1 GEORGE L. MALLORY, JR., ESQ. (SBN 86311) 2 GEORGE L. MALLORY, JR. & ASSOCIATES 1925 Century Park East, Suite 2000 3 Los Angeles, California 90067-2701 4 Telephone: (310) 788-5555 Facsimile: (310) 788-5570 5 6 Attorneys for Plaintiff 7 Nathan Davis, Jr. 8 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT 9 FOR THE CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA 10 11 Case No.: NATHAN DAVIS, JR., 12 Plaintiff, COMPLAINT FOR DAMAGESAND 13 **DEMAND FOR TRIAL BY JURY** 14 VS. 15 UNITED AIRLINES, INC, 16 MANAAIR, LLC, EXPRESSJET 17 AIRLINES, UNITED EXPRESS, **JESSIE GUTIERREZ, AND** 18 **CAPTAIN DOUGHTY, Employees of** 19 the Defendants. **Defendant** 20 21 The PLAINTIFF NATHAN DAVIS, JR., complaining of the Defendants, 22 alleges as follows: 23 THE NATURE OF THE ACTION 24 25 1. This suit is brought to redress the racial discrimination and racial profiling 26 of an African-American passenger by Defendants including but not limited 27 to United Airlines. On December 31, 2019, the Plaintiff was a passenger on 28 COMPLAINT FOR DAMAGESAND DEMAND FOR TRIAL BY JURY - 1

United Flight 4273 from Houston, Texas to Nashville, Tennessee. Upon boarding the flight and prior to takeoff, the Plaintiff was discriminated against, harassed, singled out, and humiliated by one of Defendant's flight attendants, identified as JESSIE GUTIERREZ.

2. Plaintiff was removed from the flight without justification or legal cause and made an example of and spectacle in front of other passengers despite the fact that he posed no security risk, committed no violation of law and was adhering to rules and regulations in concert with other passengers. While in the course and scope of her employment and at the insistence of Defendant Jessie Gutierrez whose conduct was outlandish, unprofessional, and unjustified, the Plaintiff was summarily removed from the flight. The ultimate decision was made by Defendant Pilot CAPTAIN DOUGHTY who acted in concert with Defendant Jessie Gutierrez to discriminate and violate the Civil Rights of the Plaintiff. Defendant Captain Doughty also assaulted Plaintiff when he attempted to take the Plaintiff's cell phone as described below.

### JURISDICTION AND VENUE

3. The Plaintiff Nathan Davis, Jr. ("Davis, Jr."), an African-American man is an actor, singer, musician, and entertainer. The Plaintiff is a resident of the COMPLAINT FOR DAMAGESAND DEMAND FOR TRIAL BY JURY - 2

11 12

13

14 15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22 23

24

25 26

27

28

State of California.

- 4. Defendant United Airlines, Inc. ("United") is a major American Airline headquartered in Chicago, Illinois. Defendant is incorporated in Delaware. It conducts business throughout the United States and the world.
- 5. Defendant ManaAir, LLC is a Delaware limited liability company with headquarters in Atlanta, Georgia.
- 6. Defendant ExpressJet Airlines, LLC is a North American regional Airline headquartered in College Park, Georgia and flies under the United Express brand for United Airlines.
- 7. Defendant United Express is a DBA and brand name for the regional brand United Airlines.
- 8. At all times hereinafter mentioned, all of the acts and conduct hereinafter described of each and every corporate defendant was duly authorized, ordered and/or directed by the respective defendant's corporate employees, and the officers and management-level employees of said corporate defendants and that said corporate defendants participated in the acts and conduct of their said employees, agents and representatives and each of them, and upon completion of the aforesaid acts and conduct of said

corporate employees, agents and representatives, the defendant corporations, individually and collectively, ratified, accepted the benefits of, condoned, lauded, acquiesced, approved and consented to each and every one of the said acts and conduct of the aforesaid corporate employees, managing agents, directors, executives and representatives. At all times hereinafter mentioned, defendants retained the ability to exercise, and in fact exercised, substantial control, whether contractual, actual, implied or otherwise, over the means and manner in which the remaining defendants conducted their business and had the power to influence the remaining defendants.

- 9. At all times hereinafter mentioned, plaintiff will show, according to proof, that various defendants were, and remain, the alter egos, successors, and/or successors in interest, of the remaining defendants.
- 10. As to "alter ego liability" defendants, it is alleged, upon information and belief, that as to those defendants, that at all times there existed such a unity of interest and ownership among those defendants such that any separateness ceased to exist that one was a mere shell or instrumentality through which the other carried out their business and that each defendant exercised such complete control over the other and so dominated it to

28

achieve individual goals and so ignored business formalities that any separateness was merely a fiction, and did not in fact exist, and should be deemed not to exist, and as such, if acts are alleged as against one defendant in this complaint, it is alleged that that defendant acted for itself as well as on behalf of its alter egos. Among other things, those defendants did one or more of the following acts supporting its alter ego liability: commingled corporate funds; failed to observe corporate formalities including maintaining minutes and failure to contribute sufficient capital; commingled funds or other assets; used corporate funds for something other than corporate uses; failed to maintain adequate corporate records; deliberately confused the records of the separate entities; had the same directors and officers of the two or more corporations; used the same office or business location; utilized the same employees and/or attorney; failed to adequately capitalize the corporation; used the corporation as a mere shell, instrumentality or conduit for a single venture; failed to maintain an arm's length relationship among related entities; and/or used a corporate entity to procure labor, services or merchandise for another entity. Moreover, injustice would result but for the finding of alter ego liability as to these defendants, and as such this Court should pierce the corporate veil.

Further, since alter ego applies here, a corporation's shareholders are treated as "partners" and are held jointly and severally liable for its debts and plaintiff notes that ownership of even one share is sufficient to impose alter ego liability, and it is thus alleged, upon information and belief, that various defendants as alter egos, are also active shareholders in the remaining defendants, influenced and governed the remaining corporate defendants and as such can, and should, be held liable as an alter ego of each and every remaining defendant.

11. As to those defendants liable under theories of "successor liability and/or successor in interest liability," it is alleged that, as to those defendants, one or more of the following factors exists: there is a mere continuation on the part of defendants; a common identity of directors, officers and shareholders from predecessor corporations to successor corporations; that assets were purchased; that the defendants are successors and successors in interest, of both assets and liabilities of the others; and that among other things, one or more of the following facts exist and/or are in play: a continuation of the enterprise, i.e., that key people of the predecessor are involved in the new entity, the same name, location, facilities or product is used, the assets were bought by the new entity and the operations are the same; the seller

dissolved or ceased doing business after the sale; the purchaser assumed the liabilities and obligations ordinarily necessary to continue doing business; and/or the new entity holds itself out as an effective continuation of the seller.

- 12. At all times herein mentioned, each of the defendants was the agent, servant, employee, and joint venturer of each of the remaining defendants and at all times alleged hereinafter mentioned, defendants were acting within the purpose and scope of said agency, employment, and joint venture, and each defendant has ratified and approved the acts of the remaining defendants.
- 13. To the extent a corporate defendant is named herein, it is believed that any such defendant's corporate officers and directors ratified and approved any wrongful conduct alleged in this complaint, or were directly responsible for perpetrating such conduct.
- 14. The Corporate and Limited Liability Company Defendants described herein will be referred to as United Airlines.
- 15. Defendant Jessie Gutierrez is a female flight attendant who was employed by the Defendants and was working in the course and scope of her employment on United Flight 4273 from Houston, Texas to Nashville,

16. Defendant Captain Doughty is a Caucasian male pilot who was employed by the Defendants and was working in the course and scope of his employment on United Flight 4273 from Houston, Texas to Nashville,

Tennessee on December 31, 2019.

Tennessee on December 31, 2019.

- 17. This lawsuit is based upon the discriminatory and unjustified removal of the Plaintiff, a United States citizen from a United flight in violation of the United States Constitution. This case is brought pursuant to 42 U.S.C. Section 1981. This Court has jurisdiction over this action pursuant to 28 U.S.C. Section 1331, 1332, 1343, and 1367.
- 18. This Court has personal jurisdiction over defendants because defendants are an airline that regularly conducts business in the City and County of Los Angeles and State of California in the Central District of California.
- 19. The venue is proper in the Central District of California under 28 U.S.C.

  Section 1391 in that Defendant's conduct substantial business in this district and operates out Southern California airports including but not limited to Los Angeles International Airport.

### **FACTS**

- 20. In December 2019, during the Christmas holidays Plaintiff Davis, Jr. visited family in Houston, Texas.
- 21. On December 31, 2019, the Plaintiff was a ticketed passenger on United Flight 4273 from Houston, Texas to Nashville, Tennessee. The Plaintiff was initially assigned to seat 20D, however at the request of 2 passengers traveling together, he agreed to relocate to a single seat in row 23A in the last row of the aircraft.
- 22. The Plaintiff who is an actor, singer, musician, and entertainer was scheduled to perform a New Year's Eve concert in Nashville, Tennessee.

  Prior to the aircraft taxing for takeoff Plaintiff Davis, Jr. was seated with a "natural" hairstyle, wearing a "hoody," and donning an artificial nose ring while listening to music from his cell phone with his air pods headset.

  Plaintiff Davis, Jr. was the only African-American male on the flight.
- 23. While minding his own business seat belted and listening to music

  Defendant Jessie Gutierrez rudely singled out Plaintiff Davis, Jr. and
  advised that she heard music in the general area where several passengers
  were wearing headphones, however she only addressed Plaintiff Davis, Jr.

COMPLAINT FOR DAMAGESAND DEMAND FOR TRIAL BY JURY - 10

- advising that his music was too loud.
- 24. Although Plaintiff Davis, Jr. did not perceive his music listening activities as annoying or impacting any other passenger he nevertheless complied with the request of Defendant Jane Doe and turned his music down. Upon observation, while Plaintiff Davis, Jr. noted other passengers listening to music that was also displayed on their personal devices the flight attendant Jessie Gutierrez dogmatically returned to Plaintiff Davis, Jr. who was seated in the last row and again advised him to turn down his music. The Plaintiff noted that no other passengers were approached or requested to turn down their music although it was patently obvious that they were listening to music on their personal devices during the same frame.
- 25. Concerned that he was being singled out, ostracized, and purposely harassed for no reason, Plaintiff Davis, Jr. remained seated with his headphones affixed however he "MUTED" the music on his personal device. Although his music was completely off the flight attendant Defendant Jessie Gutierrez approached only the Plaintiff, a third time and began mocking him while mouthing "you can't hear me, can you?" Thereafter, Defendant Gutierrez retorted "Because your music is too loud." After the flight attendant's third encounter with the Plaintiff it became

patently obvious that Plaintiff Davis, Jr. was being chastised, singled out, and verbally abused unlawfully and unjustifiably as his music was "MUTED" when he was again purposefully harassed.

- 26. Defendant Gutierrez thereafter contacted the Defendant Captain Doughty who was in the cockpit from the telephone in the rear galley to as the plane was taxing to takeoff. After their conversation the Defendant Gutierrez advised and Defendant Doughty announced to the passengers over the intercom that the aircraft would return to the gate to remove a passenger (Plaintiff Davis, Jr.).
- 27. Upon returning to the gate, an Operations Supervisor boarded the aircraft and Plaintiff Davis, Jr. was requested to deplane which he did voluntarily. While on the jetway, Plaintiff Davis, Jr. related the facts to Defendant Captain Doughty, who was not present during the Plaintiff's contact and exchange with the Defendant Gutierrez however the Plaintiff was removed from the flight in spite of his verbalization of racial discrimination, desperate treatment and his New Year's Eve professional engagement performance in Nashville, Tennessee. In addition, while on the jetway Defendant Doughty attempted to forcefully take away the Plaintiff's cell phone while he recorded the interaction between the parties.

COMPLAINT FOR DAMAGESAND DEMAND FOR TRIAL BY JURY - 11

28. In spite of his verbal protestation's embarrassment and emotional trauma, Plaintiff Davis, Jr. was ordered to return to the aircraft and remove his personal items and himself from the United flight. At the direction of the Defendants airline personnel, the Plaintiff hastily retrieved his tuxedo and although he mistakenly left his remaining carry-on luggage, he began to deplane pursuant to the orders of the Defendant airlines personnel.

- 29. As the Plaintiff deplaned in front of fellow passengers as a result of purportedly listening to music on his personal device, SHOCKINGLY, RECKLESSLY and without any basis, Defendant Jessie Gutierrez announced over the aircraft loudspeaker "HE'S GOT A GUN" referring to Plaintiff Davis, Jr. Although, Defendant Gutierrez' statement was made maliciously without any justification, Plaintiff Davis, Jr. shamefully left the aircraft emotionally distraught and tearful as a result of his unlawful and racially charged removal from the aircraft.
- 30. After deplaning the plaintiff was never contacted or detained by law enforcement nor was any action taken based upon Defendant Gutierrez' statement "He's got a gun." Indeed, gate agents and other passengers recognized the Plaintiff as a law abiding actor and entertainer. Thereafter, the Plaintiff received apologies from other United personnel, was upgraded COMPLAINT FOR DAMAGESAND DEMAND FOR TRIAL BY JURY 12

to First Class and rebooked on a later flight from Houston, Texas to Nashville, Tennessee.

31. Plaintiff Davis, Jr. suffered personal and professional embarrassment as well as severe emotional trauma as a result of the actions of Defendants Jessie Gutierrez and Captain Doughty on United Airline Flight 4273.

### FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION

# NEGLIGENT HIRING, TRAINING, SUPERVISION, AND/OR RETENTION OF AN UNFIT EMPLOYEE

32. The Plaintiff repeats and realleges the proceeding paragraphs as if set forth herein.

Plaintiff is informed and believes and thereon alleges that in doing the acts as heretofore alleged, Defendant, Jessie Gutierrez was incompetent and unfit to perform the duties for which she was employed, and that an undue risk to persons such as Plaintiff and other passengers existed because of her employment.

33. Plaintiff is informed and believes and thereon alleges that in doing the acts as heretofore alleged, Defendants including United Airlines failed to adequately train and supervise Defendant Gutierrez in the exercise of the tasks of her employment and/or failed to terminate her, thereby proximately

causing plaintiffs' injuries as set forth heretofore. COMPLAINT FOR DAMAGESAND DEMAND FOR TRIAL BY JURY - 13

34. Despite this advance knowledge of Defendant Gutierrez' unfitness to perform her duties, Defendant United retained Defendant Gutierrez as an employee in conscious disregard of the rights and safety of others.

- 35. Defendants including United Airlines are liable for the actions of its agents and employees directly and under the doctrine of respondent superior.
- 36. Defendant United Airlines is a Common Carrier. A Common Carrier must carry passengers safely. Common carriers must use the highest care and the vigilance of a very cautious person. They must do all that human care, vigilance, and foresight reasonably can do under the circumstances to avoid harm to passengers. While a common carrier does not guarantee the safety of its passengers, it must use reasonable skill to provide everything necessary for safe transportation, in view of the transportation used and the practical operation of the business. Defendants breached their duty of care in its actions toward Plaintiff.
- 37. As a direct and proximate result of Defendants actions, Plaintiff suffered mental distress, anguish, personal and professional embarrassment as well as indignation. Plaintiff is thereby entitled to general and compensatory damage in an amount no less than ten million dollars.
- 38. Defendants acts alleged herein were malicious, oppressive, despicable, and

warranted against Defendants in order to punish and make an example of each of them.

SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION

in conscious disregard of Plaintiff's rights. As such, punitive damages are

## SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION

### ASSAULT AGAINST PLAINTIFF DAVIS, JR.

- 39. The Plaintiff repeats and realleges the proceeding paragraphs as if set forth herein.
- 40. Defendant Doughty, attempted to physically take the Plaintiff's cell phone as Plaintiff filmed the interaction between the parties on the jet bridge as described above. As an agent and employee of Defendants United Airlines, Defendant Doughty's actions by reaching and attempting to grab the cell phone held by Plaintiff Davis, Jr., placed Plaintiff in imminent apprehension and fear of an unwanted battery or bodily contact.
- 41. The actions of the Defendant Doughty in reaching and grabbing for the cell phone were intentional and unwarranted while interfering with Plaintiff's Constitutional Right to record the violation of his rights.
- 42. At no time did Plaintiff Davis, Jr. consent to or in any way justify any of the acts of Defendants.
- 43. Defendants United Airlines are liable for the actions of its agents and employees directly and under the doctrine of respondeat superior.

COMPLAINT FOR DAMAGESAND DEMAND FOR TRIAL BY JURY - 16

The Corporate and Limited Liability Company Defendants are Common Carriers. Common Carriers must carry passengers safely. Common carriers must use the highest care and the vigilance of a very cautious person. They must do all that human care, vigilance, and foresight reasonably can do under the circumstances to avoid harm to passengers. While a common carrier does not guarantee the safety of its passengers, it must use reasonable skill to provide everything necessary for safe travel, in view of the transportation used and the practical operation of the business.

Defendants breached their duty of care in its actions toward Plaintiff Davis, Jr.

- 44. As a direct and proximate result of Defendants actions, Plaintiff Davis, Jr. suffered mental distress, anguish, and indignation. Plaintiff Davis, Jr. is thereby entitled to general and compensatory damage in an amount no less than ten million dollars.
- 45. Defendants acts alleged herein are malicious, oppressive, despicable, and in conscious disregard of Plaintiff Davis, Jr.'s rights. As such, punitive damages are warranted against Defendants in order to punish and make an example of each of them.

### THIRD CAUSE OF ACTION

### **NEGLIGENCE**

- 46. Plaintiff repeats and realleges the preceding and subsequent paragraphs as though set forth herein.
- 47. Defendants had a duty and they breached their duty of care to Plaintiff by failing to provide a safe place for its passengers to conduct their travel. As a direct and proximate cause of Defendants' breach of duty as described above, Plaintiff suffered and continues to suffer shock, humiliation, embarrassment, trepidation, fright, nervousness, grief, anxiety, worry, mortification, indignity and extreme and enduring emotional distress, all to his damage in an amount to be determined according to proof at trial.
- 48. Defendants United Airlines are liable for the actions of its agents and employees directly and under the doctrine of respondeat superior.
- 49. Defendants United Airlines is a Common Carrier. A Common Carrier must carry passengers safely. Common carriers must use the highest care and the vigilance of a very cautious person. They must do all that human care, vigilance, and foresight reasonably can do under the circumstances to avoid harm to passengers. While a common carrier does not guarantee the safety of its passengers, it must use reasonable skill to provide everything

necessary for safe travel, in view of the transportation used and the practical operation of the business. Defendants breached their duty of care in its actions toward Plaintiff.

- 50. As a direct and proximate result of Defendants actions, Plaintiff suffered mental distress, anguish, and indignation. Plaintiff is thereby entitled to general and compensatory damage in an amount no less than ten million dollars.
- 51. Defendants acts alleged herein are malicious, oppressive, despicable, and in conscious disregard of Plaintiffs' rights. As such, punitive damages are warranted against Defendants in order to punish and make an example of each of them.

### FOURTH CAUSE OF ACTION

### INTENTIONAL INFLICTION OF EMOTIONAL DISTRESS

- 52. Plaintiff repeat and realleges the preceding and subsequent paragraphs as though set forth herein.
- 53. Defendants engaged in outrageous conduct outlined herein which was intentional and malicious and done for the purpose of causing Plaintiff to suffer humiliation. As a direct and proximate cause of Defendants' outrageous conduct, Plaintiff suffered and continues to suffer shock,

humiliation, embarrassment, trepidation, fright, nervousness, grief, anxiety, worry, mortification, indignity and extreme and enduring emotional distress, all to his damage in an amount to be determined according to proof at trial.

- 54. Defendants United Airlines are liable for the actions of its agents and employees directly and under the doctrine of respondeat superior.
- 55. Defendant United Airlines is a Common Carrier. A Common Carrier must carry passengers safely. Common carriers must use the highest care and the vigilance of a very cautious person. They must do all that human care, vigilance, and foresight reasonably can do under the circumstances to avoid harm to passengers. While a common carrier does not guarantee the safety of its passengers, it must use reasonable skill to provide everything necessary for safe travel, in view of the transportation used and the practical operation of the business. Defendants breached their duty of care in its actions toward Plaintiff.
- 56. As a direct and proximate result of Defendants outrageous actions, Plaintiff suffered mental distress, anguish, and indignation. Plaintiff is thereby entitled to general and compensatory damage in an amount no less than ten million dollars.

5

10

11 12

13 14

15 16

17

18

19

20

21 22

23

24 25

26

27 28 conscious disregard of Plaintiffs' rights. As such, punitive damages are warranted against defendants in order to punish and make an example of each of them. FIFTH CAUSE OF ACTION

57. Defendants acts alleged herein are malicious, oppressive, despicable, and in

## **DISCRIMINATION UNDER 42 U.S.C. § 1981**

- 58. Plaintiff repeats and realleges the preceding and subsequent paragraphs as though set forth herein.
- 59. At all times relevant to the events described above, Defendant Jessie Gutierrez on December 31, 2019, was an employee and/or agent of Defendants United Airlines. The discriminatory practices described above were carried out: (a) at the direction of and with the consent, encouragement, knowledge, and ratification of the Defendants United; (b) under the Defendants United's authority, control, and supervision; and/or (c) within the scope of the employee' employment.
- 60. Defendants United is liable for the actions of its agents and employees directly and under the doctrine of respondeat superior.
- 61. Defendant Jessie Gutierrez and by extension, Defendants United Airlines engaged in intentional discrimination based on Plaintiffs' race, color and

ancestry, by assaulting Plaintiff and by their hostile treatment of Plaintiff on Defendant's December 31, 2019 flight. In so doing, Defendants violated Plaintiff's right to make and enforce the contracted created when he purchased a ticket and attempted to travel on Defendant United's December 31, 2019 flight from Houston, Texas to Nashville, Tennessee.

- 62. The foregoing actions by the Defendants thus constitute a deprivation of Plaintiffs' right to make and enforce contracts regardless of his race, in violation of 42 U.S.C. § 1981.
- 63. As a direct, foreseeable, and proximate result of Defendant's discrimination and wrongful acts, Plaintiff suffered and continues to suffer fear, anxiety, humiliation, mental pain and anguish, emotional distress, inconvenience, and economic loss. The Plaintiff was injured on an amount no less than ten million dollars.
- 64. Defendants acts alleged herein are malicious, oppressive, despicable, and in conscious disregard of Plaintiffs' rights. As such, punitive damages are warranted against Defendants in order to punish and make an example of each of them.

///

SIXTH CAUSE OF ACTION

VIOLATION OF TITLE VI OF THE CIVIL RIGHTS ACT of 1964

10 11

13

15

17

18

20

22

23

25

27 28

as though fully set forth herein. 66. The Defendant Pilot Captain Doughty and Defendant Jessie Gutierrez Flight Attendant on United Airlines United Flight 4273 from Houston to

Nashville on December 31, 2019, were at all relevant times agents and/or

employees of Defendant United and were acting within the course and

scope of their employment.

- 67. Defendants United Airlines are liable for the unlawful acts of its agents and employees directly and/or under the doctrine of respondeat superior.
- 68. Defendants United Airlines are the recipient of federal funds and is thus covered by Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 (42 U.S.C. § 2000d). Title VI and its implementing regulations prohibit recipients of federal monies from discriminating on the basis of, inter alia, race, color, or national origin.
- 69. Defendant Gutierrez' actions during the flight to include arranging for the Plaintiff to be made a public spectacle by having him escorted off of the plane as security risk in concert with Defendant Doughty's actions were

based upon the Plaintiffs' race, color, and/or national origin thus discriminated against the Plaintiff in violation of Title VI and its implementing regulations. Defendants actions were intentional and done in violation of Plaintiffs' civil rights.

- 70. As a direct, foreseeable, and proximate result of Defendant's discrimination and wrongful acts, Plaintiff suffered and continues to suffer fear, anxiety, humiliation, mental pain and anguish, emotional distress, inconvenience, and economic loss. The Plaintiff was injured on an amount no less than ten million dollars.
- 71. Defendants acts alleged herein are malicious, oppressive, despicable, and in conscious disregard of Plaintiffs' rights. As such, punitive damages are warranted against defendants in order to punish and make an example of each of them.

### **SEVENTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

### FALSE IMPRISONMENT OF THE PLAINTIFFS

72. The Defendant Pilot Captain Doughty and Defendant Gutierrez, Flight

Attendant on United Airlines United Flight 4273 from Houston to Nashville
on December 31, 2019, were at all relevant times agents and/or employees
of Defendants United Airlines and were acting within the course and scope

of their employment.

- 73. Defendants United Airlines are liable for the unlawful acts of its agents and employees directly and/or under the doctrine of respondent superior.
- 74. Defendants caused the Plaintiff to be detained on the jetway by Defendants' employees where he was interrogated and summarily removed from United Airlines Flight 4273.
- 75. The restraint, confinement, and detention compelled Plaintiff to remain on the jetway and thereafter in the airport for an appreciable amount of time.
- 76. Plaintiff did not knowingly or voluntarily consent to such restraint, confinement, and detainment.
- 77. Plaintiff was emotionally harmed by such restraint, confinement, and detainment and embarrassed before the public.
- 78. Defendant's conduct was a substantial factor in causing Plaintiffs' harm.

  The Plaintiff was injured in an amount no less than ten million dollars.
- 79. Defendants acts alleged herein are malicious, oppressive, despicable, and in conscious disregard of Plaintiffs' rights. As such, punitive damages are warranted against defendants in order to punish and make an example of each of them.

### **EIGHTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

### NEGLIGENT INFLICTION OF EMOTIONAL DISTRESS UPON THE

### **PLAINTIFFS**

- 80. Plaintiff incorporates by reference each and every allegation set forth above as though fully set forth herein.
- 81. Defendants United Airlines and their employees and agents acted negligently and/or recklessly when they removed Plaintiff from United Airlines United Flight 4273.
- 82. Defendants and their employees and agents should have known that their discriminatory treatment and confinement of Plaintiff would create an unreasonable risk of emotional and physical damages.
- 83. As a result of Defendant's actions, Plaintiff has suffered serious emotional distress, including suffering anguish, fright, nervousness, grief, anxiety, worry, shock, humiliation, and shame, all of which an ordinary reasonable person would be unable to cope.
- 84. Defendant's negligence was a substantial factor in causing Plaintiffs' serious emotional distress. The Plaintiff was injured in an amount no less than ten million dollars.
- 85. Defendants acts alleged herein are malicious, oppressive, despicable, and in

conscious disregard of Plaintiffs' rights. As such, punitive damages are warranted against defendants in order to punish and make an example of each of them.

### NINETH CAUSE OF ACTION

### **BREACH OF CONTRACT**

- 86. Plaintiff incorporates by reference each and every allegation set forth above as though fully set forth herein.
- 87. Plaintiff and Defendants entered into a contract of carriage.
- 88. Plaintiff performed all conditions, covenants, and promises required on his part to be performed in accordance with the terms and conditions of the contract.
- 89. Defendant breached the contract by removing the Plaintiff from United Airlines United Flight 4273 and failing to provide safe transport.
- 90. As a proximate result of Defendant's breach, Plaintiff has suffered damages in an amount to be proven at trial.

### **Prayer for Relief**

Plaintiff prays for judgment as follows:

A. For a declaratory judgment that the actions of Defendants described above constituted discrimination on the basis of race in violation of 42

--

U.S.C. § 1981;

- B. Permanently enjoining Defendant and its directors, officers, agents, and employees to take all affirmative steps necessary to remedy the effects of the illegal, discriminatory conduct described herein and to prevent similar occurrences in the future;
- C. Awarding Plaintiff his expenses, costs, fees, and other disbursements associated with the filing and maintenance of this action, including reasonable attorneys' fees pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1988, and any other applicable provision of law;
- D. For compensatory damages in an amount not less than ten million dollars;
- E. For statutory damages;
- F. For punitive damages; and
- G. For such other relief as the Court may deem just and proper.

Under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 11, by signing below, I certify to the best of my knowledge, information, and belief that this complaint: (1) is not being presented for an improper purpose, such as to harass, cause unnecessary delay, or needlessly increase the cost of litigation; (2) is supported by existing law or by a nonfrivolous argument for extending, modifying, or reversing existing law; (3) the factual contentions have evidentiary support or, if specifically so identified, will likely have evidentiary support after a reasonable opportunity for further investigation

COMPLAINT FOR DAMAGESAND DEMAND FOR TRIAL BY JURY - 27

or discovery; and (4) the complaint otherwise complies with the requirements of Rule 11. Dated: June 23, 2020 George L. Mallory, Jr., and Associates George L. Mallory, Tr., Esq. Attorney for Plaintiff, Nathan Davis, Jr. **DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL** Plaintiff hereby demands a trial by jury through his counsel of record. Date: June 23, 2020 George L. Mallory, Jr., and Associates George L. Mallory, Jr., Esq. Attorney for Plaintiff, Nathan Davis, Jr. COMPLAINT FOR DAMAGESAND DEMAND FOR TRIAL BY JURY - 28