

1 **ILG Legal Office, P.C.**  
2 Stephen Noel Ilg (SBN 275599)  
3 George L. Lin (SBN 287873)  
4 156 South Spruce Ave., Unit 206A  
5 South San Francisco, CA 94080  
6 Tel: (415)580-2574  
7 Fax: (415)735-3454  
8 Email: silg@ilglegal.com  
9 Email: glin@ilglegal.com

10 Attorneys for Plaintiff Emma Majo

11  
12 SUPERIOR COURT FOR THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA  
13 FOR THE COUNTY OF SAN MATEO

14 Emma Majo, an individual,  
15  
16 Plaintiff,  
17 vs.  
18 Sony Interactive Entertainment LLC, a  
19 California limited liability company,  
20  
21 Defendant.

Case No.

**COMPLEX CASE; CLASS ACTION**

**COMPLAINT**

**JURY TRIAL DEMANDED**

22 This Complaint is brought by Plaintiff Emma Majo (“Plaintiff” and/or “Ms. Majo”), an  
23 individual, against her former employer, Defendant Sony Interactive Entertainment (“Sony” or  
24 “Defendant”). Plaintiff hereby demands a jury trial on all causes of action triable to a jury. Plaintiff  
25 alleges the following:

26 **PLAINTIFF**

27 1. At all times material herein, Plaintiff was and is a competent adult and resident of  
28 the State of California, San Diego County. Plaintiff began working for Defendant in 2015. For a  
significant portion of her time working for Sony, Plaintiff held the job title of Financial Systems  
Business Analyst. The job description for this position included the following description which  
was copied from one of Sony’s job postings:

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

- a. Financial Systems Business Analyst
- b. The Financial Systems Business Analyst will play a hands on role in delivering solutions to improve and standardize processes and provide efficiency for the SNEI. The Financial Systems Analyst will work with engineering resources to understand new financially impactful features and functions that are being developed in the core platform and with controllers and accountants to configure and test third party software to handle these new features and functions from a financial reporting perspective.
- c. The Financial Systems Business Analyst will also participate in analyzing current financial processes to improve the business, document decisions, analyze expected business impact, communicate plans and progress, and manage expectations effectively.
- d. Individual must be comfortable working at a detailed level while maintaining a view of the big picture. Successful candidate will possess ability to influence and work collaboratively in a dynamic, rapidly-changing environment. Other responsibilities will include understanding system relationship to corporate systems, such as SAP, across different Sony entities.
- e. The Financial Systems Business Analyst will work with internal SNEI platform engineering, PMO, and security to oversee the integration of Network Platform data with the solution and to develop data integrity checks and balances, audit reporting processes and align with established data management and security policy.
- f. Required responsibilities of this individual may include, but are not limited to the following:
- g. Scoping: This role will document projects/initiatives to educate stakeholders and for SOX audit purposes.
- h. Planning and Reporting: This role will be responsible for contributing to business and workgroup plans around schedule, budget, resources, and risk and will have direct responsibility for reporting on status of assigned projects with emphasis on risk analysis and mitigation, particularly around change management.
- i. Requirements Analysis: This position will participate in documenting business requirements and ensuring project documents are complete, current and accessible.
- j. Execution: This role will be an administrator for the vendor's SaaS system for the Americas region and will support the administration of the system for Europe and Asia as those regions are brought on board.
- k. The analyst will coordinate testing of new financial reporting functions as needed to gain user sign-off in advance of system releases. This role will have responsibility for production support - raising and responding to trouble tickets as appropriate and monitoring daily and monthly procedures.

**DEFENDANTS**

2. Defendant Sony was and is a California limited liability company registered to do business in the State of California, including but not limited to conducting business within this County, specifically in San Mateo County, with its corporate headquarters located at 2207 Bridgepointe Parkway, San Mateo CA 94404. At all relevant times alleged herein, Plaintiff is informed and believes that Defendant Sony is authorized to and does conduct business in the State

1 of California in the consumer technology industry, including but not necessarily limited to San  
2 Mateo County. Sony was formerly known as Sony Computer Entertainment, headquartered in  
3 Tokyo. Plaintiff was an employee of Sony Computer Entertainment America, the Americas  
4 regional office, regional HQ in San Mateo. Global offices and Sony companies merged to become  
5 Sony Interactive Entertainment in April 2016, with global headquarters in San Mateo.

6 3. To the extent any allegation contradicts another allegation, they are to be construed  
7 as “alternative” theories.

8 **JURISDICTION AND VENUE**

9 4. This Court is the proper Court, and this action is properly filed in the Superior  
10 Court for the State of California in the County of San Mateo, because Defendant Sony transacts  
11 business within this county at the address specified above. Sony’s headquarters is in San Mateo  
12 County. Class Members performed work for Defendants and experienced the legal violations that  
13 are the subject of this Complaint in, *inter alia*, the County of San Mateo

14 5. This Court has jurisdiction over the Plaintiff’s and Class Members’ claims for  
15 damages, interest thereon, related penalties, injunctive and other equitable relief, restitution of ill-  
16 gotten benefits arising from Defendants’ unlawful, unfair, and/or fraudulent business practices,  
17 and attorneys’ fees and costs pursuant to, *inter alia*., California Business and Professions Code  
18 sections 17200-17208, and the statutes cited herein.

19 6. Venue is proper in this Court because Sony is headquartered in this county and  
20 many Class Members performed work in this county.

21 7. Plaintiff duly filed her administrative charges before the California Department of  
22 Fair Employment and Housing (“DFEH”) and obtained a right-to-sue notice.

23 **EXHAUSTION OF ADMINISTRATIVE REMEDIES**

24 8. Defendants regularly and systematically do business in the State of California and  
25 are subject to suit under the Fair Employment and Housing Act (“FEHA”) in that Defendants  
26 regularly employ five or more persons. Plaintiff timely filed a charge of discrimination, failure to  
27 investigate discrimination and retaliation against Defendants with the California Department of  
28 Fair Employment and Housing (“DFEH”). On November 22, 2021, Plaintiff received a notice of

1 the right to sue from the DFEH pursuant to California Government Code section 12965(b).  
2 Plaintiff filed this action within one year of the date of her DFEH right-to-sue letter(s); therefore,  
3 administrative remedies have been properly exhausted.

4 9. Plaintiff has satisfied all private, administrative and judicial prerequisites to the  
5 institution of this action. Federal claims under the federal Equal Pay Act do not require any right-  
6 to-sue notice.

7 10. Pursuant to California Labor Code section 2699.5, Plaintiff has exhausted all  
8 administrative remedies and satisfied all private, administrative and judicial prerequisites to the  
9 institution of this action, insofar as such prerequisites pertain to Plaintiff's cause of action brought  
10 pursuant to the Private Attorney General's Act ("PAGA"), California Labor Code sections 2699  
11 *et seq.* Plaintiff has complied with the procedures for bringing suit specified in California Labor  
12 Code section 2699.3. Plaintiff has given written notice, by certified mail, to the Labor and  
13 Workforce Development Agency ("LWDA") and to Defendants of the specific provisions of the  
14 California Labor Code alleged to have been violated, including the facts and theories to support  
15 those violations. More than 65 days have passed, and no response has been received from the  
16 LWDA. Accordingly, Plaintiff has satisfied all prerequisites to pursuing PAGA claims.

17 11. The California Workers' Compensation Act does not preempt this action because  
18 Defendant's unlawful practices, as alleged herein, are not risks or conditions of employment.  
19 Plaintiff is not required to satisfy any further private, administrative, or judicial prerequisites to  
20 the institution of this action, insofar as such prerequisites pertain to any of the remaining causes  
21 of action in this complaint.

### 22 SUMMARY OF FACTS

23 12. Plaintiff seeks to represent a class consisting of all individuals employed by Sony  
24 Interactive Entertainment, LLC in California at any time during the time period beginning  
25 November 22, 2017 through the date of trial in this action and who meet the following criteria:

- 26 a. who are listed as female in Defendant's human resources database of  
27 employees;  
28 b. who worked at one of the following California offices: (i) San Mateo, (ii)  
San Francisco, (iii) Foster City, or (iv) San Diego-area office located at one  
point in Rancho Bernardo;  
c. who held any job title below Vice President during the aforementioned

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

d. time period; and  
who are not listed as a non-resident of California in Defendant's database of employees.

13. Plaintiff alleges that employees who are female (a) were not compensated equally to male employees who had substantially similar job classifications, functions, titles, and/or duties; (b) were not compensated equally to male employees who performed substantially similar work; (c) were denied equal compensation to similarly situated male employees by being held back to lower pay levels; and/or (d) were denied promotions.

14. Immediately below are more specific facts about the classwide policies and practices which institutionalized gender-based discrimination and gender-based harassment.

**A. Sony Systemically Treats Women Differently Than Men**

**1. Dossier Policy Creates Different Treatment for In-Cycle Promotions**

15. Marie Harrington worked for SIE for 17 years. She was the Chief of Staff to the Senior VP of Engineering George Cacciopo. When she left Sony, she reported that systemic sexism was the reason she was resigning. She stated, "When I left Sony, I told the SVP and the Director of HR Rachel Ghadban in the Rancho Bernardo office that the reason I was leaving was systemic sexism against females." As the Chief of Staff, Marie Harrington personally observed policies and practices that discriminated against women such as "Calibration Sessions" where the purpose is to discuss candidates for promotion; however, Sony's companywide practice was that all men being considered have a profile prepared for them which is called a "dossier" whereas only about half of women being considered have a dossier prepared. This practice is companywide as evidenced by the fact that Human Resources was present during the discussions but did not object to the missing dossiers for the women.

**2. Separate Performance Criteria for Separate Sexes**

16. Sony's practices regarding promotion also directly discriminate against women because family status is considered with respect to women who may get promoted but is not considered for men. Sony lowers numerical ratings if a woman gets pregnant and takes maternity leave. Family status is part of job performance for women but not for men.

17. Aggression is considered acceptable or positive for men but is a negative factor for

1 women. Men can be "emotionally violent" towards women and can rise through the ranks. On the  
2 contrary, women are deemed too aggressive for innocuous behavior like asking a male manager  
3 to schedule a meeting with her instead of contacting the male manager's assistant to schedule.

4 18. When male employees underperform, women are blamed. Even if the male  
5 responsible for the project speaks up to correct the unfair criticism, Sony managers continue to  
6 blame the female worker.

7 19. Women are told that they cannot get promoted if they have a non-native accent,  
8 yet men are not held to that standard. Women are criticized for issues unrelated to performance  
9 such as unspecified body language issues.

10 **3. Current Job Titles Is a Factor In Promotions Instead of Performance**

11 20. One Sony worker reported the following: "HR and managers also often say a  
12 person cannot be promoted because they do not currently hold a certain specific job title. I believe  
13 SIE makes it harder for females to get promoted, and one way it does so is by looking at current  
14 job titles and deciding a person isn't qualified for a certain job because of her current job title,  
15 without a real examination of her skills." Even when a woman is already performing the  
16 management job duties, Sony refuses to award the actual job title.

17 **4. Separate Policies for Separate Sexes**

18 21. Emma Majo was demoted when a VP claimed that they did not have time to handle  
19 individual subordinates, but in actuality the VP dropped the female subordinate but kept the male  
20 subordinates.

21 **5. Separate Educational Requirements for Separate Sexes**

22 22. One female employee was told that she could not earn any promotion. She was  
23 told that a Master's Degree was required to earn another promotion. Yet when Sony posted the  
24 job ad for the position it stated that only a Bachelor's Degree was required. This shows that Sony  
25 had a different educational requirement for this female employee than it would use for other  
26 potential hires.

27 **6. Gender Bias in Off-Cycle Promotions:**

28 23. One female employee reported the following: "I believe there is widespread

1 favoritism towards males at Sony. My role oversees who gets mid-year promotions .... I have  
2 noticed that male employees are advanced through off cycle promotions more often than female  
3 employees." "SIE sometimes promotes people 'in cycle' (meaning around the time of annual  
4 performance reviews) and sometimes 'out of cycle.' The number of men promoted out of cycle is  
5 notable. Every 'out of cycle' promotion I know of was for a male. This indicates that at SIE there  
6 are separate processes for men vs. women to get promoted."

7 **B. Sony's Classwide Policies and Practices Negatively Impact Women**

8 **1. Sony Refuses to Specify the Criteria for Promotion**

9 24. Marie Harrington reported the following: "I was a Senior Director for five years.  
10 On several occasions, I asked how to prepare myself for a promotion to Vice President. I asked if  
11 there was anything I could do to work towards becoming a Vice President. I could never get any  
12 guidance on what projects, scope, skills, or attributes that would help to develop my leadership  
13 potential." (Harrington Decl. ¶ 17.) "I worked my way up to Project Manager; during a recent  
14 review, I said I'd like to stay and grow. I pointed out that I had been with the company and within  
15 the same department for a long time. I asked what growth looks like, meaning how could I earn a  
16 promotion. I was told there is no possibility of further advancement for me. I was told, 'This is it  
17 for you.'" "When I tried to get promoted by asking my manager at the time, especially during  
18 reviews, I was always given vague reasons about why I could not get promoted." "Towards the  
19 end of my employment, it became ironic when I would speak to my manager about how to get  
20 promoted because my manager at the end was one of my peers earlier in my employment. While  
21 I was told I could not earn a promotion for vague reasons, he was given the opportunity to become  
22 a high-level manager and became my boss."

23 25. Sony's refusal to specify criteria for promotion allows Sony's managers to invent  
24 any reason desired for why an individual was not promoted. One female employee was criticized  
25 during a review because of her "body language and facial expressions." When the performance  
26 review discussed her actual performance, her manager stated she was doing very well.  
27 Nonetheless, she received a 3 out of 5 on her annual review which impacted her bonus and merit.  
28 She asked what she could do to improve, and her manager told her to take training classes; she

1 began taking courses during her free time in the hopes of earning a promotion. When she spoke  
2 to her manager again, he said she was not taking the right courses. She asked a training coordinator  
3 to help select courses; her manager declined them all and said she was not picking the courses but  
4 would not specify what the "right courses" were. This review, the worker received a 2 out of 5,  
5 her lowest review ever; typically a score of 2 would trigger a Performance Improvement Plan, but  
6 her manager said she did not need one. Plaintiff Emma Majo echoes her co-workers' statements.  
7 "I observed female employees get passed up for job promotions which were given to male  
8 employees where, in my opinion, the female employee was at least as qualified as the male who  
9 was actually promoted." "I kept asking my manager if there were any concerns about my  
10 performance, to which my manager said I'm doing a great job. .... I had been proactive on asking  
11 what steps I could take to get promoted. I repeatedly asked what I could do until finally my  
12 manager provided an informal document with a list of actions I should take. I followed the steps.  
13 I even asked for a 360 review from my peers because I know I have worked well with them. Even  
14 after following all actions suggested by my manager, I still was unable to earn a promotion."

15 **2. Women Must Follow Different Protocols Than Men**

16 26. One female employee reported the following: "I was told by my manager that I  
17 was intimidating when I walked into bays and interacted with testers and that they felt  
18 uncomfortable. .... The manager suggested that either I or the test go solo. This didn't make much  
19 sense to me because the whole point was to train my tester to interact with others so they aren't so  
20 uncomfortable. Having either myself go alone, or sending my tester alone, doesn't help my tester.  
21 My fellow male leads never received this advice." Women must follow different rules at Sony.  
22 "SIE has managers (e.g. Yu Sugita) who will not be alone in a room with a female with the door  
23 closed...."

24 **C. Other Class Members Corroborate Gender Bias**

25 27. Discovery has not yet started, but many women have already come forward and  
26 stood up to declare to specific unlawful mistreatment. One female employee reported the  
27 following: "I left Sony for several reasons. There were 4 other women I worked directly with, 3  
28 in Product Management and 1 in Business Management. All left Sony for similar reasons related



1 to sexual discrimination, sexual harassment, and not being able to earn a promotion."

2 **D. Sony's Companywide Culture Reinforces Systemic Bias Against Women**

3 28. Marie Harrington reported the following: "In July 2019, during a site leadership  
4 meeting in the Rancho Bernardo office where I brought our new Diversity Director and invited  
5 Sony Electronic's Diversity Director, Jason Harkins, Chief Security Officer stated, 'I don't like  
6 talking about diversity because these conversations always make me feel icky.'" (Harrington Decl.  
7 ¶ 6.)

8 29. One female employee reported the following: "I attended another meeting that was  
9 supposed to be about gender equality. It was a panel, but there were five males and zero females  
10 on the panel. The panel said they tried to include a female, but they could not get her on the plane  
11 to attend the meeting. As a result, the meeting about gender equality had no female panel  
12 members."

13 **E. Several Women Declared to Inappropriate Sexual Conduct by Managers**

14 30. One female employee reported the following: "Sony often had offsite events where  
15 people stayed at a hotel. .... One of the Senior Managers of a different team tried to grab my  
16 breast. Luckily, a male co-worker saw it and stepped in to stop it then helped me leave." One  
17 woman was warned by a co-worker that a lead was overheard talking about how he was going to  
18 try to "hit that," which the co-workers laughed about; that lead tried to invite himself to the female  
19 employee's room, then after being rebuked he invited the woman to his room if she changed her  
20 mind.

21 31. One female employee reported the following: "In 2011, the VP of Engineering  
22 Jacob Shen asked me out on a date to a restaurant in Little Italy in San Diego. I rejected the  
23 advance. I heard several other employees report similar things by the same manager, Jacob Shen.  
24 For instance, the same VP of Engineering asked a female co-worker out to dinner on several  
25 occasions. She was very uncomfortable and we strategized on how she might avoid him in the  
26 future." Later Sony began recruiting interns and women were forced to create plans to protect  
27 interns from inappropriate attention from managers.

28 **F. Diminutive Treatment-Women Are Assigned Inferior Duties**

1           32. Marie Harrington reported the following: "I was in a large Engineering leadership  
2 meeting with many employees below me on the hierarchy. I was the only woman in the room,  
3 and I was asked to take people's coffee orders. It was very demeaning to be asked to wait on co-  
4 workers that included multiple male employees that were lower in the hierarchy." (Harrington  
5 Decl. ¶ 13.) "My co-workers and I consistently saw that males were given opportunities that  
6 females were not given."

7 **G. Diminutive Treatment-Women Are Ignored**

8           33. Women are ignored during meetings to such an extreme that multiple women have  
9 already reported that the only way to have their ideas heard and respected is to filter the idea  
10 through a man or get a male co-worker's support in advance. (Harrington Decl. 12.) When the  
11 female employee tried to speak up, the male colleagues continued to ignore and interrupt the  
12 female engineer which devolved into an argument. One of the leaders, said, "I find that in general,  
13 women can't take criticism."

14           34. Plaintiff reports the following: "[I]f I went into a room with Sug [Yu Sugita] and  
15 a male colleague then Sugi would only speak to the male colleague. It would be as if I was not  
16 even in the room. After a while, I realized that if I really wanted something done, I needed to send  
17 the request through a male because if I communicated directly to Sugi the request would be  
18 ignored." (Majo Decl. ¶ 3.) Others report the same. Women reported these issues to management.  
19 (Harrington Decl. ¶ 11.) This occurred with women during meetings but not men. (Harrington  
20 Decl. ¶ 15.)

21 **H. Diminutive Treatment-Status as a Female Is Referenced as a Negative**

22           35. One female employee reported the following: "During group lunch, everyone was  
23 talking about their aspirations. I mentioned climbing the ladder in my career, and needed to work  
24 harder to get a promotion. Vijay Viswanathan [then- Sr. Director, now-VP] said 'you just need to  
25 marry rich.'"

26           36. One female employee reported the following: "[Redacted] also routinely called my  
27 male boss, 'Marsha' when he was displeased with him. He would call other men by feminine  
28 versions of their names as well, to insult them. On the other hand, when he was impressed that I

1 had managed out an underperformer on my team, he said, "You're the only one with the balls to  
2 do it," There was a clear indication that positive actions were male and negative actions were  
3 female." (Harrington Decl. ¶ 27.) "I was told directly by Suresh Bathini, VP Engineering, 'You  
4 don't know anything about security, so you shouldn't speak.' At the time, I was managing  
5 [Redacted], Principal Security Architect at SIE as well as a team of Security Program Managers.  
6 Suresh did not make this kind of comment to any male in the room." (Harrington Decl. ¶ 14.)

7 37. One female employee reported the following: "Gender-biased comments  
8 suggesting that females are less intelligent than males were common." Plaintiff corroborates  
9 others' reports: "I have also personally heard managers make gender-biased comments about  
10 female workers." (Majo Decl. ¶ 8.)

11 **I. Diminutive Treatment-Women are Given Fewer Resources**

12 38. One female employee reported the following: "I was hired as a full-time employee  
13 in 2010. When I started, full-time employees were given offices. I was not given an office. A year  
14 later, there was a wave of new hires on my team. The new hires were all men and were all being  
15 given offices. I was not given an office until I complained that the male new hires were given  
16 offices while was not. Finally, after I complained, I was given an office to share with another  
17 worker."

18 **J. Sony Knows About Systemic Sexism Because Many Workers Reported It**

19 39. Sony hired Deloitte to study whether there were overlapping functions between  
20 departments. One female employee reported the following: "Deloitte found out that there's a great  
21 imbalance in terms of female vs males in terms of employee distribution, and very low % of  
22 managers/leadership in both teams. Female employee and management % is much lower  
23 compared to other peers, and also low (not the lowest) within SIE. Steve Mourton, the VP of DSO  
24 mentioned that this is a problem but didn't disclose the report details to the team members."

25 40. When site leader Kara Johnson quit in 2021, she "wrote up a document on my  
26 experiences as the Site Lead and shared it with the Women@PS Rancho Bernardo board members  
27 on [her] last day at SIE (January 15, 2021." (Johnson Decl. pp. 3-4.) She saved the letter as a  
28 shareable document in a folder owned by the Women@PS Rancho Bernardo group. (Johnson

1 Decl. p. 4.) "As I write this (Jan 14, 2021), my last day at SIE is tomorrow. I'm the 11th woman  
2 to leave the Rancho Bernardo office in the last 4 months." (Johnson Decl. p. 4.) "Nothing that I  
3 write here will be news to my Director, my VP, my HR partner, or any others I've spoken with  
4 since I submit my resignation." (Johnson Decl. p. 4.)

5 41. "During my time as the Site Lead, various women approached me to individually  
6 share their experiences. Some of the stories were positive.... Other times the stories stemmed  
7 from frustration over specific incidents. The examples clearly indicated toxic environments:  
8 inappropriate comments, retaliatory behavior, pay discrepancy, and discrimination for being  
9 pregnant." (Johnson Decl. pp. 4-5.) Women reported these problems through various resources,  
10 but their complaints were not handled properly. (Johnson Decl. p. 5)

11 42. In the Summer of 2020, "Women@PS leads from across all sites participated in a  
12 conversation with Christina Hanna, Workforce & Community Engagement Leader....Other  
13 leaders brought up general examples of situations in their sites that involved sexual harassment  
14 and other unacceptable behavior." (Johnson Decl. pp. 5-6.) Sony managers have admitted that  
15 Sony knows women are paid less than men. "A Women@PS member told me that Ted [Schraven,  
16 VP of Information Technology] launched an investigation and subsequent initiative to address  
17 unequal pay issues identified in IT." (Johnson Decl. p. 6.) Kara Johnson informed the  
18 "Women@PS-RB board about the conversation." (Johnson Decl. p. 6.) An HR employee named  
19 Rachel Ghadban "explained that there is a Task Force working to take action on the alarming  
20 number of women who left the company in a short period." (Johnson Decl. p. 6.)

21 43. "SIE admitted they noticed females have been leaving the company far more than  
22 men. SIE decided to conduct a listening session and invited only females so the females could  
23 explain what the problems were. Expecting a marginalized group to "fix the problem" is not only  
24 offensive, it's purely performative. If marginalized people could change the status quo they would  
25 not be marginalized."

26 44. On May 13, 2018, Marie Harrington sent an email to one of the Vice Presidents  
27 reiterating previous reports about inappropriate male behavior. "As we discussed on Friday and  
28 on many other days, read Dan Myers, Jeff Ludwig, or any of the other man you and I have

1 discussed over the past many months into this article. There is very little difference in the  
2 atmosphere. Can we address this before PlayStation has its own national news article?"  
3 (Harrington Decl. ¶ 18.)

4 45. "Dan Myers is emotionally violent . . . and you know it. People are beyond raising  
5 this issue to HR anymore because it appears to be futile. In fact, he is rewarded with additional  
6 scope. Well after his continuous, egregious behavior was reported to HR and senior executives,  
7 Dan's scope was expanded to include Commerce and A&I." (Harrington Decl. ¶ 18.)

8 **K. Women At Sony Are Scared To Speak Up About Discrimination**

9 46. A Senior Director of Product Management told Marie Harrington, "Thank you for  
10 taking up the torch. I don't want to impact the trajectory of my career and I know how stuff works.  
11 Nothing will change. I will talk to HR, but I won't give specifics because I will suffer retribution."  
12 (Harrington Decl. ¶ 18.)

13 **L. Women Who Report Discrimination Risk Retaliation**

14 47. Women who speak up about gender discrimination and harassment end up getting  
15 punished in retaliation. Plaintiff is one example.

16 48. Sony had supposedly hired an investigator to look into allegations of  
17 discrimination. The investigator contacted Plaintiff and requested to conduct an interview. Before  
18 that interview began, Plaintiff sent the investigator a short summary of information regarding  
19 sexism and gender discrimination at the company. Plaintiff also explained that she had retained  
20 an attorney. The investigator postponed the scheduled interview to ask Sony whether Sony wanted  
21 the interview to proceed with Plaintiff. Sony's investigator never conducted the interview. This  
22 shows that even when a female employee writes directly to Sony explicitly describing gender  
23 discrimination within the company, Sony does not take prompt, immediate, or appropriate action  
24 to investigate the issue. Instead, a few months later, Emma Majo is terminated which Sony claims  
25 was because a certain department was being dissolved. This was a false basis to terminate her and,  
26 in fact, the real reason was retaliation for Emma Majo speaking up about gender discrimination.  
27 It is also clear this was a false basis to terminate her because Emma Majo was not a permanent  
28 member of the department being dissolved. Moreover, Emma Majo saw a job ad published by

1 Sony to fill her previous position which Sony had claimed had been dissolved.

2 **M Gender-Biased Policies and Practices Have Survived Reorganizations**

3 49. SIE was split off from Sony Online Entertainment. (Harrington Decl. 29.)  
4 "Several leaders on that Steering (like Enrico Bernardo and Lee Pedlow) stated that I should be  
5 promoted and the only reason I wasn't was because I was female." (Harrington Decl. 20.) SIE's  
6 precursor entity was also pervaded by sexual harassment and gender discrimination. Women were  
7 tricked into going on a date with a manager. (Harrington Decl. 29.) "Also while at SOE,  
8 [Redacted], the head of Finance, talked to me about his wife's 'boob job' and asked me if my  
9 husband would like me to have a 'boob job' and what size he thought I should get." (Harrington  
10 Decl. 30.) "At SOE, I also received an email from an engineer telling me that I shouldn't wear  
11 a skirt to work anymore because it was distracting to him. Behavior like this was common towards  
12 female employees at Sony entities." (Harrington Decl. 31.) "At SOE, male engineers regularly  
13 went to strip clubs at lunch and shared pornography at work." (Harrington Decl. 32.)

14 50. "Under [Redacted] leadership, the sexism was so rampant I can't catalog it all: men  
15 were ranking their female colleagues on hotness levels; [Redacted], Director of Product  
16 Management, was routinely admonished by HR to act appropriately; there were email distribution  
17 lists for filthy jokes and images of women, the 4chan message board was used throughout the  
18 work day to further share offensive images of women, and on and on." (Harrington Decl. 28.)

19 **N. At Sony, Victims Get Targeted and Alleged Harassers Get Promoted**

20 51. One female employee was working for Vijay Viswanathan who was a Senior  
21 Director at the time but was subsequently promoted to Vice President. When [the employee]  
22 discussed her desire to get promoted Viswanathan said, "You just need to marry rich." When the  
23 employee changed teams to get away from her sexist manager, Viswanathan went out of his way  
24 to try to tarnish her reputation with her new team. She and others raised concerns about the sexist  
25 manager to Human Resources: "My supervisor Deirdre and I raised our concerns about Vijay's  
26 hostility towards female employees to HR, and there were other 3 female employees who became  
27 the witnesses too. .... In addition, Vijay and Gabor always deprioritized Catherine's data request  
28 to the team, and continuing saying that her requests are dumb/stupid, so that the team shouldn't

1 work on her stuffs. (VP) Steve Mourton, who is Vijay's supervisor informed him that there were  
2 HR complaints about him being hostile towards female employees." The same manager who was  
3 reported to be treating women differently and negatively was moved up the hierarchy. "I heard  
4 HR hired a 3rd party company as his career coach. 18 months later, Vijay got promoted to be the  
5 VP and continued to report to Steve."

6 **O. Sony Is Aware of Gender Disparities in Pay and Promotions**

7 52. Sony reports that forty-one percent (41%) of PlayStation owners are females (i.e.,  
8 41% of the owners of the two most recent consoles, the PS4 and PS5 consoles). (See  
9 [https://www.Sony.com/en/Sony\\_Info/IR/library/presen/irday/pdf/2021/GNS\\_E.pdf](https://www.Sony.com/en/Sony_Info/IR/library/presen/irday/pdf/2021/GNS_E.pdf) [last visited  
10 November 21, 2021]). Even though nearly half of PlayStation owners are females, a 2020 study  
11 revealed that Sony's Executive Committee was 100% male. (See [https://20-first.com/wp-  
12 content/uploads/2020/08/200825-2020-Global-Gaming-Scorecard-Web.pdf](https://20-first.com/wp-content/uploads/2020/08/200825-2020-Global-Gaming-Scorecard-Web.pdf) [last visited  
13 November 21, 2021].) The report was prepared by "20-first Research" which analyzes "progress  
14 on gender balance in the top companies of a number of industries and countries, as well as across  
15 the Top 100 companies of the Fortune Global 500. For more [information], go to [https://20-  
16 first.com/thinking](https://20-first.com/thinking)." Sony received the worst possible rating, "Asleep" because Sony did not have  
17 any females in either Staff or Line leadership roles. There was no female representation at all on  
18 the Executive Committee.

19 53. Sony tolerates and cultivates a work environment that discriminates against female  
20 employees, including female employees and those who identify as female. Female employees are  
21 subjected to continuing unlawful disparate treatment in pay and work opportunities. Moreover,  
22 Sony's policies and procedures have an ongoing disparate impact on female employees. Sony  
23 maintains policies and practices regarding the promotion process that promote gender-based  
24 inequities in title and compensation. Sony maintains policies and practices regarding advancement  
25 that lead to gender-based inequities favoring males regarding promotions. Sony's discriminatory  
26 policies, practices, and procedures include a system where women are denied opportunities for  
27 advancement at Sony. Sony's companywide practices, policies, and procedures result in lower  
28 compensation for female employees than similarly situated male employees.

1           54.     In general, the policies, practices, and procedures that govern the pay and  
2 promotions of female employees lack the sufficient standards, quality controls, implementation  
3 metrics, transparency, and oversight to ensure equal opportunities for males and females at Sony.

4           55.     Because Sony’s management does not provide sufficient oversight or safety  
5 measures to protect against intentional and overt discrimination or the disparate impact of facially  
6 neutral policies and procedures, female employees suffering from discrimination are without  
7 recourse. Whatever complaint and compliance policies may exist, lack meaningful controls,  
8 standards, implementation metrics, and means of redress such that upper management may ignore,  
9 disregard, minimize, cover up, mishandle, or otherwise fail to respond properly to evidence of  
10 discrimination in the workplace.

11           56.     Sony’s policies, practices, and procedures are not valid, job-related, or justified by  
12 business necessity. Alternative, objective, and more valid procedures are available to Sony that  
13 would avoid such a disparate impact on female employees. Sony has failed or refused to use such  
14 alternative procedures.

15           57.     Upon information and belief, Sony’s discriminatory employment practices,  
16 policies, and procedures are centrally established and implemented at the highest levels of Sony.

17           58.     Upon information and belief, Sony’s employment policies, practices, and  
18 procedures are not unique or limited to any location; rather, they apply uniformly and  
19 systematically to employees throughout Sony, occurring as a pattern and practice throughout all  
20 locations.

21           59.     Because of Sony’s systemic pattern and practice of gender discrimination, the  
22 Plaintiff and members of the proposed Class have suffered harm including lost compensation,  
23 back pay, employment benefits, and emotional distress.

24           60.     Plaintiff and members of the Class have no plain, adequate, or complete remedy at  
25 law to redress the rampant and pervasive wrongs alleged herein, and this suit is their only means  
26 of securing adequate relief. Plaintiff and members of the Class have suffered and are now  
27 suffering irreparable injury from Sony’s ongoing, unlawful policies, practices, and procedures set  
28 forth herein, and they will continue to suffer unless those policies, practices, and procedures are



1 enjoined by this Court.

2 61. Plaintiff was paid less than male counterparts who were performing nearly  
3 identical tasks to her. For instance, a co-worker named “Greg” was given a promotion in title  
4 while still performing the same job duties. At Sony, promotions virtually always include a pay  
5 raise. This co-worker was still performing the same job duties as Plaintiff, their work was  
6 substantially identical yet the male counterpart was earning more money for the same work.

7 62. **Class Definition:** Plaintiff proposes to represent the following Class: The  
8 proposed Class consists of: “all individuals employed by Sony Interactive Entertainment, LLC in  
9 California at any time during the time period beginning November 22, 2017 through the date of  
10 trial in this action and who meet the following criteria:

- 11 a. who are listed as female in Defendant’s human resources database of  
employees;
- 12 b. who worked at one of the following California offices: (i) San Mateo, (ii)  
San Francisco, (iii) Foster City, or (iv) San Diego-area office located at one  
13 point in Rancho Bernardo
- 14 c. who held any job title below Vice President during the aforementioned  
time period; and
- 15 d. who are not listed as a non-resident of California in Defendant’s database  
of employees.”

16 63. Upon information and belief, there are more than 40 members of the proposed  
17 Class.

18 64. Plaintiff is a member of the Class.

19 65. The systemic gender discrimination described in this Complaint has been, and is,  
20 continuing in nature.

21 66. Plaintiff reserves the right to amend the class definitions based on discovery or  
22 legal developments.

23 67. **Efficiency of Class Prosecution of Class Claims:** Certification of the proposed  
24 classes and subclasses is the most efficient and economical means of resolving the questions of  
25 law and fact that are common to the claims of the Plaintiff and the Class. The individual claims  
26 of Plaintiff as a Class Representative, require resolution of the common questions concerning  
27 whether Sony has engaged in a pattern and/or practice of gender discrimination against its female  
28 employees, and whether its policies or practices have an adverse effect on the Class. The Class

1 Representative seeks remedies to eliminate the adverse effects of such discrimination in her own  
2 life, career, and working conditions and in the lives, careers, and working conditions of the Class  
3 members, and to prevent Sony’s continued gender discrimination. The Class Representative has  
4 standing to seek such relief because of the adverse effect that such discrimination has on her  
5 individually and on female employees generally. Sony caused Plaintiff’s injuries through its  
6 discriminatory practices, policies, and procedures and through the disparate impact its policies,  
7 practices, and procedures have on female employees. These injuries are redressable through  
8 systemic relief, such as equitable and injunctive relief and other remedies sought in this action. In  
9 addition, proper relief for Plaintiff’s individual discrimination claims can include retroactive  
10 promotion and increased compensation. Plaintiff has a personal interest in the policies, practices,  
11 and procedures implemented at Sony.

12 68. To obtain relief for herself and the Class members, the Class Representative will  
13 first establish the existence of systemic gender discrimination as the premise for the relief she  
14 seeks. Without class certification, the same evidence and issues would be subject to re-litigation  
15 in a multitude of individual lawsuits with an attendant risk of inconsistent adjudications and  
16 conflicting obligations.

17 69. Certification of the proposed Class is the most reasonable and efficient means of  
18 presenting the evidence and arguments necessary to resolve such questions for the Class  
19 Representative, the Class members, and Sony.

20 70. **Numerosity and Impracticability of Joinder:** The Class that the Class  
21 Representative seeks to represent is so numerous that joinder of all members is impracticable. In  
22 addition, joinder is impractical as the employees are physically based in different locations  
23 throughout California. Fear of retaliation on the part of Sony’s female employees is also likely to  
24 undermine the possibility of joinder.

25 71. **Common Questions of Law and Fact:** The prosecution of the claims of the Class  
26 Representative will require the adjudication of numerous questions of law and fact common to  
27 her individual claims and those of the Class she seeks to represent. Plaintiff’s claims are typical  
28 of the claims pursued on behalf of the Class.

1           72.     The common issues of law include, *inter alia*: (a) whether Sony has engaged in  
2 unlawful, systemic gender discrimination in its promotion and compensation policies, practices,  
3 and procedures; (b) whether the failure to institute adequate standards, quality controls,  
4 implementation metrics or oversight of those policies, practices, and procedures violates, the  
5 FEHA, or the California Equal Pay Act (“CEPA”), and/or other statutes; (c) whether the lack of  
6 transparency and opportunities for redress in those systems violates the FEHA, the CEPA, and/or  
7 other statutes; (d) a determination of the proper standard for proving whether Sony’s employment  
8 policies had a disparate impact on the Classes and Subclasses; (e) a determination of the proper  
9 standards for proving a pattern or practice of discrimination by Sony against its female employees,  
10 and under the disparate treatment theory of liability for employees; (f) whether Sony’s failure to  
11 prevent, investigate, or properly respond to evidence and complaints of discrimination in the  
12 workplace violates FEHA and other statutes; and (g) whether Sony is liable for continuing  
13 systemic violations of FEHA and other statutes.

14           73.     The common questions of fact include, *inter alia*: whether Sony has: (a)  
15 intentionally held back female employees on its pay scale because Sony does not provide the same  
16 opportunities for advancement; (b) used a compensation system that lacks appropriate standards,  
17 implementation metrics, quality controls, transparency, and opportunities for redress; (c) relied  
18 on compensation criteria that perpetuate discrimination; (d) compensated female employees less  
19 than similarly-situated male employees in salary and/or promotions; (e) minimized, ignored, or  
20 covered-up evidence of gender discrimination in the workplace and/or otherwise mishandled the  
21 investigation of and response to complaints of discrimination; (f) cultivated an indifference to  
22 evidence of discrimination in the workplace or otherwise minimized, ignored, mishandled, or  
23 covered up evidence of or complaints of gender discrimination; and (g) otherwise discriminated  
24 against female employees in the terms and conditions of employment.

25           74.     Upon information and belief, Sony’s employment policies, practices, and  
26 procedures are not unique or limited to any location; rather, they apply uniformly and  
27 systematically to employees throughout Sony, occurring as a pattern and practice throughout all  
28 locations. They thus affect the Class Representative and Class members in the same ways

1 regardless of the location in which they work. Discrimination in compensation occurs as a pattern  
2 and practice throughout Sony.

3 75. **Typicality of Claims and Relief Sought:** The Class Representative’s claims are  
4 typical of the claims of the proposed Class. The Class Representative possesses and asserts each  
5 of the claims asserted on behalf of the proposed Class. She pursues the same factual and legal  
6 theories and seeks similar relief.

7 76. Like members of the proposed Classes and Subclasses, the Class Representative is  
8 a female who was employed by Sony during the liability period.

9 77. Differential treatment between male and female employees occurs as a pattern and  
10 practice throughout Sony. Sony discriminates against female employees in compensation and  
11 promotion and subjects them to a work culture predominated by men. This differential treatment  
12 has affected the Class Representative and Class Members in the same or similar ways.

13 78. Sony has failed to respond adequately or appropriately to evidence and complaints  
14 of discrimination. The Class Representative and Class members have been affected in the same  
15 or similar ways by Sony’s failure to implement adequate procedures to detect, monitor, and  
16 correct this pattern and practice of discrimination.

17 79. Sony has failed to create adequate procedures to ensure its management complies  
18 with equal employment opportunity laws regarding each of the policies, practices, and procedures  
19 referenced in this Complaint, and Sony has failed to discipline adequately supervisors when they  
20 violate anti-discrimination laws. These failures have affected the Class Representative and the  
21 Class members in the same or similar ways.

22 80. The relief necessary to remedy the Class Representative’s claims is the same as  
23 that necessary to remedy the claims of the proposed Class Members.

24 81. The Class Representative seeks the following relief for their individual claims and  
25 for the claims of the members of the proposed Classes: (a) a declaratory judgment that Sony has  
26 engaged in systemic gender discrimination against female employees, including those who are  
27 female and those who identify as female, by: (i) denying work opportunities to female employees  
28 on the basis of gender, (ii) paying females less than their male counterparts in base compensation,

1 (iii) failing to investigate or respond to evidence of discrimination in the workplace against female  
2 employees, and (iv) otherwise exposing female employees to differential treatment; (b) a  
3 permanent injunction against such continuing discriminatory conduct; (c) injunctive relief that  
4 effects a restructuring of Sony’s policies, practices, and procedures for promoting and awarding  
5 compensation to female employees; (d) equitable relief that effects a restructuring of Sony’s  
6 compensation system so female employees receive the compensation they would have been paid  
7 in the absence of Sony’s discrimination; (e) back pay, front pay, reinstatement, and other equitable  
8 remedies necessary to make female employees whole from Sony’s past discrimination; (f)  
9 compensatory damages; (g) punitive damages to deter Sony from engaging in similar  
10 discriminatory practices in the future; and (h) attorneys’ fees, costs, and expenses.

11 82. Sony discriminates against female employees in several ways. As a non-exhaustive  
12 list of examples, Sony utilizes different performance standards for men and women. While  
13 assertiveness and aggressiveness are deemed positive qualities in men, they are deemed negative  
14 qualities in women. Moreover, women’s performance is evaluated based on factors that are  
15 irrelevant to the job such as body language while men are not graded based on body language.  
16 Women’s job performance is evaluated based in part on familial status which is not true for men.  
17 Women have different educational requirements for jobs than men do. Men and women have  
18 different opportunities at Sony with men receiving more favorable job assignments than women.

19 83. Sony creates barriers to prevent women from being promoted. For instance, Sony  
20 will force women to perform the job duties of a higher-level position yet Sony will not escalate  
21 change the woman’s job title. Compounding this unfairness, Sony uses job titles as part of the  
22 criteria for receiving high-level promotions. The fact that Sony refuses to upgrade women’s job  
23 titles even when they are performing the tasks of the higher-level position, combined with Sony’s  
24 use of current job title as a measurement of skill—instead of an actual analysis of skills—has a  
25 disparate impact on women in terms of pay and promotions.

26 84. **Adequacy of Representation**: The Class Representative’s interests are  
27 coextensive with those of the members of the proposed Class. The Class Representative seeks to  
28 remedy Sony’s discriminatory policies, practices, and procedures so female employees will not

1 receive disparate pay and differential treatment.

2 85. The Class Representative is willing and able to represent the proposed Class fairly  
3 and vigorously as she pursues similar individual claims in this action.

4 86. The Class Representative has retained counsel sufficiently qualified, experienced,  
5 and able to conduct this litigation and to meet the time and fiscal demands required to litigate an  
6 employment discrimination class action of this size and complexity. The combined interests,  
7 experience, and resources of the Class Representative and her counsel to litigate competently the  
8 individual and class claims at issue in this case clearly satisfy the adequacy of representation  
9 requirement of class action rules.

10 87. **Sony's Classwide Policies and Practices Are at Issue:** Sony has acted on  
11 grounds generally applicable to the Class Representative and the proposed Class by adopting and  
12 following systemic policies, practices, and procedures that discriminate on the basis of gender.  
13 Gender discrimination is Sony's standard operating procedure rather than a sporadic occurrence.

14 88. Sony has also acted or refused to act on grounds generally applicable to the Class  
15 Representative and the proposed Class by, *inter alia*: (a) systematically, intentionally, or  
16 knowingly denying work opportunities for women in favor of similarly situated males; (b) using  
17 an assignment system that lacks meaningful or appropriate standards, implementation metrics,  
18 quality controls, transparency, and opportunities for redress; (c) compensating women less than  
19 similarly situated males in salary; (c) systematically, intentionally, or knowingly compensating  
20 women less than similarly situated male employees, including a difference in salary; (d)  
21 minimizing, ignoring, or covering up evidence of gender discrimination in the workplace and/or  
22 otherwise mishandling the investigation of and response to complaints of discrimination; (e)  
23 cultivating an indifference to evidence of discrimination in the workplace or otherwise  
24 minimizing, ignoring, mishandling, or covering up evidence of or complaints of gender  
25 discrimination: and (f) otherwise discriminating against women in the terms and conditions of  
26 employment as employees.

27 89. Sony's policies, practices, and procedures with respect to compensation have led  
28 to gender discrimination and stratification. The systemic means of accomplishing such gender-

1 based stratification include, but are not limited to, Sony’s policies, practices, and procedures for  
2 awarding base compensation, bonus pay, and opportunities for promotions to female employees.  
3 These practices and procedures all suffer from a lack of transparency, adequate quality standards,  
4 and controls; sufficient implementation metrics; and opportunities for redress or challenge. Sony’s  
5 systemic discrimination and refusals to act on nondiscriminatory grounds justify the requested  
6 injunctive and declaratory relief with respect to the Class as a whole.

7 90. Injunctive, declaratory, and affirmative relief are a predominant form of relief  
8 sought in this case. Entitlement to declaratory, injunctive, and affirmative relief flows directly and  
9 automatically from proof of Sony’s systemic gender discrimination. In turn, entitlement to  
10 declaratory, injunctive, and affirmative relief forms the factual and legal predicate for recovery  
11 by the Class Representative and Class members of monetary and non-monetary remedies for  
12 individual losses caused by the systemic discrimination, as well as their recovery of compensatory  
13 and punitive damages.

14 91. **Commonality Exists:** The common issues of fact and law affecting the claims of  
15 the Class Representative and proposed Class members—including, but not limited to, the common  
16 issues identified above— predominate over any issues affecting only individual claims. The  
17 common issues include whether Sony has engaged in gender discrimination against female  
18 employees.

19 92. A class action is superior to other available means for fairly and efficiently  
20 adjudicating the claims of the Class Representative and members of the proposed Class.

21 93. By virtue of the pattern and practice of discrimination at Sony, the Class  
22 Representative and Class members are eligible for monetary remedies for losses caused by the  
23 systemic discrimination, including back pay, front pay, reinstatement, compensatory damages and  
24 other relief.

25 94. In addition, or in the alternative, the Court may grant “partial” or “issue”  
26 certification. Resolution of common questions of fact and law would materially advance the  
27 litigation for all Class members.

28 **ADDITIONAL ALLEGATIONS UNDER CALIFORNIA’S EQUAL PAY ACT**

1           95. Plaintiff alleges that the violations of the Equal Pay Act were willful, deliberate,  
2 and systematic.

3           96. The Class seeks compensation because female employees (a) were not  
4 compensated equally to male employees who had substantially similar job classifications,  
5 functions, titles, and/or duties, (b) were not compensated equally to male employees who  
6 performed substantially similar work, and/or (c) were denied equal compensation to similarly  
7 situated male employees by being held back to lesser pay levels than male employees who  
8 performed substantially similar work and had substantially similar experience.

9           97. Plaintiff and the Class are similarly situated with respect to their claims that Sony  
10 paid and promoted them less than their male counterparts.

11           98. There is a common nexus of fact and law suggesting that Plaintiff and the  
12 Companywide Class members were discriminated against in the same manner.

13           99. Questions at issue in the case include: a) Whether Sony unlawfully awarded less  
14 in pay to female employees than to similarly qualified male employees; b) Whether Sony  
15 unlawfully awarded less in bonuses to female employees than similarly qualified male employees;  
16 c) Whether Sony unlawfully assigned and continues to assign female employees into positions  
17 with lesser pay and other compensation than similarly qualified male employees; d) Whether  
18 Sony's resulting failure to compensate female employees on a par with comparable male  
19 employees was willful within the meaning of the Equal Pay Act.

20           100. Plaintiff and the Class members (a) are similarly situated; (b) have substantially  
21 similar job classifications, functions, titles, and/or duties; and (c) are subject to Sony's common  
22 policy and practice of gender discrimination in failing to compensate female employees  
23 commensurate with compensation given to male employees who perform substantially equal  
24 work.

25           **FACTS REGARDING PLAINTIFF'S INDIVIDUAL CAUSES OF ACTION**

26           101. Ms. Majo joined Sony in 2015.

27           102. When Plaintiff began at Sony, her department was roughly 60:40 of men:women,  
28 but over the years Plaintiff observed a shift towards more and more males. As of 2021, Sony is



1 dominated by males.

2 103. Sony has managers (e.g. Yu Sugita) who will not be alone in a room with a female  
3 with the door closed; if Plaintiff went into a room with Sugita and a male colleague then Sugita  
4 would only speak to the male colleague. It would be as if Plaintiff was not even in the room.

5 104. Eventually Plaintiff realized that if she really wanted something done, she needed  
6 to send the request through a male because if Plaintiff communicated directly to Sugita the request  
7 would be ignored. Plaintiff confirmed this by sending a request through a male intern. The request  
8 would garner a response when it came from a male intern while a virtually identical request would  
9 be ignored if it came from a higher-level female employee.

10 105. Plaintiff observed a bias against females at Sony. In fact, Plaintiff left a specific  
11 department (SGRC (Security Governance, Risk, and Compliance)) because it became clear to her  
12 there was no path to get promoted. Plaintiff's requests for a path to management resulted in the  
13 creation of a plan for more levels within the department instead of any communication that tasks,  
14 behavior modification, or knowledge was needed on Plaintiff's part.

15 106. Plaintiff often asked managers what she could do to get promoted. Plaintiff could  
16 not even get an answer to the question about what she could possibly do to get promoted. This  
17 occurred for several years in a row, with multiple managers. Managers would say something to  
18 the effect of, "yeah we should talk about that," but Plaintiff could never get an answer regarding  
19 what Plaintiff could do, as a female in the department, to earn a promotion.

20 107. Plaintiff spoke to three separate managers about what she could do to get  
21 promoted. Not only did Plaintiff not get promoted or get an answer as to how she could get  
22 promoted, but in fact Plaintiff was effectively demoted. Plaintiff used to report to a VP; after  
23 asking about how to get promoted, she was then told to report to a manager below the VP. The  
24 VP claimed that they did not have time to handle subordinates. Plaintiff noticed that other male  
25 co-workers continued reporting to the VP.

26 108. Plaintiff worked for Sony for half a decade, and Plaintiff did not earn a promotion  
27 from 2015 to 2021. Plaintiff was essentially in the same position for approximately six years.  
28 Plaintiff was unable to earn any managerial title and still had a staff title. Additionally, Plaintiff

1 had the same direct subordinate for three years, but Sony never made Plaintiff’s management role  
2 official. Plaintiff asked her manager what Plaintiff must do to become an official manager, but  
3 Plaintiff’s manager would not answer the question.

4 109. Plaintiff has also personally heard managers make gender-biased comments about  
5 female workers. For instance, if a female worker had some personal issue at any given time,  
6 managers would talk about how, “We can understand she is not performing well because she has  
7 a lot going on at home.” Plaintiff has never heard comments like this about men; Plaintiff has only  
8 heard these comments about women. This behavior construes women as more emotional and less  
9 professional than male colleagues.

10 110. While in SGRC, Plaintiff was asked by the CFO to join a project underneath  
11 another department. Plaintiff’s manager asked if job sharing between departments was a  
12 possibility temporarily. The new group manager was not open to job sharing. Plaintiff felt she had  
13 no room to negotiate and that Plaintiff essentially had to agree due to the politics. Plaintiff told  
14 Plaintiff’s manager Plaintiff felt Plaintiff had to agree unless they could advocate for me. When  
15 Plaintiff left SGRC, Plaintiff’s manager said Plaintiff could return anytime there was an opening.  
16 This was not actually true. There have been several openings in SGRC, and Plaintiff applied to  
17 transfer back into the department as Plaintiff realized the inability to get promoted was true  
18 throughout Sony, not just within SGRC. Plaintiff applied but was never allowed; in fact, Plaintiff  
19 was never even given an explanation, update, or answer. Plaintiff simply heard nothing about the  
20 application. This is for the exact same job Plaintiff had performed in the past. The jobs remained  
21 open.

22 111. Approximately two and a half years ago, Plaintiff sought out a mentor. Plaintiff  
23 told this Sony mentor that Plaintiff was a flight risk because it appears it is impossible for her to  
24 earn a promotion or even get an answer about how Plaintiff can earn a promotion. The mentor  
25 said the only thing Plaintiff can do is speak to Plaintiff’s current manager. There is no other path  
26 to get a promotion at Sony. Given that Plaintiff’s manager would not even answer what she could  
27 do to get promoted, it became clear there was no possible way for her to get promoted at Sony.

28 112. Sony sometimes promotes people “in cycle” (meaning around the time of annual

1 performance reviews) and sometimes “out of cycle.” The number of men promoted out of cycle  
2 is notable. Every “out of cycle” promotion Plaintiff knew of was for a male. This indicates that at  
3 Sony there are separate processes for men vs. women to get promoted.

4 113. HR itself creates resistance when women try to get promoted. HR creates  
5 resistance by losing track of females seeking promotion. HR and managers also often say a person  
6 cannot be promoted because they do not currently hold a certain specific job title. Plaintiff believe  
7 Sony makes it harder for females to get promoted, and one way it does so is by looking at current  
8 job titles and deciding a person isn’t qualified for a certain job because of her current job title,  
9 without a real examination of her skills.

10 114. In 2021, Plaintiff submitted a signed statement to Sony detailing the gender bias  
11 she has experienced at Sony. Soon after that, Plaintiff received a letter that she was being  
12 terminated. The notification from Sony stated that it was eliminating a certain department and that  
13 Plaintiff would be terminated because that department was being eliminated. However, this was  
14 a false basis to terminate Plaintiff because she was not even a member of the department being  
15 dissolved. Moreover, Sony posted a job ad soon after that seeking to hire someone to fill Plaintiff’s  
16 former position.

17 115. Ms. Majo alleges she was not promoted, and she was demoted, because of gender  
18 bias, because she is a female, and because she spoke up about gender bias. She further alleges her  
19 termination was caused by gender bias against females, and because of bias against those who  
20 spoke up about gender bias.

21 **FIRST CLAIM**

22 Violation of the California Equal Pay Act  
23 Cal. Labor Code §§1197.5 *et seq.*, 1194.5  
(*On behalf of Plaintiff and the Class*)

24 116. Plaintiff hereby re-alleges and incorporates by reference all allegations in each and  
25 every preceding paragraph as if fully set forth herein.

26 117. Sony has discriminated and continues to discriminate against Plaintiff and all Class  
27 Members in violation of California Labor Code §1197.5 *et seq.* by paying its female employees  
28 at wage rates less than the wage rates paid to its male employees for substantially equal or similar

1 work, when viewed as a composite of skill, effort, and responsibility, and performed under similar  
2 working conditions, throughout the Class Period.

3 118. Sony's failure to pay women and men equal wages for performing substantially  
4 equal or similar work is not justified by any lawful reason.

5 119. Sony has willfully violated California Labor Code §1197.5 by intentionally,  
6 knowingly, and/or deliberately paying women less than men for substantially equal or similar  
7 work throughout the Class Period. As a result of Sony's ongoing conduct, violation of California  
8 Labor Code §1197.5, and/or willful discrimination, Plaintiff Majo and Class members have  
9 suffered and will continue to suffer harm, including but not limited to lost earnings, lost benefits,  
10 and other financial loss, as well as non-economic damages. Plaintiff Majo and Class members are  
11 therefore entitled to all legal and equitable remedies available under law, including wages,  
12 interest, and liquidated damages.

13 120. Sony has discriminated against Plaintiff and all Class Members in violation of the  
14 California Equal Pay Act, Cal. Lab. Code § 1197.5 (West 2015) (amended 2015), *et seq.* Sony  
15 has paid Plaintiff and Class Members less than similarly situated male employees in the same  
16 establishment performing equal work on jobs, the performance of which requires equal skill,  
17 effort, and responsibility, and which are performed under similar working conditions.

18 121. Sony has discriminated against Plaintiff and all Class Members in violation of the  
19 California Equal Pay Act, Cal. Lab. Code § 1197.5 *et seq.* Sony has paid Plaintiff and all Class  
20 Members less than similarly situated male employees performing substantially equal work, when  
21 viewed as a composite of skill, effort, and responsibility, and performed under similar working  
22 conditions.

23 122. Sony subjected Plaintiff and all Class Members to common discriminatory pay  
24 policies, including maintaining a discriminatory system of determining compensation;  
25 maintaining a discriminatory system for promotions; and other forms of discrimination affecting  
26 pay.

27 123. The differential in pay between male and female employees was not due to  
28 seniority, merit, or the quantity or quality of production, a bona fide factor other than sex, such as

1 education, training, or experience, but was due to gender. In the alternative, to the extent that Sony  
2 relied upon one or more of these factors, said factor(s) were not reasonably applied and did/do  
3 not account for the entire wage differential.

4 124. The foregoing conduct constitutes a willful violation of the California Equal Pay  
5 Act, Cal. Lab. Code §1197.5 et seq., as amended by the California Fair Pay Act. Therefore, a  
6 three-year statute of limitations applies to such violations, pursuant to California Equal Pay Act,  
7 Cal. Lab. Code § 1197.5(h), *et seq.*, and California Equal Pay Act, as amended by the California  
8 Fair Pay Act, Cal. Labor Code § 1197.5(h).

9 125. Sony pays women less than men even when a woman is performing the same  
10 functions and job duties, i.e., even when they are doing substantially similar work. For instance,  
11 a co-worker named “Greg” was given a promotion in title while still performing the same job  
12 duties. At Sony, promotions virtually always include a pay raise. This co-worker was still  
13 performing the same job duties as Plaintiff, their work was substantially identical yet the male  
14 counterpart was earning more money for the same work.

15 126. Sony paid Plaintiff less than her male counterparts, for instance the counterpart  
16 named “Greg” referenced above. Plaintiff was performing the same functions and job duties as  
17 her male counterpart but was paid less. This pay disparity was because of gender.

18 127. Plaintiff alleges that the same pattern has occurred for other women including  
19 women at the four main offices within California, as specified above.

20 128. As a result of Sony’s conduct alleged in this Complaint and/or Sony’s willful,  
21 knowing, and intentional discrimination, Plaintiff and the Class Members have suffered and will  
22 continue to suffer harm, including but not limited to lost earnings, lost benefits, and other financial  
23 loss, as well as non-economic damages.

24 129. Plaintiff and the Class Members are therefore entitled to all legal and equitable  
25 remedies, including doubled compensatory awards for all willful violations.

26 **SECOND CLAIM**  
27 **DISCRIMINATION (UNEQUAL PAY & FAILURE TO PROMOTE) & HARASSMENT**  
28 (California Gov’t Code §§ 12940 *et seq.*)  
(*On behalf of Plaintiff and the Class*)

1           130. Plaintiff incorporates in this claim each and every allegation of the preceding  
2 paragraphs, with the same force and effect as though fully set forth herein.

3           131. Plaintiff alleges that she and other Class Members were denied promotions and  
4 were paid less because they were female or identified as female.

5           132. At all times mentioned herein, Defendant was an employer within the meaning of  
6 the California Fair Employment and Housing Act (Cal. Govt. Code §§ 12940 *et seq.*) (“FEHA”) and Plaintiff was an employee within the meaning of FEHA. Defendant regularly employed five  
7 or more persons or, in the alternative, Defendant is a direct or indirect agent of an employer. *See*  
8 Cal. Govt. Code §§ 12926(d) (“‘Employer’ includes any person regularly employing five or more  
9 persons, or any person acting as an agent of an employer, directly or indirectly, the state or any  
10 political or civil subdivision of the state, and cities, except as follows: ‘Employer’ does not include  
11 a religious association or corporation not organized for private profit.”) *Id.* This claim is brought  
12 pursuant to FEHA, and the corresponding regulations promulgated by the California Department  
13 of Fair Employment and Housing. Defendant regularly and systematically does business in the  
14 State of California and is subject to suit under FEHA in that Defendant regularly employed five  
15 or more persons.  
16

17           133. Plaintiff was paid less than male counterparts who were performing nearly  
18 identical tasks to her. For instance, a co-worker named “Greg” was given a promotion in title  
19 while still performing the same job duties. At Sony, promotions virtually always include a pay  
20 raise. This co-worker was still performing the same job duties as Plaintiff, their work was  
21 substantially identical yet the male counterpart was earning more money for the same work.

22           134. Plaintiff also was denied a promotion that was given to a male co-worker who was  
23 less qualified than Plaintiff was. Plaintiff alleges that the reason she was denied promotions was  
24 because of her gender.

25           135. With respect to harassment claims under subdivision (j) of Section 12940, the  
26 definition of an “employer” includes “any person regularly employing one or more persons or  
27 regularly receiving the services of one or more persons providing services pursuant to a contract,  
28 or any person acting as an agent of an employer, directly or indirectly, the state, or any political

1 or civil subdivision of the state, and cities.” Gov’t Code § 12940(j)(4).

2 136. Plaintiff and Class Members were subjected to harassment in the form of a hostile  
3 work environment. Many women spoke up about sexual harassment—like inappropriate touching  
4 by co-workers—and gender-based discrimination, and their employer did not take the necessary  
5 actions to correct this improper conduct. As described above, derogatory comments about females  
6 occurred in the workplace, as did many instances of verbally abusive and sexually inappropriate  
7 conduct at the workplace or at off-site work events. As a result, Plaintiff and Class Members  
8 suffered by working in a toxic, hostile work environment.

9 137. With respect to discrimination, California Government Code section 12940(a)  
10 provides that it is an unlawful employment practice:

11 For an employer, because of the race, religious creed, color, national origin,  
12 ancestry, physical disability, mental disability, medical condition, genetic  
13 information, marital status, sex, gender, gender identity, gender expression, age,  
14 sexual orientation, or military and veteran status of any person, to refuse to hire or  
15 employ the person or to refuse to select the person for a training program leading  
16 to employment, or to bar or to discharge the person from employment or from a  
17 training program leading to employment, or to discriminate against the person in  
18 compensation or in terms, conditions, or privileges of employment.

19 138. With respect to harassment, California Government Code section 12940(j)(1)  
20 provides:

21 For an employer, labor organization, employment agency, apprenticeship training  
22 program or any training program leading to employment, or any other person,  
23 because of race, religious creed, color, national origin, ancestry, physical  
24 disability, mental disability, medical condition, genetic information, marital status,  
25 sex, gender, gender identity, gender expression, age, sexual orientation, or military  
26 and veteran status, to harass an employee, an applicant, an unpaid intern or  
27 volunteer, or a person providing services pursuant to a contract. Harassment of an  
28 employee, an applicant, an unpaid intern or volunteer, or a person providing  
services pursuant to a contract by an employee, other than an agent or supervisor,  
shall be unlawful if the entity, or its agents or supervisors, knows or should have  
known of this conduct and fails to take immediate and appropriate corrective  
action. An employer may also be responsible for the acts of nonemployees, with  
respect to sexual harassment of employees, applicants, unpaid interns or  
volunteers, or persons providing services pursuant to a contract in the workplace,  
where the employer, or its agents or supervisors, knows or should have known of  
the conduct and fails to take immediate and appropriate corrective action. In  
reviewing cases involving the acts of nonemployees, the extent of the employer's  
control and any other legal responsibility that the employer may have with respect  
to the conduct of those nonemployees shall be considered. An entity shall take all

1 reasonable steps to prevent harassment from occurring. Loss of tangible job  
2 benefits shall not be necessary in order to establish harassment.

3 139. This is a claim for relief arising from Defendant's causing, and its failure to  
4 prevent, discrimination and harassment against Plaintiff based on her gender.

5 140. According to California Code of Regulations Title 2, section 11029(b) states:  
6 The purpose of the laws against discrimination and harassment in employment  
7 because of sex is to eliminate the means by which individuals, by virtue of their  
8 sex, gender identity, or gender expression, are treated differently, paid less, treated  
9 adversely based on stereotyping, subjected to conduct of a sexual nature, subjected  
10 to hostile work environments, or made to suffer other forms of adverse action, and  
11 to guarantee that in the future equal employment benefits will be afforded  
12 regardless of the individual's sex

13 141. As alleged above, Plaintiff was entitled to protection under FEHA because Plaintiff  
14 is an employee who has a protected characteristic based on her gender, specifically being female.  
15 Class Members also have a protected characteristic.

16 142. As such, Plaintiff was entitled to FEHA's protection pursuant to California  
17 Government Code sections 12940 *et seq.* Class Members are also entitled to FEHA's protections.

18 143. Defendant was aware that Plaintiff was an employee who has a protected  
19 characteristic. The same is true for Class Members.

20 144. Pursuant to California Government Code section 12940(a), Defendant was  
21 prohibited from taking any adverse employment action motivated by the fact that an employee  
22 has a protected characteristic.

23 145. Plaintiff satisfies all criteria. (1) Plaintiff was a female employee of SIE; (2) she  
24 suffered adverse employment actions including; (3) Plaintiff was qualified and was performing  
25 well; and (4) Other women similarly experienced discrimination and retaliation because of their  
26 gender.

27 146. Plaintiff's allegations satisfy the elements for a FEHA harassment claim for the  
28 following reasons: (1) Plaintiff was a female employee of SIE; (2) she was subjected to  
unwelcome harassment in the form of an environment permeated by gender-biased treatment; (3)  
the harassment was based on her protected class; and (4) the harassment created a hostile,  
offensive work environment.



1           147. Women working at Sony were subjected to a work environment permeated with  
2 discriminatory intimidation, ridicule and insult which was sufficiently severe and pervasive  
3 enough to alter the conditions of employment and create an abusive working environment.

4           148. Defendant’s discriminatory and harassing actions against Plaintiff and Class  
5 Members, as alleged above, including preventing females from being promoted and preventing  
6 females from equal payment, constituted unlawful discrimination in employment on account of  
7 the fact that Plaintiff was an employee that has a protected characteristic, in violation of California  
8 Government Code section 12940.

9           149. Plaintiff is informed and believes and, based thereon, alleges that Defendant’s  
10 conduct, as described herein, was substantially motivated by the fact that Plaintiff has a protected  
11 characteristic.

12           150. **Disparate Treatment Claims Satisfy Class Certification Standards**

13           151. Plaintiff Emma Majo disparate treatment claims can satisfy class certification  
14 standards. Sony operates under a general policy of discrimination in that different standards are  
15 used to evaluate male versus female workers. The different standards applied to women (e.g.  
16 graded on body language, family status, and non-native accents) result in systemically lowered  
17 performance reviews which have slowed the process of pay increases and promotions. Sony’s  
18 management utilizes a common mode of exercising discretion.

19           152. The entire class was subject to the same allegedly discriminatory practices such as  
20 different performance standards for male versus female employees.

21           153. Sony utilizes unwritten procedures for selecting promotion candidates and high-  
22 level management—including managers and human resources personnel—are involved in the  
23 promotion process.

24           154. Sony’s management has been aware that the gender discrimination that is rampant.  
25 Sony is aware of a group within the company called “Women @ PS” which has periodic meetings  
26 to discuss issues of interest to the group. In the Summer of 2020, many women at the Women @  
27 PS meeting disclosed that they had been sexually harassed, discriminated against, and retaliated  
28 against. Sony has hired third party companies to audit various business aspects which results in

1 third-party reports of gender disparities within Sony’s workforce.

2 155. The company's actions demonstrate that Sony’s senior management had  
3 knowledge of the gender disparity in the promotion processes at these California locations. Sony  
4 supposedly created a task force to investigate why such a high percentage of female workers were  
5 leaving the company. The company’s actions treated the gender disparity as a company-wide  
6 issue.

7 156. Given the extensive involvement by human resources and senior management in  
8 the promotion process Sony has a common mode of exercising discretion that pervades the entire  
9 company.

10 (1) No Written Procedures Governing Promotions: Emma Majo sufficiently  
11 alleged that Sony lacks written procedures to govern promotions.

12 (2) Upper Management Was Involvement in Promotion Decisions: Emma Majo  
13 sufficiently alleged that Sony’s upper management decisions are involved in promotion  
14 decisions. “Discriminatory employment practices, policies, and procedures are centrally  
15 established and implemented at the highest levels of Sony.”

16 (3) “Promotables” List of Potential Candidates: Emma Majo sufficiently alleged  
17 that Sony uses predetermined factors—other than performance—to decide who is eligible  
18 for a promotion.

19 (4) Senior Management’s Awareness of Gender Disparity in Promotion Process:  
20 Sony’s management is aware of gender disparity in the promotion process.

21 (5) Classwide Practices: Emma Majo sufficiently alleged that classwide policies  
22 and practices institutionalize gender discrimination and harm women at Sony.

23 157. Given the extensive involvement by human resources and senior management in  
24 the promotion process Sony has a common mode of exercising discretion that pervades the entire  
25 company.

26 **158. Disparate Impact Claims Will Also Satisfy Class Certification Standards**

27 159. The same reasons *Ellis v. Costco*’s disparate impact claim was certified are present  
28 here.

1 (1) A tap-on-the-shoulder appointment process: A “tap-on-the-shoulder”  
2 promotion process exists through “off cycle” promotions.

3 (2) Promotion exclusively from within: Sony engages in internal favoritism such  
4 that people at Sony with high-level job titles are eligible for more promotions—which  
5 preserves the status quo.

6 (3) Requirement of Specific in-house Experience: Sony uses current job titles as a  
7 major factor in deciding future promotions.

8 (4) Reliance on unwritten and informal evaluation of candidates: Sony relies on  
9 unwritten criteria to evaluate candidates.

10 (5) Reliance on promotable lists of desired candidates: Sony uses predetermined  
11 factors—other than performance—to decide who is eligible for a promotion.

12 160. As a direct and proximate result of the actions of Defendant, including the  
13 discrimination and harassment against Plaintiff and Class Members as described herein, Plaintiff  
14 and Class Members have suffered and will continue to suffer pain and extreme and severe mental  
15 anguish and emotional distress. Plaintiff and Class Members have further suffered and will  
16 continue to suffer a loss of earnings and other employment benefits. Accordingly, Plaintiff and  
17 Class Members are entitled to general compensatory damages in amounts to be proven at trial.

18 161. By discriminating against and harassing Plaintiff and Class Members in violation  
19 of Government Code section 12940, Defendant acted willfully, oppressively, maliciously and  
20 with conscious disregard for the rights of Plaintiff and Class Members, and with the intent to  
21 annoy, harass or injure Plaintiff and Class Members, in violation of California Civil Code section  
22 3294, such that Plaintiff and Class Members are entitled to recovery of punitive damages in an  
23 amount according to proof at trial.

24 162. Upon information and belief, one or more of Defendant’s managing agents  
25 committed, authorized, or ratified the wrongful conduct. As such, punitive damages are warranted  
26 against Defendants.

27 163. Plaintiff seeks her attorneys’ fees and costs pursuant to California Government  
28 Code section 12965(b).

**THIRD CLAIM**  
**FAILURE TO PREVENT AND INVESTIGATE**  
**DISCRIMINATION AND HARASSMENT**

(Gov't. Code § 12940 *et seq.*; *Tameny v. Atlantic Richfield Company*)  
(*On behalf of Plaintiff and the Class*)

164. Plaintiff incorporates in this claim each and every allegation of the preceding paragraphs, with the same force and effect as though fully set forth herein.

165. Under California law, there is a fundamental and well-established public policy against taking any adverse employment action motivated by the fact that an employee has a protected characteristic.

166. Under the Fair Employment and Housing Act (“FEHA”), it is an unlawful employment practice to take any adverse employment action motivated by the fact that an employee has a protected characteristic. Said public policy is embodied in the Constitution of the State of California and California Statutory law, including but not limited to Gov’t. Code § 12940. Jurisdiction is invoked in this court pursuant to FEHA and the public policy and common law of the State of California, pursuant to *Tameny v. Atlantic Richfield Company*, 27 Cal. 3d 167 (1980) and *Rojo v. Kliger*, 52 Cal. 3d 65 (1990).

167. As alleged above, Plaintiff and Class Members are entitled to protection under FEHA based on the fact that they are employees who have a protected characteristic.

168. As such, Plaintiff and Class Members were entitled to FEHA’s protection pursuant to California Government Code section 12940 *et seq.*

169. Defendant was aware that Plaintiff and Class Members were/are employees who have a protected characteristic.

170. At all times mentioned herein, Defendant was an employer within the meaning of FEHA and Plaintiff was an employee within the meaning of FEHA. Defendant regularly employed five or more persons or, in the alternative, Defendant is direct or indirect agents of an employer. *See* Cal. Govt. Code §§ 12926(d) (“‘Employer’ includes any person regularly employing five or more persons, or any person acting as an agent of an employer, directly or indirectly, the state or any political or civil subdivision of the state, and cities, except as follows: ‘Employer’ does not include a religious association or corporation not organized for private

1 profit.” *Id.* This claim is brought pursuant to FEHA, and the corresponding regulations  
2 promulgated by the California Department of Fair Employment and Housing. Defendants  
3 regularly and systematically do business in the State of California and is subject to suit under  
4 FEHA in that Defendants regularly employed five or more persons.

5 171. Under FEHA, including California Government Code section 12940(k), and the  
6 common law of the State of California, Defendant owes to Plaintiff a duty to take all reasonable  
7 steps necessary to investigate or prevent harassment and discrimination.

8 172. California Government Code section 12940(j)(1) provides that it is an unlawful  
9 employment practice:

10 For an employer, ... or any other person, because of race, religious creed, color,  
11 national origin, ancestry, physical disability, mental disability, medical condition,  
12 genetic information, marital status, sex, gender, gender identity, gender  
13 expression, age, sexual orientation, or military and veteran status, to harass an  
14 employee, an applicant, an unpaid intern or volunteer, or a person providing  
15 services pursuant to a contract. Harassment of an employee, an applicant, an  
16 unpaid intern or volunteer, or a person providing services pursuant to a contract by  
17 an employee, other than an agent or supervisor, shall be unlawful if the entity, or  
18 its agents or supervisors, knows or should have known of this conduct and fails to  
19 take immediate and appropriate corrective action. An employer may also be  
20 responsible for the acts of nonemployees, with respect to sexual harassment of  
21 employees, applicants, unpaid interns or volunteers, or persons providing services  
22 pursuant to a contract in the workplace, where the employer, or its agents or  
23 supervisors, knows or should have known of the conduct and fails to take  
24 immediate and appropriate corrective action. In reviewing cases involving the acts  
25 of nonemployees, the extent of the employer’s control and any other legal  
26 responsibility that the employer may have with respect to the conduct of those  
27 nonemployees shall be considered. An entity shall take all reasonable steps to  
28 prevent harassment from occurring. Loss of tangible job benefits shall not be  
necessary in order to establish harassment.

173. Plaintiff complained about the harassment and discrimination to at least one of  
Plaintiff’s managers. Nonetheless, Defendant did not investigate Plaintiff’s complaints or take  
action to stop the harassment and discrimination.

174. Despite Defendant’s knowledge of Plaintiff’s complaints, Defendant failed to take  
immediate and appropriate corrective action to prevent discrimination, retaliation, and  
harassment. Defendant similarly failed to take all reasonable steps to prevent discrimination from  
occurring.

1           175. Moreover, Defendant knew or should have known about the discrimination and  
2 harassment against Plaintiff. Defendant failed to take immediate and appropriate corrective action  
3 to prevent discrimination, retaliation, and harassment. Defendant similarly failed to take all  
4 reasonable steps to prevent discrimination from occurring.

5           176. Sony had supposedly hired an investigator to look into allegations of  
6 discrimination. The investigator contacted Plaintiff and requested to conduct an interview. Before  
7 that interview began, Plaintiff sent the investigator a short summary of information regarding  
8 sexism and gender discrimination at the company. Plaintiff also explained that she had retained  
9 an attorney. The investigator postponed the scheduled interview to ask Sony whether Sony wanted  
10 the interview to proceed with Plaintiff. Sony's investigator never conducted the interview. This  
11 shows that even when a female employee writes directly to Sony explicitly describing gender  
12 discrimination within the company, Sony does not take prompt, immediate, or appropriate action  
13 to investigate the issue. Instead, a few months later, Emma Majo is terminated which Sony claims  
14 was because a certain department was being dissolved. This was a false basis to terminate her and,  
15 in fact, the real reason was retaliation for Emma Majo speaking up about gender discrimination.  
16 It is also clear this was a false basis to terminate her because Emma Majo was not a permanent  
17 member of the department being dissolved. Moreover, Emma Majo saw a job ad published by  
18 Sony to fill her previous position which Sony had claimed had been dissolved.

19           177. Sony did not properly investigate Plaintiff's reports of discrimination just like  
20 Sony did not do so with other women's similar reports.

21           178. On information and belief, Defendant does not provide adequate anti-  
22 discrimination training to its workforce, which results in unlawful discrimination, unlawful  
23 harassment, unlawful retaliation and related violations against Plaintiff and Class Members.

24           179. Because of Defendant's failure to prevent and investigate harassment and  
25 discrimination, Plaintiff suffered adverse employment actions, including failure to promote and  
26 failure to pay females equally to males.

27           180. Plaintiff is informed and believes and thereon alleges that, as a direct and  
28 proximate result of Defendant's willful, knowing, and intentional wrongful conduct, Plaintiff has

1 suffered and continues to suffer damages in an amount subject to proof, but which are in excess  
2 of the jurisdictional minimum of this Court, and which include, but are not limited to, mental  
3 distress, anguish, indignation, humiliation, depression, anxiety, fear, and loss of sleep. Plaintiff  
4 and Class Members have also suffered from a loss of earnings, other employment benefits and  
5 job opportunities and other monetary damages. Plaintiff and Class Members are thereby entitled  
6 to general and compensatory damages in an amount to be proven at trial.

7 181. Plaintiff seeks attorneys' fees and costs pursuant to California Government Code  
8 section 12965(b).

9 182. Defendant's acts alleged herein are malicious, oppressive, despicable, and in  
10 conscious disregard of Plaintiff's rights. Upon information and belief, one or more of Defendant's  
11 managing agents committed, authorized, or ratified the wrongful conduct. As such, punitive  
12 damages are warranted against Defendants.

13 **FOURTH CLAIM**  
14 **VIOLATION OF CALIFORNIA BUSINESS AND PROFESSIONS CODE, Cal. Bus. &**  
15 **Prof. Code § 17200 et seq. UNFAIR COMPETITION**  
16 *(On behalf of Plaintiff and the Class)*

17 183. Plaintiff hereby re-alleges and incorporates by reference all allegations in each and  
18 every preceding paragraph as if fully set forth herein.

19 184. Sony is a "person" as defined under California Business & Professions Code §  
20 17201.

21 185. Sony's willful failure to pay women equally, to promote women equally, and  
22 otherwise to offer women equal employment opportunities as alleged above, constitutes unlawful,  
23 unfair and/or fraudulent activity prohibited by California Business and Professions Code §17200.

24 186. As a result of its unlawful, unfair and/or fraudulent acts, Sony reaped and continues  
25 to reap unfair benefits and illegal profits at the expense of Plaintiff and the Class.

26 187. Sony should be enjoined from this activity.

27 188. Accordingly, Plaintiff and the Class members are entitled to restitution with  
28 interest and other equitable relief, pursuant to Business & Professions Code § 17203.

**FIFTH CLAIM**  
**PRIVATE ATTORNEY GENERAL ACT OF 2004 CLAIM**

(Cal. Lab. Code §§ 2698 *et seq.*)  
(*On behalf of Plaintiff and the Class*)

189. Plaintiff incorporates in this claim each and every allegation of the preceding paragraphs, with the same force and effect as though fully set forth herein.

190. Plaintiff provided written notice by certified mail to the Labor and Workforce Development Agency of the specific provisions of this code alleged to have been violated as required by Labor Code section 2699.3. More than sixty-five days have passed with no response. As a result, Plaintiff may now commence a civil action pursuant to Labor Code section 2699.

191. The policies, acts and practices heretofore described violate the applicable Labor Code sections listed in Labor Code section 2699.5 and other sections of the Labor Code also eligible to combine with PAGA; thus, the policies, acts and practices give rise to statutory penalties as a result of such conduct. Plaintiff and Class Members, as aggrieved employees, hereby seek recovery of civil penalties as prescribed by the Labor Code Private Attorney General Act of 2004 on behalf of themselves and all other aggrieved employees against whom one or more of the aforementioned violations of the Labor Code was committed and other applicable provisions of the Employment Laws and Regulations in amounts to be established at trial, as well as attorneys' fees and costs, pursuant to statute.

**PLAINTIFF EMMA MAJO'S INDIVIDUAL CLAIMS**

**SIXTH CLAIM**  
**WRONGFUL TERMINATION IN VIOLATION OF PUBLIC POLICY**  
(*Tameny v. Atlantic Richfield Company*)  
(*On behalf of Plaintiff as an individual*)

192. Plaintiff incorporates in this claim each and every allegation of the preceding paragraphs, with the same force and effect as though fully set forth herein.

193. Jurisdiction is invoked in this court pursuant to the public policy and common law of the State of California, pursuant to *Tameny v. Atlantic Richfield Company*, 27 Cal. 3d 167 (1980).



1           194. Defendant terminated Plaintiff’s employment based upon Plaintiff having a  
2 protected characteristic and/or engaging in a protected activity, as alleged herein. For instance,  
3 Plaintiff was terminated because she is female and because she spoke up about discrimination  
4 against females.

5           195. Sony had supposedly hired an investigator to look into allegations of  
6 discrimination. The investigator contacted Plaintiff and requested to conduct an interview. Before  
7 that interview began, Plaintiff sent the investigator a short summary of information regarding  
8 sexism and gender discrimination at the company. Plaintiff also explained that she had retained  
9 an attorney. The investigator postponed the scheduled interview to ask Sony whether Sony wanted  
10 the interview to proceed with Plaintiff. Sony’s investigator never conducted the interview. This  
11 shows that even when a female employee writes directly to Sony explicitly describing gender  
12 discrimination within the company, Sony does not take prompt, immediate, or appropriate action  
13 to investigate the issue. Instead, a few months later, Emma Majo is terminated which Sony claims  
14 was because a certain department was being dissolved. This was a false basis to terminate her and,  
15 in fact, the real reason was retaliation for Emma Majo speaking up about gender discrimination.  
16 It is also clear this was a false basis to terminate her because Emma Majo was not a permanent  
17 member of the department being dissolved. Moreover, Emma Majo saw a job ad published by  
18 Sony to fill her previous position which Sony had claimed had been dissolved. Plaintiff alleges  
19 that the cause of her termination was the fact that she spoke up about gender discrimination, and  
20 because of a bias against female employees.

21           196. Plaintiff is informed and believes and, based thereon, alleges that Defendant’s  
22 conduct, as described herein, was substantially motivated by Plaintiff having a protected  
23 characteristic and/or engaging in a protected activity, as alleged herein.

24           197. The conduct of Defendant described herein above was outrageous and was  
25 executed with malice, fraud and oppression, and with conscious disregard for Plaintiff’s rights,  
26 and further, with the intent, design and purpose of injuring Plaintiff.

27           198. As a proximate result of Defendant’s wrongful acts, Plaintiff has suffered, and  
28 continues to suffer, substantial losses incurred in seeking substitute employment and in earnings,

1 bonuses, and other employment benefits; and has suffered, and continues to suffer, emotional  
2 distress in an amount according to proof at the time of trial.

3 199. Defendant, through its officers, managing agents, and/or their supervisors,  
4 authorized, condoned and/or ratified the unlawful conduct described herein above. By reason  
5 thereof, Plaintiff is entitled to an award of punitive damages in an amount according to proof at  
6 the time of trial, as well as attorneys' fees and costs, pursuant to statute.

7 **SEVENTH CLAIM**  
8 **INTENTIONAL INFLICTION OF EMOTIONAL DISTRESS**  
9 (Civ. Code)  
10 (*On behalf of Plaintiff as an individual*)

11 200. Plaintiff incorporates in this claim each and every allegation of the preceding  
12 paragraphs, with the same force and effect as though fully set forth herein.

13 201. The conduct complained of hereinabove was outside the conduct expected to exist  
14 in the workplace, was intentional and done for the purpose of causing Plaintiff to suffer  
15 humiliation, mental anguish, and emotional and physical distress. Defendant's conduct was done  
16 with the knowledge that Plaintiff's emotional and physical distress would thereby increase, and  
17 was done with a wanton and reckless disregard of the consequences to Plaintiff.

18 202. As a proximate result of Defendant's intentional infliction of emotional distress as  
19 hereinabove alleged, Plaintiff has been harmed in that Plaintiff has suffered humiliation, mental  
20 anguish, and emotional and physical distress, and has been injured in mind and health. As a result  
21 of said distress and consequent harm, Plaintiff has suffered such damages in an amount in  
22 accordance with proof at time of trial.

23 203. Defendant engaging in the conduct as hereinabove alleged, acted oppressively and  
24 with reckless disregard of Plaintiff's rights and safety, thereby entitling Plaintiff to an award of  
25 punitive damages.

26 204. Defendant authorized, ratified, and knew of the wrongful conduct complained of  
27 herein, but failed to take immediate and appropriate corrective action to remedy the situation and  
28 thereby acted oppressively and with reckless disregard of Plaintiff's rights and safety, entitling  
Plaintiff to an award of punitive damages.

1 205. As a direct and proximate result of Defendant's conduct, Plaintiff sustained  
2 damages, including but not limited to, loss of earnings and earning potential, opportunities and  
3 other benefits of employment and employment opportunities and harm to her reputation, mental  
4 anguish, embarrassment, humiliation, and other emotional distress and/or medical and related  
5 expenses in an amount to be established at trial. As a result of this wrongful conduct, Plaintiff is  
6 entitled to attorneys' fees, costs, and injunctive relief.

7 206. Moreover, in that, at all times referenced herein, Defendant intended to cause or  
8 acted with reckless disregard of the probability of causing injury to Plaintiff and, because said  
9 Defendant was guilty of oppressive, fraudulent, and/or malicious conduct, Plaintiff is entitled to  
10 an award of exemplary or punitive damages in an amount adequate to deter such conduct in the  
11 future, in addition to attorneys' fees and costs.

12 207. Defendant's acts alleged herein are malicious, oppressive, despicable, and in  
13 conscious disregard of Plaintiff's rights. Upon information and belief, one or more of Defendant's  
14 managing agents committed, authorized, or ratified the wrongful conduct. As such, punitive  
15 damages are warranted against Defendants.

16  
17 **EIGHTH CLAIM**

18 **NEGLIGENT INFLICTION OF EMOTIONAL DISTRESS**

19 (Civ. Code § 1714)

20 *(On behalf of Plaintiff as an individual)*

21 208. Plaintiff incorporates in this claim each and every allegation of the preceding  
22 paragraphs, with the same force and effect as though fully set forth herein.

23 209. Sony owed a duty to Plaintiff and the Class, including a duty to investigate and  
24 prevent discrimination and harassment. This duty arises out of anti-discrimination laws such as  
25 FEHA. Her NIED claim incorporates the facts section.

26 210. In the alternative, if said conduct of Defendant, and of its agents and employees  
27 was not intentional, it was negligent. Plaintiff is thereby entitled to general damages for the  
28 negligent infliction of emotional distress

211. As a direct and proximate result of Defendant's conduct, Plaintiff sustained

1 damages, including but not limited to, loss of earnings and earning potential, opportunities and  
2 other benefits of employment and employment opportunities and harm to her reputation, mental  
3 anguish, embarrassment, humiliation, and other emotional distress and/or medical and related  
4 expenses in an amount to be established at trial. As a result of this wrongful conduct, Plaintiff is  
5 entitled to attorneys' fees, costs, and injunctive relief.

6 212. Moreover, in that, at all times referenced herein, Defendant intended to cause or  
7 acted with reckless disregard of the probability of causing injury to Plaintiff and, because said  
8 Defendant was guilty of oppressive, fraudulent, and/or malicious conduct, Plaintiff is entitled to  
9 an award of exemplary or punitive damages in an amount adequate to deter such conduct in the  
10 future, in addition to attorneys' fees and costs.

11 213. Defendant's acts alleged herein are malicious, oppressive, despicable, and in  
12 conscious disregard of Plaintiff's rights. Upon information and belief, one or more of Defendant's  
13 managing agents committed, authorized, or ratified the wrongful conduct. As such, punitive  
14 damages are warranted against Defendants.

15 **NINTH CLAIM**

16 **DISCRIMINATION --TERMINATION**

17 (California Gov't Code §§ 12940 *et seq.*; *Tameny v. Atlantic Richfield Company*)

18 (*On behalf of Plaintiff as an individual*)

19 214. Plaintiff incorporates in this claim each and every allegation of the preceding  
20 paragraphs, with the same force and effect as though fully set forth herein.

21 215. Plaintiff alleges that she lost her job and was terminated because she is female and  
22 because she spoke up about discrimination against females.

23 216. At all times mentioned herein, Defendant was an employer within the meaning of  
24 the California Fair Employment and Housing Act (Cal. Govt. Code §§ 12940 *et seq.*) ("FEHA")  
25 and Plaintiff was an employee within the meaning of FEHA. Defendant regularly employed five  
26 or more persons or, in the alternative, Defendant is a direct or indirect agent of an employer. *See*  
27 Cal. Govt. Code §§ 12926(d) ("Employer" includes any person regularly employing five or more  
28 persons, or any person acting as an agent of an employer, directly or indirectly, the state or any

1 political or civil subdivision of the state, and cities, except as follows: ‘Employer’ does not include  
2 a religious association or corporation not organized for private profit.’” *Id.* This claim is brought  
3 pursuant to FEHA, and the corresponding regulations promulgated by the California Department  
4 of Fair Employment and Housing. Defendant regularly and systematically does business in the  
5 State of California and is subject to suit under FEHA in that Defendant regularly employed five  
6 or more persons.

7 217. With respect to discrimination, California Government Code section 12940(a)  
8 provides that it is an unlawful employment practice:

9 For an employer, because of the race, religious creed, color, national origin,  
10 ancestry, physical disability, mental disability, medical condition, genetic  
11 information, marital status, sex, gender, gender identity, gender expression, age,  
12 sexual orientation, or military and veteran status of any person, to refuse to hire or  
13 employ the person or to refuse to select the person for a training program leading  
14 to employment, or to bar or to discharge the person from employment or from a  
15 training program leading to employment, or to discriminate against the person in  
16 compensation or in terms, conditions, or privileges of employment.

17 This is a claim for relief arising from Defendant’s causing, and its failure to prevent,  
18 discrimination and harassment against Plaintiff based on her gender.

19 218. According to California Code of Regulations Title 2, section 11029(b) states:  
20 The purpose of the laws against discrimination and harassment in employment  
21 because of sex is to eliminate the means by which individuals, by virtue of their  
22 sex, gender identity, or gender expression, are treated differently, paid less, treated  
23 adversely based on stereotyping, subjected to conduct of a sexual nature, subjected  
24 to hostile work environments, or made to suffer other forms of adverse action, and  
25 to guarantee that in the future equal employment benefits will be afforded  
26 regardless of the individual's sex

27 219. As alleged above, Plaintiff was entitled to protection under FEHA because Plaintiff  
28 is an employee who has a protected characteristic based on her gender, specifically being female.

219. As alleged above, Plaintiff was entitled to protection under FEHA because Plaintiff  
is an employee who has a protected characteristic.

220. As such, Plaintiff was entitled to FEHA’s protection pursuant to California  
Government Code sections 12940 *et seq.*

221. Defendant was aware that Plaintiff was an employee who has a protected  
characteristic and who engaged in protected activity.

1           223. Pursuant to California Government Code section 12940(a), Defendant was  
2 prohibited from taking any adverse employment action motivated by the fact that an employee  
3 has a protected characteristic.

4           224. At all times mentioned herein, Plaintiff was qualified for the position she held and  
5 was performing competently in the position.

6           225. Defendant's discriminatory and harassing actions against Plaintiff, as alleged  
7 above, including preventing her from being promoted and her ultimate termination of  
8 employment, constituted unlawful discrimination in employment on account of the fact that  
9 Plaintiff was an employee that has a protected characteristic and who engaged in protected  
10 activity, in violation of California Government Code section 12940.

11           226. Plaintiff is informed and believes and, based thereon, alleges that Defendant's  
12 conduct, as described herein, was substantially motivated by the fact that Plaintiff has a protected  
13 characteristic and that she engaged in protected activity.

14           227. As a direct and proximate result of the actions of Defendant, including the  
15 discrimination and harassment against Plaintiff as described herein, Plaintiff has suffered and will  
16 continue to suffer pain and extreme and severe mental anguish and emotional distress. Plaintiff  
17 has further suffered and will continue to suffer a loss of earnings and other employment benefits.  
18 Accordingly, Plaintiff is entitled to general compensatory damages in amounts to be proven at  
19 trial.

20           228. By discriminating against and harassing Plaintiff in violation of Government Code  
21 section 12940, Defendant acted willfully, oppressively, maliciously and with conscious disregard  
22 for Plaintiff's rights, and with the intent to annoy, harass or injure Plaintiff, in violation of  
23 California Civil Code section 3294, such that Plaintiff is entitled to recovery of punitive damages  
24 in an amount according to proof at trial.

25           229. Upon information and belief, one or more of Defendant's managing agents  
26 committed, authorized, or ratified the wrongful conduct. As such, punitive damages are warranted  
27 against Defendant. Plaintiff seeks her attorneys' fees and costs pursuant to California Government  
28 Code section 12965(b).

**TENTH CLAIM**

**RETALIATION**

(Lab. Code §§ 232.5, 1102.5)

*(On behalf of Plaintiff as an individual)*

230. Plaintiff incorporates in this claim each and every allegation of the preceding paragraphs, with the same force and effect as though fully set forth herein.

231. Under California law, there is a fundamental and well-established public policy against discrimination, harassment or retaliation based on the fact that the employee engaged in a protected activity. Said public policy is embodied in FEHA and in Labor Code sections 232.5 (due to disclosure of working conditions), 1102.5 (due to reporting of unlawful activity or refusal to participate in unlawful activity), and other sections of the Labor Code. When an employer’s adverse employment action is motivated by the fact that an employee engaged in protected activity, the adverse employment action is deemed contrary to public policy and legally actionable.

232. California Labor Code section 232.5 provides, “No employer may do any of the following: ... (c) Discharge, formally discipline, or otherwise discriminate against an employee who discloses information about the employer’s working conditions.”

233. Plaintiff alleges she was discriminated against because she disclosed working conditions—i.e., gender discrimination against women—to Sony’s supposed investigator.

234. California Labor Code section 1102.5(b) provides: “An employer, or any person acting on behalf of the employer, shall not retaliate against an employee for disclosing information...to a person with authority over the employee or another employee who has the authority to investigate, discover, or correct the violation or noncompliance...if the employee has reasonable cause to believe that the information discloses a violation of state or federal statute, or a violation of or noncompliance with a local, state, or federal rule or regulation, regardless of whether disclosing the information is part of the employee’s job duties.” Under California law, discharge of an employee perceived to have reported an alleged violation of a statute or regulation violates public policy. Perceived whistleblowers are also protected from retaliatory discharge as

1 are employees who report suspected violations to other employees. *Diego v. Pilgrim United*  
2 *Church of Christ*, 231 Cal. App. 4th 913 (2014).

3 235. Sony violated FEHA because Plaintiff’s termination resulted from discrimination  
4 and as retaliation for speaking up about discrimination. Plaintiff alleges that her termination was  
5 in retaliation for disclosing working conditions, vis-à-vis discrimination against women. Plaintiff  
6 incorporated by reference all prior allegations.

7 236. Section 1102.5(f) provides that “in addition to other penalties, an employer that is  
8 a corporation or limited liability company is liable for a civil penalty not exceeding ten thousand  
9 dollars (\$10,000) for each violation” of Labor Code section 1102.5.

10 237. California Labor Code section 1102.6 provides, “In a civil action or administrative  
11 proceeding brought pursuant to Section 1102.5, once it has been demonstrated by a preponderance  
12 of the evidence that an activity proscribed by Section 1102.5 was a contributing factor in the  
13 alleged prohibited action against the employee, the employer shall have the burden of proof to  
14 demonstrate by clear and convincing evidence that the alleged action would have occurred for  
15 legitimate, independent reasons even if the employee had not engaged in activities protected by  
16 Section 1102.5.”

17 238. Defendant terminated Plaintiff’s employment in violation of public policy.  
18 Defendants retaliated against Plaintiff because Plaintiff reported gender-based discrimination, a  
19 form of protected activity.

20 239. Plaintiff is informed and believes and, based thereon, alleges that Defendant’s  
21 conduct, as described herein, was substantially motivated by Plaintiff’s reporting of the actual  
22 and/or perceived violations described herein.

23 240. The conduct of Defendants described herein above was outrageous and was  
24 executed with malice, fraud and oppression, and with conscious disregard for Plaintiff’s rights,  
25 and further, with the intent, design and purpose of injuring Plaintiff.

26 241. As a proximate result of Defendant’s wrongful acts, Plaintiff has suffered, and  
27 continues to suffer, losses incurred in seeking substitute employment and in earnings, bonuses,  
28 and other employment benefits; and has suffered, and continues to suffer, emotional distress in an



1 amount according to proof at the time of trial.

2 242. Defendant, through its officers, managing agents, and/or their supervisors,  
3 authorized, condoned and/or ratified the unlawful conduct described herein above. By reason  
4 thereof, Plaintiff is entitled to an award of punitive damages in an amount according to proof at  
5 the time of trial, as well as attorneys' fees and costs, pursuant to statute.

6  
7 **PRAYER FOR RELIEF**

8 Wherefore, Plaintiff, on behalf of herself and all others similarly situated including the  
9 Class and the Class, respectfully prays for the following forms of relief against Sony, as follows:

10 1. For penalties, including statutory and civil penalties, pursuant to all provisions of  
11 the Labor Code referenced herein which provide for penalties as a result of the conduct alleged  
12 herein;

13 2. For costs of suit incurred herein and attorneys' fees pursuant to the statutes cited  
14 herein;

15 3. For compensatory damages;

16 4. For general damages in amounts according to proof and in no event in an amount  
17 less than the jurisdictional limit of this court;

18 5. For special damages according to proof;

19 6. For punitive damages where allowed by law;

20 7. For an order certifying this action as a class action;

21 8. For an order appointing Plaintiff Majo as Class representative, and appointing  
22 Plaintiff's counsel as Class counsel;

23 9. For all wages due pursuant to California Labor Code §1197.5(h) in an amount to  
24 be ascertained at trial;

25 10. For liquidated damages pursuant to California Labor Code §1197.5(h);

26 11. For prejudgment interest on unpaid wages at a rate of 10% per annum pursuant to  
27 California Labor Code §1197.5(h) and California Civil Code §§ 3287-3288, and/or any other  
28 applicable provision providing for prejudgment interest;

- 1           12.    For declaratory relief;
- 2           13.    For restitution of all monies due to Plaintiff and Class Members, as well as  
3 disgorgement of Sony’s profits from its unlawful and/or unfair business practices;
- 4           14.    For preliminary and permanent injunctive relief enjoining Sony from violating  
5 California Labor Code §1197.5 *et seq.* by paying its female employees lower wage rates than  
6 those paid to their male counterparts for substantially similar work; and from engaging in the  
7 unfair and unlawful business practices complained of herein;
- 8           15.    For reasonable attorneys’ fees and costs pursuant to California Labor Code  
9 §1197.5(h), California Code of Civil Procedure §1021.5, and/or any other applicable provision  
10 providing for attorneys fees and costs;
- 11           16.    Designation of Plaintiff as the representative of the Class Members;
- 12           17.    A declaratory judgment that the practices complained of therein are unlawful and  
13 violate, among other laws, Cal. Gov. Code § 12940 *et seq.*; Cal. Gov. Code § 12945.2; Cal. Labor  
14 Code section 1197.5 *et seq.*; and Cal. Bus. & Prof. Code § 17200 *et seq.*;
- 15           18.    A permanent injunction against Sony and its partners, officers, owners, agents,  
16 successors, employees, representatives and any and all persons acting in concert with them, from  
17 engaging in any further unlawful practices, policies, customs and usages set forth therein;
- 18           19.    An Order requiring Sony to initiate and implement programs that (i) remedy the  
19 hostile work environment at Sony; (ii) ensure prompt, remedial action regarding all claims of  
20 gender discrimination; and (iii) eliminate the continuing effects of the discrimination and  
21 retaliatory practices described therein;
- 22           20.    An Order requiring Sony to initiate and implement systems for compensating  
23 female employees in a non-discriminatory manner;
- 24           21.    An Order directing Sony to adjust the compensation for Plaintiff and the Class  
25 Members to the level that they would be enjoying but for Sony’s discriminatory policies,  
26 practices, and procedures;
- 27           22.    An award of back pay, front pay, lost benefits, preferential rights to jobs, and other  
28 damages for lost compensation and job benefits suffered by the Plaintiffs, and Class Members;

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

- 23. An award of nominal damages to Plaintiff and Class Members; and
- 24. For such other and further relief as this Court deems just and proper.

**DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL**

Plaintiff hereby demands a trial by jury of all issues triable of right to a jury.

Respectfully submitted,

**ILG Legal Office, P.C.**

DATED: May 19, 2022



\_\_\_\_\_  
Stephen Noel Ilg

Attorneys for Plaintiff and the Plaintiff Class