of dignity, emotional distress and other non-pecuniary losses and intangible injuries.
- 86. The actions of MDPD and The City make reinstatement ineffective as a make whole remedy, entitling Howell to front pay in lieu of reinstatement.

87. Howell has retained counsel to represent her in this matter and has incurred, and will continue to incur, attorney's fees and costs.

WHEREFORE, Howell demands judgment against The City for:

- a. Back pay;
- b. Front pay;
- c. Compensatory damages;
- d. Punitive damages;
- e. Attorneys' fees and costs of this action pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1988(b); and
- f. Such other relief as this Court deems just and proper.

#### **COUNT III: FMLA RETALIATION**

- 88. Howell incorporates by reference paragraphs 1(c), 3, 5-8, 12-53, 62, and 63 of this Verified Complaint.
- 89. Howell met all of the eligibility requirements to qualify for up to twelve (12) weeks of unpaid, job-protected, leave per year for qualifying reasons.
  - 90. Howell was entitled to FMLA leave.
- 91. Howell engaged in statutorily protected activity by applying for and taking leave under the FMLA.
- 92. Thereafter, Howell suffered adverse employment decisions because she took leave
- 93. These adverse decisions were made as a direct result of, and in retaliation for, Howell exercising her rights under the FMLA.

- 94. MDPD and The City did not act in good faith, nor did it have any reasonable grounds for believing that its actions were in compliance with the FMLA.
- 95. Moreover, MDPD and The City' proffered reason for engaging in the foregoing acts was merely pretext for its unlawful retaliatory actions against Howell for availing herself of the rights afforded to her under the FMLA.
- 96. As a result of MDPD and The City' retaliatory conduct, Howell suffered lost compensation, including the loss of wages and benefits.
- 97. Howell has and will continue to incur attorneys' fees and costs in this action, and is entitled to recovery of her attorneys' fees and costs pursuant to the FMLA. 29 C.F.R. § 825.400(c).

WHEREFORE, Howell demands judgment against The City for:

- a. Lost wages and benefits;
- b. Liquidated damages;
- c. Injunctive relief;
- d. Attorney's fees and costs;
- e. Prejudgment interest; and
- f. Any other relief this Court deems just and proper.

#### **DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL**

Howell hereby demands a trial by jury on all issues and counts triable of right before a

jury.

Date: March 31, 2020.

Respectfully submitted,

s/ Christopher A. Pace

Jill S. Schwartz, Esquire Florida Bar No. 523021 Christopher A. Pace, Esquire

Florida Bar No. 676721

JILL S. SCHWARTZ & ASSOCIATES, P.A.

655 W. Morse Blvd., Suite 212 Winter Park, Florida 32789 Telephone: (407) 647-8911 Facsimile: (407) 628-4994

E-mail: jschwartz@schwartzlawfirm.net E-mail: cpace@schwartzlawfirm.net

Attorneys for Plaintiff

#### **VERIFICATION**

Personally appeared before the undersigned, JESSICA HOWELL-GONZALEZ, who being first duly sworn, deposes and says that the allegations of this Verified Complaint and Demand for Jury Trial, are true and correct to the best of her knowledge, information and belief.

ESSICA HOWELL-GONZALEZ

STATE OF FLORIDA )
COUNTY OF ORANGE )

The foregoing instrument was acknowledged before me this 31<sup>st</sup> day of March 2020, by JESSICA HOWELL-GONZALEZ, who is personally known to me or who has produced as identification, and who did take an oath.

Notary Public State of Florida at Large My Commission Expires: 8/22/23

AMY L. COOK
MY COMMISSION # GG 326959
EXPIRES: August 22, 2023
Bonded Thru Notary Public Underwriters

## Case 5:20-cv-00126-JSM-PRL Document 1-1 Filed 03/31/20 Page 1 of 1 PageID 15 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. (SEE INSTRUCTIONS ON NEXT PAGE OF THIS FORM.)

	(	orrano orrandir i nob o							
I. (a) PLAINTIFFS	JESSICA HOWELL-G	ONZALEZ,		DEFENDANTS	S THE C	ITY OF MOUN	NT DORA, FI	ORIDA	4
(b) County of Residence of First Listed Plaintiff LAKE COUNTY, FL (EXCEPT IN U.S. PLAINTIFF CASES)				County of Residence of First Listed Defendant LAKE COUNTY, FL  (IN U.S. PLAINTIFF CASES ONLY)  NOTE: IN LAND CONDEMNATION CASES, USE THE LOCATION OF THE TRACT OF LAND INVOLVED.					
(c) Attorneys (Firm Name,	Address, and Telephone Numb	oer)		Attorneys (If Known)	)				
Jill S. Schwartz & Assoc	ciates, P.A., 655 W. M		2,						
Winter Park, FL 32789;				720					
II. BASIS OF JURISD	ICTION (Place an "X" in	One Box Only)		TIZENSHIP OF F (For Diversity Cases Only)	PRINCIPA	AL PARTIES			
☐ 1 U.S. Government Plaintiff	★ 3 Federal Question     (U.S. Government)	Not a Party)		P	TF DEF	Incorporated or P		PTF   4	DEF
2 U.S. Government Defendant	☐ 4 Diversity (Indicate Citizens)	hip of Parties in Item III)	Citize	n of Another State	2 0 2	Incorporated and of Business In	Principal Place Another State	<b>5</b>	<b>5</b>
					3 🗇 3	Foreign Nation		<b>6</b>	<b>1</b> 6
IV. NATURE OF SUI	Γ (Place an "X" in One Box O	nlv)	FOI	eign Country	Click	here for: Nature	of Suit Code De	scrintion	ns.
CONTRACT		ORTS	FO	RFEITURE/PENALTY		KRUPTCY		STATUT	
☐ 110 Insurance ☐ 120 Marine ☐ 130 Miller Act ☐ 140 Negotiable Instrument ☐ 150 Recovery of Overpayment	□ 330 Federal Employers' Liability □ 340 Marine □ 345 Marine Product Liability □ 350 Motor Vehicle □ 355 Motor Vehicle Product Liability □ 360 Other Personal Injury □ 362 Personal Injury - Medical Malpractice  CIVIL RIGHTS □ 440 Other Civil Rights	PERSONAL INJURY  365 Personal Injury - Product Liability  367 Health Care/ Pharmaceutical Personal Injury Product Liability  368 Asbestos Personal Injury Product Liability  PERSONAL PROPERT  370 Other Fraud  371 Truth in Lending  380 Other Personal Property Damage Product Liability  PRISONER PETITIONS  Habeas Corpus:	710 710 720 740 X 751	LABOR  Description of Property 21 USC 881  Description of Property 21 USC 881  Description of Property 21 USC 881  LABOR  Description of Prair Labor Standards Act  Description of Prair Labor Management Relations  Railway Labor Act Family and Medical Leave Act  Other Labor Litigation Employee Retirement	423 With   28 U   PROPES   820 Copy   830 Paten   835 Paten   840 Trade   SOCIAL   861 HIA (   862 Black   863 DIW(   864 SSID (   865 RSI (   FEDERA (   870 Taxes	SC 157  RTY RIGHTS rights t - Abbreviated Drug Application mark SECURITY (1395ff) Lung (923) C/DIWW (405(g)) Title XVI 405(g))  LTAX SUITS (U.S. Plaintiff	□ 375 False Claims Act □ 376 Qui Tam (31 USC		ment g  ted and tons 1692) ner  dities/ tions tters
<ul> <li>230 Rent Lease &amp; Ejectment</li> <li>240 Torts to Land</li> <li>245 Tort Product Liability</li> <li>290 All Other Real Property</li> </ul>	☐ 441 Voting ☐ 442 Employment ☐ 443 Housing/ Accommodations ☐ 445 Amer. w/Disabilities - Employment ☐ 446 Amer. w/Disabilities - Other ☐ 448 Education	463 Alien Detainee   510 Motions to Vacate   Sentence   530 General   535 Death Penalty   Other:   540 Mandamus & Other   550 Civil Rights   555 Prison Condition   560 Civil Detaince -   Conditions of   Confinement		IMMIGRATION Naturalization Application Other Immigration Actions	or Defendant)  871 IRS—Third Party 26 USC 7609		□ 895 Freedom of Information Act □ 896 Arbitration □ 899 Administrative Procedure Act/Review or Appeal of Agency Decision □ 950 Constitutionality of State Statutes		
V. ORIGIN (Place an "X" in	One Box Only)					1.22			
		Remanded from Appellate Court	4 Reinst Reope	. I miloto	rred from r District	☐ 6 Multidistr Litigation Transfer	-	Multidist Litigation Direct File	1 -
VI. CAUSE OF ACTIO	Brief description of ca						nd the First A	mendn	nent
VII. REQUESTED IN COMPLAINT:		IS A CLASS ACTION		MAND S	CF	HECK YES only RY DEMAND:	if demanded in o		
VIII. RELATED CASE IF ANY	(See instructions):	JUDGE			DOCKET	NUMBER			
DATE 03/31/2020		SIGNATURE OF ATTO	RNEY OF	RECORD					
FOR OFFICE USE ONLY									
RECEIPT # AM	OUNT	APPLYING IFP		JUDGE		MAG. JUDO	GE		

United States	S DISTRICT COURT
	for the
	istrict of Florida
Oc. JESSICA HOWELL-GONZALEZ,	ala Division ) ) )
Plaintiff(s)  V.  THE CITY OF MOUNT DORA, FLORIDA,	Civil Action No.
Defendant(s)	)
SUMMONS IN	NA CIVIL ACTION
To: (Defendant's name and address) CITY OF MOUNT DORA 510 N. BAKER STREET MOUNT DORA, FL 32757	7
A lawsuit has been filed against you.	
are the United States or a United States agency, or an office	uire ates, P.A.
If you fail to respond, judgment by default will be You also must file your answer or motion with the court.	e 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 (1))

		ne of individual and title, if any)						
was re	ceived by me on (date)	·						
	☐ I personally served	the summons on the individual	at (place)					
			on (date)	; or				
	☐ I left the summons	at the individual's residence or	usual place of abode with (name)					
		, a perso	on of suitable age and discretion who res	sides there,				
	on (date)	, and mailed a copy to the individual's last known address; or						
	☐ I served the summo	ons on (name of individual)		, who is				
	designated by law to a	accept service of process on beh	alf of (name of organization)					
			on (date)	; or				
	☐ I returned the sumn	nons unexecuted because		; or				
	☐ Other (specify):							
	My fees are \$	for travel and \$	for services, for a total of \$	0.00				
	I declare under penalty	of perjury that this information	is true.					
Date:								
			Server's signature					
			Printed name and title					
			Server's address					

Additional information regarding attempted service, etc: