

a Securitas Recruitment Specialist that “I would personally side step this one...” and, after being pressed on the issue by the Recruitment Specialist, the Regional Compliance Manager ordered the Recruitment Specialist, “Just pass on this candidate.” See, Pl.’s Exs. A and B, Securitas Email Correspondence.

3. As set forth below, the timing of these statements make this discriminatory interaction even more offensive.

4. A Regional Compliance Manager first responded to a subordinate’s email regarding Ms. Ali at 3:02 PM on October 8, 2015.

5. Within seven minutes of a Regional Compliance Manager’s first email response regarding Ms. Ali, a Regional Compliance Manager was instructing a subordinate that she “would personally side step this one....”

6. A Securitas Recruitment Specialist, apparently believing that Securitas would not openly and obviously disqualify a job candidate based on their religion alone, responded at 3:11 PM “What do you mean, like have Megan interview her?”

7. A Regional Compliance Manager, at 3:34 PM on October 8, 2015, responded “Just pass on this candidate.”

8. Even though Ms. Ali applied to Securitas as a qualified candidate with six years of correctional officer experience, Securitas would not even consider Ms. Ali for employment because Ms. Ali wears a hijab. Within seven minutes of her first response email, a Regional Compliance Manager indicated that a subordinate should “side step” Ms. Ali based on Ms. Ali’s Islamic faith.

9. This putative class action is brought to correct and, importantly, prevent obvious and offensive discriminatory practices of Securitas, to recover monetary damages and damages

for emotional distress suffered by Ms. Ali and, upon information and belief, other Muslim job applicants who have applied for employment with Securitas, but were not considered because of their religion, and to recover punitive damages in an amount that is fair and reasonable, but sufficient to prevent Securitas, or any other employer, from discriminating on the basis of religion.

PARTIES, JURISDICTION, AND VENUE

10. Plaintiff Zahraa Ali is a female citizen of The State of Missouri. Ms. Ali is a converted and practicing Muslim, and lives in St. Louis County.

11. Defendant Securitas Security Service, USA, Inc. (“Securitas USA”) is a Delaware corporation with a registered office at 120 South Central Avenue, Clayton, Missouri 63105 and a principal office at 2 Campus Drive, Parisippany New Jersey, 07054.

12. Defendant Securitas Services, Inc. (“Securitas Inc.”) is a Delaware corporation with a registered office at 120 South Central Avenue, Clayton, Missouri 63105 and a principal office at 2 Campus Drive, Parisippany New Jersey, 07054.

13. Both Securitas USA and Securitas Inc. may be served through their registered agent, Nation Registered Agents, Inc. at 120 South Central Avenue, Clayton, Missouri, 63105.

14. This Court has subject matter jurisdiction pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §§ 1331 and 1343 as the cause of action asserted arises under federal law, namely 42 U.S.C. § 2000e-2.

15. This Court has subject matter jurisdiction over pendent state law claims pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1367.

16. This Court’s exercise of personal jurisdiction over Defendants Securitas USA and Securitas Inc. is proper here as Defendants maintain an office and employees in Missouri, are registered with the Missouri Secretary of State to do business in the state of Missouri, and maintain a registered office in the state of Missouri.

17. Venue is proper in this District and this Division pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1391 and E.D.Mo. L.R. 3-2.07(A)(1), as the unlawful employment practices of Securitas, as alleged below, were committed in St. Louis County.

FACTUAL ALLEGATIONS

PLAINTIFF ALI HAS EXHAUSTED HER ADMINISTRATIVE REMEDIES

18. On or about November 16, 2015, Ms. Ali filed a Charge of Discrimination with the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission (“EEOC”), alleging unlawful employment practices in violation of the law.

19. On or about November 16, 2015, Ms. Ali filed a Charge of Discrimination with the Missouri Commission on Human Rights (“MCHR”), alleging unlawful employment practices in violation of the law.

20. Ms. Ali alleged that she was not hired by Securitas due to her religion – Islam.

21. On October 21, 2016, the EEOC issued Ms. Ali a Right to Sue Letter. Pl.’s Ex. C, EEOC Right to Sue Letter.

22. On October 3, 2016, the MCHR issued Ms. Ali a Right to Sue Letter. Pl.’s Ex. D, EEOC Right to Sue Letter.

23. This lawsuit is filed within ninety (90) days of the issuance of both the EEOC and MCHR Right to Sue Letters.

24. Ms. Ali has duly met all administrative prerequisites before filing the instant action.

PLAINTIFF ALI APPLIES FOR EMPLOYMENT WITH SECURITAS; IS QUICKLY DENIED ONCE SECURITAS LEARNS THAT SHE WEARS A HIJAB

25. Ms. Ali applied for employment with Securitas on or about September 15, 2015.

26. On or about early October 2015, and potentially on October 8, 2016, Ms. Ali had a phone conversation with a Securitas Recruitment Specialist.

27. During this phone call, among other things, Ms. Ali asked the Recruitment Specialist if there would be any issue regarding her wearing a hijab as part of her religion.

28. The Recruitment Specialist informed Ms. Ali that there should not be any problem because the hijab is worn as part of the Islamic faith, but said that she would check with her Securitas superiors.

29. The Recruitment Specialist did email her Securitas superiors – Andrea Paulson, Laura Keating, and Megan Schaeffer – on the afternoon of October 8, 2015. Pl.’s Exs. A and B.

30. On October 8, 2015 at 3:02 PM, a Regional Compliance Manager responded to the Recruitment Specialist asking, “Is this a candidate you are considering for hire?” Pl.’s Ex. A at p. 4.

31. On October 8, 2015 at 3:03 PM, the Securitas Recruitment Specialist responded to the Regional Compliance Manager, “I haven’t interviewed her yet, I was conducting a phone screen and she was wondering if it [wearing the hijab] would affect her getting hired.” *Id.*

32. On October 8, 2015 at 3:09 PM, the Regional Compliance Manager responded to the Recruitment Specialist, advising “I would personally side step this one....” Pl.’s Ex. B at p. 2.

33. On October 8, 2015 at 3:11 PM, the Securitas Recruitment Specialist responded to the Regional Compliance Manager asking “What do you mean, like have Megan interview her?” *Id.* at p. 1.

34. On October 8, 2015 at 3:34 PM, the Regional Compliance Manager ordered the Securitas Recruitment Specialist “Just pass on this candidate.” Pl.’s Ex. A at p. 3.

35. Other Securitas employees were carbon copied (“cc:”) on this discriminatory email exchange. See generally, *Id.*

36. On or about October 23, 2015, Ms. Ali was informed by Securitas that they would not be hiring her.

37. Ms. Ali's religion was clearly considered as part of Securitas's decision not to hire Ms. Ali.

38. Securitas actually relied on Ms. Ali's Islamic faith as at least the determinative, and, very likely, the only factor considered prior to instructing the Recruitment Specialist to "Just pass on this candidate."

CLASS ACTION ALLEGATIONS

39. Plaintiff brings this action pursuant to Rules 23(a), 23(b)(2), and 23(b)(3) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure on behalf of herself, a putative nationwide class, and a putative Missouri subclass, encompassing persons similarly situated to Plaintiff and seeking relief, and defined as:

The Title VII Class

All current and former Securitas job applicants who were not hired for a position with Securitas, and whose Islamic faith was a determinative factor in the applicant not being hired within the preceding three years from the date of filing of this Complaint.

The Missouri Subclass

All current and former Securitas job applicants, who applied for employment at a Securitas location in the State of Missouri, and were not hired for a position with Securitas, and whose Islamic faith was a contributing factor in the applicant not being hired within the preceding two years from the date of filing of this Complaint.

40. The Title VII Class and the Missouri Subclass are collectively referred to herein as the "Classes," unless otherwise indicated. The Missouri Subclass is referred to as the "Subclass" unless otherwise indicated. Plaintiff reserves the right to add, amend, modify, or further define the Classes or Subclass and/or to move for certification of a class or classes defined differently than set forth above depending on the facts or law as discovered in this action.

41. Plaintiff asserts claims against Defendants individually and on behalf of all Class and Subclass members for violations of the law as set forth below.

42. The members of the Class and Subclass are ascertainable from objective criteria.

43. If necessary to preserve the case as a class action, the Court itself can redefine the Classes, create additional subclasses, or both.

44. The requirements of Rule 23(a) are satisfied for the proposed classes because the members of the proposed classes are so numerous and geographically dispersed that joinder of all its members is impracticable.

45. Upon information and belief there are more than 50 Class Members and more than 50 Subclass members.

46. Therefore, the “numerosity” requirement of Rule 23(a)(1) is met.

47. The commonality requirement of Rule 23(a)(2) is satisfied because there are questions of law or fact common to Plaintiff and the other members of the proposed Class and Subclass that predominate over questions affecting only individual members of the Class and Subclass. Among those common questions of law or fact are, but are not limited to, the following:

- a. whether Plaintiff and Class members submitted an application for employment with Securitas;
- b. whether Securitas received Plaintiff’s and Class Members’ applications for employment;
- c. whether Plaintiff and Class Members were identified as being of the Islamic faith after submitting an application for employment to Securitas;
- d. whether Plaintiff and Class Members were denied employment based on their Islamic faith;
- e. whether Plaintiff and Class Members’ Islamic faith was a determinative factor in Securitas’ decision not to hire Plaintiff and Class Members;
- f. whether Plaintiff and Class Members’ Islamic faith was a contributing factor in Securitas’ decision not to hire Plaintiff and Missouri Subclass Members; and

- g. whether Plaintiff and Class and Subclass Members have suffered damages resulting from Securitas' illegal acts.

48. Plaintiff's claims are typical of the claims of the proposed classes that she seeks to represent, as described above, because the claims arise from the same course of conduct and policies and procedures of Securitas and are based on the same legal theories. Further, Plaintiff has sustained legal injuries arising from Securitas' conduct, as alleged herein, and Plaintiff seeks the same forms of relief for herself and the proposed classes. Therefore, the "typicality" requirement of Rule 23(a)(3) is satisfied.

49. Because her claims are typical of the proposed classes that Plaintiff seeks to represent, Plaintiff has every incentive to pursue those claims vigorously. Plaintiff has no conflicts with, or interests antagonistic to, the proposed classes. Plaintiff, a victim of Securitas' unlawful discriminatory practices, is committed to the vigorous prosecution of this action, which is reflected in their retention of competent counsel experienced in complex and challenging litigation.

50. Plaintiff's counsel satisfies the requirements of Rule 23(g) to serve as counsel for the proposed class. Plaintiff's counsel (a) has identified and thoroughly investigated the claims set forth herein, (b) has been in the past, and is currently, involved in complex discrimination litigation; (c) has extensive knowledge of the applicable law; and (d) is committed to the vigorous prosecution of this action on behalf of the proposed class. Accordingly, Plaintiff satisfies the adequacy of representation requirements of Rule 23(a)(4).

51. In addition, this action meets the requirements of Rule 23(b)(2). Securitas has acted or refused to act on grounds generally applicable to Plaintiff and other members of the proposed classes, making declaratory relief with respect to the proposed classes appropriate.

52. This action also meets the requirements of Rule 23(b)(3). Common questions of law or fact, including those set forth above, exist as to the claims of all members of the proposed

classes and predominate over questions affecting only individual class members, and a class action is the superior method – if not the only method – for the fair and efficient adjudication of this controversy.

53. Moreover, notice may be provided to members of the proposed class by including notice with each potential class members paycheck stub, first-class mail to addresses maintained for each employee by Securitas, and through the alternative means, including electronic mail (email), social network posting (i.e., Facebook posts), and job-site postings.

CLAIMS FOR RELIEF

COUNT I – ON BEHALF OF THE TITLE VII CLASS AGAINST ALL DEFENDANTS RELIGIOUS DISCRIMINATION IN TITLE VII

54. Ms. Ali re-alleges and incorporates by reference all allegations made in paragraphs 1–53.

55. Ms. Ali was a practicing Muslim at the time of her application for employment with Securitas.

56. Upon information and belief, the Class Members were practicing Muslims at the time of their application for employment with Securitas.

57. Ms. Ali was a practicing Muslim at the time that Securitas determined that they would not hire Ms. Ali.

58. Upon information and belief, the Class Members were practicing Muslims at the time that Securitas determined that they would not hire Class Members.

59. Ms. Ali and Class Members were members of a protected class inasmuch as they were practicing Muslims.

60. Ms. Ali, and upon information and belief, Class Members were highly qualified for the position for which they applied.

61. Ms. Ali had six years of prior correctional officer experience.

62. Ms. Ali was not hired by Securitas because she was a practicing Muslim and because she, as part of her Islamic faith, wore a hijab.

63. Upon information and belief, Class Members were not hired because they were practicing Muslims.

64. Upon information and belief, Ms. Ali and Class Members were not hired in favor of non-Muslim job applicants with inferior qualifications.

65. By engaging in the behavior set forth above, Securitas engaged in conduct proscribed by Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 and Title I of the Civil Rights Act of 1991.

66. As a direct and proximate result to Securitas' conduct, Ms. Ali and Class Members have been damaged and have lost income and other benefits, in addition to suffering embarrassment and humiliation, damage to their personal and professional reputation, and sustained emotional distress and, therefore, are entitled to monetary damages.

67. Securitas' conduct was willful, wanton, and malicious and in complete disregard to Ms. Ali's and Class Members rights.

**COUNT II – ON BEHALF OF THE MISSOURI SUBCLASS AGAINST ALL DEFENDANTS
RELIGIOUS DISCRIMINATION IN VIOLATION OF THE MISSOURI HUMAN RIGHTS ACT**

68. Ms. Ali re-alleges and incorporates by reference all allegations made in paragraphs 1–67.

69. Ms. Ali was a practicing Muslim at the time of her application for employment with Securitas.

70. Upon information and belief, all Missouri Subclass Members were practicing Muslims at the time of their application for employment with Securitas.

71. Ms. Ali was a practicing Muslim at the time that Securitas determined that they would not hire Ms. Ali.

72. Upon information and belief, the Missouri Subclass Members were practicing Muslims at the time that Securitas determined that they would not hire Class Members.

73. Ms. Ali and the Missouri Subclass Members were members of a protected class inasmuch as they were practicing Muslims.

74. Ms. Ali, and upon information and belief, Missouri Subclass Members were highly qualified for the position for which they applied.

75. Ms. Ali had six years of prior correctional officer experience.

76. Ms. Ali was not hired by Securitas because she was a practicing Muslim and because she, as part of her Islamic faith, wore a hijab.

77. Upon information and belief, Class Members were not hired because they were practicing Muslims.

78. Upon information and belief, Ms. Ali and Class Members were not hired in favor of non-Muslim job applicants with inferior qualifications.

79. Ms. Ali was a member of a protected class inasmuch as she was a practicing Muslim.

80. Ms. Ali was highly qualified for the position for which she applied, as Ms. Ali had six years of prior correctional officer experience.

81. Ms. Ali was not hired by Securitas because she was a practicing Muslim and because she, as part of her Islamic faith, wore a hijab.

82. At least, Ms. Ali' and Missouri Subclass Members' Islamic faith was a contributing factor to Securitas' decision not to hire Ms. Ali and the Missouri Subclass Members.

83. Upon information and belief, Ms. Ali and Missouri Subclass Members were not hire, and, instead, less qualified non-Muslims were hired even though they had inferior qualifications.

84. By engaging the in the behavior set forth above, Securitas engaged in conduct proscribed by MO. REV. STAT. § 213.055.

85. As a direct and proximate result to Securitas' conduct, Ms. Ali and Missouri Subclass Members have been damaged and has lost income and other benefits, in addition to suffering embarrassment and humiliation, damage to their personal and professional reputation, and sustained emotional distress and, therefore, are entitled to monetary damages.

86. Securitas' conduct was willful, wanton, and malicious and in complete disregard to Ms. Ali's and Missouri Subclass Members' rights.

PRAYER FOR RELIEF

WHEREFORE, in light of the above, Plaintiff Zahraa-Imani Ali prays that this Court:

- A. an order from the Court certifying the Title VII Class as identified herein as a class action pursuant to FED. R. CIV. P. 23(b) and (c) and appointing Plaintiff as class representative and her counsel to represent the Title VII Class;
- B. an order from the Court certifying the Missouri Subclass identified herein as a class action pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 23(b) and (c) and appointing Plaintiff as subclass representative and her counsel to represent the Missouri Subclass;
- C. an order from the Court awarding Plaintiff and Class and Subclass members monetary damages to compensate her for lost wages, lost benefits, damage to their personal and professional reputations, and emotional distress;
- D. an order from the Court awarding Plaintiff and Class and Subclass members punitive damages, in an amount to be determined at trial, and sufficient to prevent Securitas from engaging in the same or similar conduct as outlined above
- E. an order from the Court awarding attorney's fees and costs in an amount that is fair and reasonable

- F. an order from the Court awarding Plaintiff and Class and Subclass members pre-judgment and post-judgment interest, as well as expert-witness fees and other costs as may be available under law; and
- G. an order from the Court awarding such other and further relief as this Court may deem just and proper.

DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL

Plaintiffs request a jury trial on all issues so triable.

Dated: October 21, 2016

Respectfully submitted,

By: /s/ Brandon M. Wise
Brandon M. Wise – #67242
Paul A. Lesko – # 51914
PEIFFER ROSCA WOLF
ABDULLAH CARR & KANE, APLC
818 Lafayette Ave., Floor 2
St. Louis, MO 63104
Ph: 314-833-4825
Ph: 314-833-4826
Email: bwise@prwlegal.com
Email: plesko@prwlegal.com

Robert A. West – #67796
CAIR–MISSOURI
13408 Clayton Road
St. Louis, MO 63131
Phone: 314-666-0529
E-mail: rWest@CAIR.com

COUNSEL FOR PLAINTIFF ZAHRAA-IMANI ALI, THE
PUTATIVE TITLE VII CLASS, AND THE MISSOURI
SUBCLASS

EXHIBIT A

From: EEOC - I I G <info@eeoc.gov>
Date: October 11, 2015 at 1:25:14 PM CDT
To: [REDACTED]
Subject: TITLE VII violation - Securitas [Incident:151011-000005]
Reply-To: EEOC - I I G <info@eeoc.gov>

Response

Thank you for contacting the United States Equal Employment Opportunity Commission. This automated response confirms receipt of your inquiry and is not intended to address your specific questions. For those of you wishing to file a charge of employment discrimination, please note that there is a time limit of either 300 or 180 days to file a charge, depending on a number of factors. If you want to file a charge or have questions about your time limits to file a charge, you can visit our online assessment tool at <https://egov.eeoc.gov/eas/> as well as our Employees and Applicants section on the www.eeoc.gov website. You can not file a charge via email. We will respond to your specific questions promptly.

Discussion Thread

Customer By Email (Thomas Oakheart)

10/11/2015 01:25 PM

Hello,

I have a question regarding the email below. My employer is denying employment to an individual based strictly on the fact that the individual wears a Hijab. I would like to know if I should come in to file an EEOC claim.

Some background info on this email :

Andrea Paulson – Securitas Regional Compliance Manager and previous Area Human Resources Manager.
Laura Keating – Regional Labor Relations Manager.
Megan Schaeffer – Area Recruitment Manager

All three of these individuals are superiors and have been in HR for years. In addition, Securitas has a specific policy that states Hijabs are fine and should be accommodated. (Not to mention the fact that they Supreme Court ruled on it back in 2008).

Andrea Paulson denied employment based on only the following information :

****Please note, the application was attached to the email chain, which I can forward if needed ****

1. The applicant has 6 years of correctional officer experience (as indicated on the application).
2. The applicant wears a Hijab.

THAT'S IT. I would really appreciate some help. This employer has made many other violations in the past, however, I was never able to get it in Email, or any physical proof to back my claim. Most often they claim they can't hire females due to the contractual agreements with the clients, however, I think this is a lie, and the position doesn't actually require a male. Also they have removed a pregnant employee from a site because one of our supervisors requested it. Kenya Cathy. In addition to that, I have been told not to hire disabled people, homeless people, etc. Anyone without a nice car, the list goes on, however, it was all verbal.

This email below has an additional email in which I ask if I should have Megan Schaeffer interview the candidate, I can forward as well.

I would really like this to remain confidential as my employer is extremely quick to fire anyone they suspect might report them.

Tonya Oakheart

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

From: Tonya.Oakheart@securitasinc.com
Sent: Thursday, October 8, 2015 4:36 PM
To: [REDACTED]
Subject: FW: Zahraa Ali

Tonya Oakheart | Recruitment Specialist
T: (314) 206-6243
Tonya.Oakheart@securitasinc.com

-----Original Message-----

From: Tonya Oakheart (60072)
Sent: Thursday, October 08, 2015 4:36 PM
To: Tonya Oakheart (60072)
Subject: FW: Zahraa Ali

I will be giving the company a couple days to respond since Laura Keating is on this email chain. However with Andrea Paulson being a AHRM for the company, she ought to know better. This is a clear cut case of discrimination.

Tonya Oakheart | Recruitment Specialist
T: (314) 206-6243
Tonya.Oakheart@securitasinc.com

-----Original Message-----

From: Tonya Oakheart (60072)
Sent: Thursday, October 08, 2015 4:32 PM
To: [REDACTED]
Subject: FW: Zahraa Ali

Tonya Oakheart | Recruitment Specialist
T: (314) 206-6243
Tonya.Oakheart@securitasinc.com

-----Original Message-----

From: Andrea Paulson (01100)
Sent: Thursday, October 08, 2015 3:34 PM
To: Tonya Oakheart (60072)
Cc: Laura Keating (01100); Megan Schaeffer (60072)
Subject: Re: Zahraa Ali

Just pass on this candidate.

Sent from my iPhone

> On Oct 8, 2015, at 3:12 PM, Tonya Oakheart (60072) <Tonya.Oakheart@securitasinc.com> wrote:
>
> I asked the standard "do you have any piercings or tattoos on your face neck or hands" question.
> She volunteered the information.
>
>
> Tonya Oakheart | Recruitment Specialist
> T: (314) 206-6243
> Tonya.Oakheart@securitasinc.com
>
>
> -----Original Message-----
> From: Andrea Paulson (01100)
> Sent: Thursday, October 08, 2015 3:10 PM
> To: Tonya Oakheart (60072)

> Cc: Laura Keating (01100); Megan Schaeffer (60072)

> Subject: Re: Zahraa Ali

>

> How did this come up during phone screen?

>

> Sent from my iPhone

>

>> On Oct 8, 2015, at 3:03 PM, Tonya Oakheart (60072) <Tonya.Oakheart@securitasinc.com> wrote:

>>

>> I haven't interviewed her yet, I was conducting a phone screen and she was wondering if it would affect her getting hired.

>>

>> Tonya Oakheart | Recruitment Specialist

>> T: (314) 206-6243

>> Tonya.Oakheart@securitasinc.com

>>

>>

>> -----Original Message-----

>> From: Andrea Paulson (01100)

>> Sent: Thursday, October 08, 2015 3:02 PM

>> To: Tonya Oakheart (60072)

>> Cc: Laura Keating (01100); Megan Schaeffer (60072)

>> Subject: Re: Zahraa Ali

>>

>> Is this a candidate you are considering for hire?

>>

>> Sent from my iPhone

>>

>>> On Oct 8, 2015, at 2:43 PM, Tonya Oakheart (60072) <Tonya.Oakheart@securitasinc.com> wrote:

>>>

>>> Hey,

>>>

>>> This applicant wears a hijab (religious headpiece). Never encountered this before.

>>> Do I need to know anything regarding our uniform standard? I know allowing her to work with it on is a reasonable accommodation, but I want to make sure I am not missing anything.

>>>

>>>

>>>

>>> Tonya Oakheart | Recruitment Specialist

>>> T: (314) 206-6243

>>> Tonya.Oakheart@securitasinc.com

>>>

>>>

>>> -----Original Message-----

>>> From: Tonya.Oakheart@securitasinc.com [mailto:Tonya.Oakheart@securitasinc.com]

>>> Sent: Thursday, October 08, 2015 2:34 PM

>>> To: Tonya Oakheart (60072)

>>> Subject: Zahraa Ali

>>>

>>> Please see the employment application that I have attached.

>>> <Zahraa-Imani_Ali.pdf>

===== This communication contains confidential Securitas Security Services USA, Inc. business information, and is intended for the addressee only. If you have received this message in error, or if there is a problem with the communication, please notify the sender immediately. The unauthorized use, disclosure, reproduction, forwarding, copying or alteration of this message is strictly prohibited. Participants in this communication are not permitted to exchange or transmit Personal Identity Information (PII) via unsecured email. PII includes: Social Security numbers, credit card numbers, bank and credit union account numbers, health insurance plan identification numbers, driver's license numbers, dates of birth, and other similar information associated with an individual that, if misused, might compromise that person's personal or financial security.

Question Reference #151011-000005

Date Created: 10/11/2015 01:25 PM

Last Updated: 10/11/2015 01:25 PM

Status: Open

Employer Zip Code:

[---001:005841:44776---]

EXHIBIT B

From: Tonya Oakheart [REDACTED]
Date: March 22, 2016 at 6:50:56 PM CDT
To: MYLINH NGUYEN <MYLINH.NGUYEN@EEOC.GOV>
Subject: Fw: FW: Zahraa Ali

2nd email chain.

From: Thomas Oakheart [REDACTED]
Sent: Friday, October 9, 2015 10:38 AM
To: Shane
Subject: Fwd: FW: Zahraa Ali

----- Forwarded message -----
From: Tonya.Oakheart@securitasinc.com Date: Oct 8, 2015
4:33 PM Subject: FW: Zahraa Ali To: [REDACTED]
Cc:

Tonya Oakheart | Recruitment Specialist
T: (314) 206-6243
Tonya.Oakheart@securitasinc.com

-----Original Message-----
From: Tonya Oakheart (60072)
Sent: Thursday, October 08, 2015 3:11 PM
To: Andrea Paulson (01100)
Cc: Laura Keating (01100); Megan Schaeffer (60072)
Subject: RE: Zahraa Ali

What do you mean, like have Megan interview her?

Tonya Oakheart | Recruitment Specialist

T: (314) 206-6243

Tonya.Oakheart@securitasinc.com

-----Original Message-----

From: Andrea Paulson (01100)

Sent: Thursday, October 08, 2015 3:09 PM

To: Tonya Oakheart (60072)

Cc: Laura Keating (01100); Megan Schaeffer (60072)

Subject: Re: Zahraa Ali

I would personally side step this one Tonya.

Sent from my iPhone

> On Oct 8, 2015, at 3:03 PM, Tonya Oakheart (60072) <Tonya.Oakheart@securitasinc.com> wrote:

>

> I haven't interviewed her yet, I was conducting a phone screen and she was wondering if it would affect her getting hired.

>

> Tonya Oakheart | Recruitment Specialist

> T: (314) 206-6243

> Tonya.Oakheart@securitasinc.com

>

>

> -----Original Message-----

> From: Andrea Paulson (01100)

> Sent: Thursday, October 08, 2015 3:02 PM

> To: Tonya Oakheart (60072)

> Cc: Laura Keating (01100); Megan Schaeffer (60072)

> Subject: Re: Zahraa Ali

>

> Is this a candidate you are considering for hire?

>

> Sent from my iPhone

>

>> On Oct 8, 2015, at 2:43 PM, Tonya Oakheart (60072) <Tonya.Oakheart@securitasinc.com> wrote:

>>

>> Hey,

>>

>> This applicant wears a hijab (religious headpiece). Never encountered this before.

>> Do I need to know anything regarding our uniform standard? I know allowing her to work with it on is a reasonable accommodation, but I want to make sure I am not missing anything.

>>

>>

>>

>> Tonya Oakheart | Recruitment Specialist

>> T: (314) 206-6243

>> Tonya.Oakheart@securitasinc.com

>>

>>

>> -----Original Message-----

>> From: Tonya.Oakheart@securitasinc.com [<mailto:Tonya.Oakheart@securitasinc.com>]

>> Sent: Thursday, October 08, 2015 2:34 PM

>> To: Tonya Oakheart (60072)

>> Subject: Zahraa Ali

>>

>> Please see the employment application that I have attached.

>> <Zahraa-Imani_Ali.pdf>

=====
This communication contains confidential Securitas Security Services USA, Inc. business information, and is intended for the addressee only. If you have received this message in error, or if there is a problem with the communication, please notify the sender immediately. The unauthorized use, disclosure, reproduction, forwarding, copying or alteration of this message is strictly prohibited. Participants in this communication are not permitted to exchange or transmit Personal Identity Information (PII) via unsecured email. PII includes: Social Security numbers, credit card numbers, bank and credit union account numbers, health insurance plan identification numbers, driver's license numbers, dates of birth, and other similar information associated with an individual that, if misused, might compromise that person's personal or financial security.

EXHIBIT C

U.S. EQUAL EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITY COMMISSION
NOTICE OF RIGHT TO SUE (ISSUED ON REQUEST)

To: **Zahraa-Imani Ali**



From: **St. Louis District Office**
1222 Spruce Street
Room 8.100
Saint Louis, MO 63103

On behalf of person(s) aggrieved whose identity is
CONFIDENTIAL (29 CFR §1601.7(a))

EEOC Charge No.	EEOC Representative	Telephone No.
560-2016-00270	My Linh Nguyen, Investigator	(314) 539-7906

(See also the additional information enclosed with this form.)

NOTICE TO THE PERSON AGGRIEVED:

Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA), or the Genetic Information Nondiscrimination Act (GINA): This is your Notice of Right to Sue, issued under Title VII, the ADA or GINA based on the above-numbered charge. It has been issued at your request. Your lawsuit under Title VII, the ADA or GINA **must be filed in a federal or state court WITHIN 90 DAYS of your receipt of this notice**; or your right to sue based on this charge will be lost. (The time limit for filing suit based on a claim under state law may be different.)

- More than 180 days have passed since the filing of this charge.
- Less than 180 days have passed since the filing of this charge, but I have determined that it is unlikely that the EEOC will be able to complete its administrative processing within 180 days from the filing of this charge.
- The EEOC is terminating its processing of this charge.
- The EEOC will continue to process this charge.

Age Discrimination in Employment Act (ADEA): You may sue under the ADEA at any time from 60 days after the charge was filed until 90 days after you receive notice that we have completed action on the charge. In this regard, **the paragraph marked below applies to your case:**

- The EEOC is closing your case. Therefore, your lawsuit under the ADEA **must be filed in federal or state court WITHIN 90 DAYS of your receipt of this Notice.** Otherwise, your right to sue based on the above-numbered charge will be lost.
- The EEOC is continuing its handling of your ADEA case. However, if 60 days have passed since the filing of the charge, you may file suit in federal or state court under the ADEA at this time.

Equal Pay Act (EPA): You already have the right to sue under the EPA (filing an EEOC charge is not required.) EPA suits must be brought in federal or state court within 2 years (3 years for willful violations) of the alleged EPA underpayment. This means that **backpay due for any violations that occurred more than 2 years (3 years) before you file suit may not be collectible.**

If you file suit, based on this charge, please send a copy of your court complaint to this office.

On behalf of the Commission

**James R. Neely, Jr.,
Director**

OCT 21 2016

(Date Mailed)

Enclosures(s)

cc: **Sabrina Wesley**
Manager EEO Investigations
SECURITAS SECURITY SERVICES USA, INC
4330 Park Terrace Drive
Westlake Village, CA 91361

Brandon Wise
PEIFFER ROSSCA WOLF ABDULLAH
CARR & KANE, LLP
818 Lafayette Ave., Floor 2
Saint Louis, MO 63104

EXHIBIT D



MISSOURI COMMISSION ON HUMAN RIGHTS



JEREMIAH W. (JAY) NIXON
GOVERNOR

RYAN MCKENNA
DEPARTMENT DIRECTOR

SARA NELL LAMPE
COMMISSION CHAIRPERSON

ALISA WARREN, Ph.D.
EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR

Zahraa-Imani Ali

[Redacted]

RE: Ali vs. Securitas Security Services USA
FE-11/15-24434 560-2016-00270

FE-11/15-24434
Administrative Use/Records

The Missouri Commission on Human Rights (MCHR) is terminating its proceedings and issuing this notice of your right to sue under the Missouri Human Rights Act because you have requested a notice of your right to sue.

This letter indicates your right to bring a civil action within 90 days of this notice against the respondent(s) named in the complaint. Such an action may be brought in any circuit court in any county in which the unlawful discriminatory practice is alleged to have occurred but it must be brought no later than two years after the alleged cause occurred or its reasonable discovery. Upon issuance of this notice, the MCHR is terminating all proceedings relating to the complaint. No person may file or reinstate a complaint with the MCHR after the issuance of a notice of right to sue relating to the same practice or act. You are hereby notified of your right to sue the Respondent(s) named in your complaint in state circuit court. **THIS MUST BE DONE WITHIN 90 DAYS OF THE DATE OF THIS NOTICE OR YOUR RIGHT TO SUE IS LOST.**

You are also notified that the Executive Director is hereby administratively closing this case and terminating all MCHR proceedings relating to it. This notice of right to sue has no effect on the suit-filing period for any federal claims. This notice of right to sue is being issued as required by Section 213.111.1, RSMo, because it has been requested in writing 180 days after filing of the complaint. This complaint was being initially processed by the EEOC and MCHR has not been notified of their determination. **Please note that administrative processing of this complaint, including determinations of jurisdiction, has not been completed.**

Respectfully,

Alisa Warren, Ph.D.
Executive Director

October 3, 2016
Date

Securitas Security Services USA
55 W. Port Plaza Dr., #750
St. Louis, MO 63146

Brandon Wise
818 Lafayette Ave., Floor 2
St. Louis, MO 63104
Via email

3315 W. TRUMAN BLVD.
P.O. Box 1129
JEFFERSON CITY, MO 65102-1129
PHONE: 573-751-3325
FAX: 573-751-2905

111 N. 7TH STREET, SUITE 903
ST. LOUIS, MO 63101-2100
PHONE: 314-340-7590
FAX: 314-340-7238

P.O. Box 1300
OZARK, MO 65721-1300
FAX: 417-485-6024

1410 GENESSEE, SUITE 260
KANSAS CITY, MO 64102
FAX: 816-889-3582

106 ARTHUR STREET
SUITE D
SIKESTON, MO 63801-5454
FAX: 573-472-5321

Missouri Commission on Human Rights is an equal opportunity employer/program. Auxiliary aides and services are available upon request to individuals with disabilities.