

CHARGE OF DISCRIMINATION <small>This form is affected by the Privacy Act of 1974. See enclosed Privacy Act Statement and other information before completing this form.</small>		Charge Presented to: Agency(ies) Charge No(s): _____ FEPA <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> EEOC	
_____ and EEOC <small>State or local Agency, if any</small>			
Name (indicate Mr. Ms. Mrs.) <div style="text-align: center; font-weight: bold;">Glinda Cho</div>		Home Phone (Incl. Area Code) <div style="text-align: center;">[REDACTED]</div>	
Date of Birth <div style="text-align: center;">[REDACTED]</div>			
Street Address <div style="text-align: center;">[REDACTED]</div>		City, State and ZIP Code <div style="text-align: center;">[REDACTED]</div>	
Named is the Employer, Labor Organization, Employment Agency, Apprenticeship Committee, or State or Local Government Agency That I believe Discriminated Against Me or Others. (If more than two, list under PARTICULARS below.)			
Name <div style="text-align: center; font-weight: bold;">Tourneau Bucherer</div>		No. Employees, Members <div style="text-align: center; font-weight: bold;">500+</div>	
Phone No. (Include Area Code) <div style="text-align: center; font-weight: bold;">212-758-7300</div>			
Street Address <div style="text-align: center; font-weight: bold;">80 State Street,</div>		City, State and ZIP Code <div style="text-align: center; font-weight: bold;">Albany, NY, 12207-2543</div>	
DISCRIMINATION BASED ON (Check appropriate box(es).) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> RACE <input type="checkbox"/> COLOR <input type="checkbox"/> SEX <input type="checkbox"/> RELIGION <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> NATIONAL ORIGIN <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> RETALIATION <input type="checkbox"/> AGE <input type="checkbox"/> DISABILITY <input type="checkbox"/> OTHER (Specify below.)		DATE(S) DISCRIMINATION TOOK PLACE <div style="display: flex; justify-content: space-between;"> <div> Earliest (ADEA/EPA) 09/01/2024 </div> <div> Latest (All) 01/13/2025 </div> </div> <input type="checkbox"/> CONTINUING ACTION	
THE PARTICULARS ARE (If additional paper is needed, attached extra sheet(s)): <div style="font-weight: bold; margin-top: 5px;">Please see the attached Narrative Statement of Facts.</div>			
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> I want this charge filed with both the EEOC and the State or local Agency, if any. I will advise the agencies if I change my address or phone number and I will cooperate fully with them in the processing of my charge in accordance with their procedures.		NOTARY – When necessary for State and Local Agency Requirements	
I declare under penalty of perjury that the above is true and correct. <div style="display: flex; justify-content: space-between; margin-top: 20px;"> <div> <u>01/16/2025</u> Date </div> <div> <div style="text-align: center;">[REDACTED]</div> Charging Party Signature </div> </div>		I swear or affirm that I have read the above charge and that it is true to the best of my knowledge, information and belief. <div style="display: flex; justify-content: space-between; margin-top: 20px;"> <div> <div style="text-align: center;">[REDACTED]</div> SIGNATURE OF COMPLAINANT SUBSCRIBED AND SWORN TO BEFORE ME THIS DATE <u>January, 16 2025</u> (month, day, year) </div> </div>	

**EQUAL EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITY COMMISSION
NEW YORK DISTRICT OFFICE**

-----X

MA GLINDA CHO,

Claimant,

**EEOC CHARGE
OF DISCRIMINATION:
NARRATIVE STATEMENT**

-against-

TOURNEAU BUCHERER,

Respondent.

-----X

Claimant Ma Glinda Cho hereby alleges the following against Respondent Tourneau Bucherer (“Tourneau” or the “Company”) in support of her claims of race and national origin and unlawful retaliation:

NARRATIVE STATEMENT OF MATERIAL FACTS

Preliminaries

1. At all times relevant hereto, Charging Party Ma Glinda Cho is a resident of the State of New York and County of Westchester.
2. Ms. Cho is a Filipino woman.
3. At all times relevant hereto, Tourneau Bucherer (“Tourneau” or the “Company”) was and is a Foreign Limited Liability Company maintaining its principal place of business at 80 State Street, Albany, NY 12207.
4. Upon information and belief, Respondent Tourneau employs approximately 500 individuals on a full-time or full-time equivalent basis and thus is subject to all statutes upon which Charging Party is proceeding herein.

5. At all times relevant hereto, Ms. Cho was an employee of Respondent Tourneau.
6. Upon information and belief, Glinda Cho was an employee of Tourneau.
7. At all times relevant hereto, Angelina Petrova held the title Store Director, and, as such, had the ability to affect the terms and conditions of Ms. Cho 's employment.

MATERIAL FACTS

I. Ms. Cho is Hired by Tourneau

1. Ms. Cho commenced her role as Assistant Store Director at Tourneau's Westchester location (the "Store") on February 2, 2024.

2. In this capacity, she oversaw operations for a \$12 million luxury retail store, demonstrating exceptional leadership and strategic acumen. Her accomplishments included driving double-digit growth, implementing innovative client development initiatives, and fostering a team culture dedicated to delivering outstanding customer experiences.

3. Ms. Cho excelled in her position, earning consistent praise and positive feedback from the then-Store Director, Ernst Bien-Aime, for her exemplary performance and contributions to the store's success.

4. In March 2024, following the termination of two management personnel and one associate, Ms. Cho seized the opportunity to apply for the Store Director position, confident that her proven success and dedication had prepared her for the role.

5. In April 2024, her efforts were recognized when Mathieu Villot, Senior Vice President of Retail, appointed her as Interim Store Director.

6. This appointment gave Ms. Cho hope that the Company valued her contributions and viewed her as a strong candidate for the permanent Store Director role, marking what she believed was a pivotal step toward achieving her career aspirations.

7. On June 5, 2024, five months after applying for the Store Director position and four months of serving as Interim Store Director, Ms. Cho followed up with Mr. Villot to inquire about the status of her candidacy.

8. Rather than addressing her concerns directly, Mr. Villot dismissed her inquiry, instructing her to focus on filling open Associate positions at the Store before any further discussion about her application.

9. Despite this, he commended Ms. Cho for her accomplishments in the Interim Store Director role and encouraged her to maintain her strong performance to further bolster her candidacy.

10. Ms. Cho took his words as both recognition of her success and a call to continue proving herself, despite the growing delay and lack of clear guidance.

11. In the months that followed, Ms. Cho continued to thrive as Interim Store Director, consistently meeting and exceeding the Store's monthly and quarterly performance goals.

12. Her leadership and strategic efforts ensured the Store's ongoing success, earning recognition during Mr. Villot's visits.

13. Each time, he complimented the Store's performance, a testament to Ms. Cho's unwavering commitment and ability to deliver exceptional results despite the uncertainty surrounding her candidacy for the permanent Store Director role.

II. Ms. Cho is Passed Up for a Promotion and the New Store Director Discriminates Against Her

14. Despite Ms. Cho's unwavering efforts to prove herself as a capable leader, on August 26, 2024, she was informed by Mr. Villot that the Company had decided to hire a permanent Store Director.

15. The position, for which Ms. Cho had worked tirelessly and demonstrated her qualifications over several months, was given to an external candidate, Angelina Petrova.

16. This decision came as a significant disappointment to Ms. Cho, who had dedicated herself to excelling as Interim Store Director, consistently achieving and surpassing goals for the Store.

17. In her very first week as Store Director, Angelina Petrova began targeting Ms. Cho with discriminatory and condescending behavior, setting the tone for a hostile work environment.

18. On September 18, 2024, Ms. Petrova conducted a store inspection and instructed Ms. Cho and Boutique Manager Jeremy Vega to follow her throughout the walkthrough.

19. During this inspection, Ms. Petrova made disparaging remarks about the store's cleanliness, speaking in a noticeably condescending and demeaning tone.

20. Her comments were unwarranted and created an atmosphere of discomfort and tension for Ms. Cho and Mr. Vega.

21. Later that same day, Ms. Petrova called Ms. Cho and Mr. Vega into the back office, where her dismissive attitude escalated.

22. She chastised Mr. Vega for not meeting her for lunch on her first day, despite his explanation that he had a pre-scheduled meeting with a national director from the Omega brand.

23. Ms. Petrova dismissed his explanation and labeled his actions as "unacceptable," her tone continuing to exude hostility.

24. Turning her attention to Ms. Cho, Ms. Petrova questioned her past performance, despite Ms. Cho's proven track record of success. When Ms. Cho tried to defend her efforts, stating, "I worked really hard in the past several months," Ms. Petrova sarcastically retorted, "Did you?" in a belittling tone. The situation grew so tense that Mr. Vega had to intervene to diffuse the conversation.

25. These incidents set the stage for the ongoing hostility Ms. Cho would face at the hands of Ms. Petrova, marking the beginning of a pattern of discriminatory and demeaning behavior.

26. On September 30, 2024, Ms. Petrova's discriminatory actions escalated significantly during a meeting in her office, where she explicitly instructed Ms. Cho not to speak in her native language, Tagalog.

27. When Ms. Cho respectfully inquired if there had been any concerns raised about her use of multiple languages, or if any colleagues had reported an issue, Ms. Petrova dismissively responded, "No issue. In a professional setting we should speak the common language which is English," using an intimidating tone.

28. This directive was not only unnecessary but targeted, as Ms. Cho only spoke Tagalog in the back office or when assisting clients who specifically requested translations.

29. Her professionalism and ability to communicate effectively with both colleagues and customers were weaponized against her in an act that left her feeling demeaned and singled out.

30. Adding to the discriminatory nature of the interaction, Ms. Cho highlighted that other team members regularly spoke in other languages, such as Spanish, without consequence.

31. Ms. Petrova brushed off this fact, stating, “I did not observe it, so it does not matter,” making it clear that her actions were selectively aimed at Ms. Cho. Later that same day, Ms. Petrova extended her discriminatory behavior by instructing another employee, Rosario Pinto, a 79-year-old cash office manager with 17 years of service at the Company, not to speak in her native language. This left Ms. Pinto feeling intimidated and deeply offended.

32. These actions were not only unjustified but indicative of a deliberate and pervasive attempt by Ms. Petrova to create an environment of hostility and exclusion.

33. By targeting Ms. Cho and Ms. Pinto based on their use of native languages, Ms. Petrova demonstrated a blatant disregard for inclusivity and respect, fostering a workplace climate marked by intimidation and discrimination.

34. These events further solidified the ongoing hostility Ms. Cho faced under Ms. Petrova’s leadership.

III. Ms. Cho Makes a Protected Complaint to HR and Subsequently Faces Retaliation

35. On October 11, 2024, Ms. Cho formally submitted a harassment and discrimination complaint to Human Resources (“HR”), detailing the hostile and discriminatory actions she had endured under Ms. Petrova’s leadership.

36. Despite taking this step to address the ongoing mistreatment, the retaliation against Ms. Cho continued. On October 12, 2024, Ms. Cho sent an email to Ms. Petrova, transparently

outlining a transaction error that had occurred during store operations, which Ms. Petrova initially acknowledged without issue.

37. However, while Ms. Cho was on vacation, she received a response in the same email thread in which Ms. Petrova wrongfully accused her of actions that did not occur and baselessly claimed that Ms. Cho had been dishonest.

38. This unfounded accusation not only added to the hostility Ms. Cho faced but also served as another attempt by Ms. Petrova to undermine her credibility.

39. On October 28, 2024, Ms. Cho met with Laura Mundell, the Director of HR, to discuss her harassment and discrimination complaint, as well as the false accusations made by Ms. Petrova.

40. Rather than addressing the core issues, Ms. Mundell minimized Ms. Petrova's behavior, suggesting that it was merely a reflection of her "different management style" and "different ways of communicating."

41. Ms. Mundell refused to acknowledge the discriminatory and harassing nature of Ms. Petrova's actions, instead framing the situation as an "opportunity" for improved communication.

42. Frustrated but undeterred, Ms. Cho sought clarification directly from Ms. Petrova on October 31, 2024, regarding the wrongful accusations.

43. Rather than engaging in a meaningful discussion, Ms. Petrova dismissed Ms. Cho's concerns entirely, patronizingly instructing her to "not use big words" when she referred to the accusations as wrongful.

44. These interactions further exemplified the discriminatory, retaliatory, and dismissive treatment Ms. Cho faced, both from her direct supervisor and the HR department that was supposed to protect her.

45. On November 1, 2024, Ms. Cho emailed Mr. Villot and HR to report concerns about declining team morale, which had been communicated to her by multiple store Associates.

46. A few hours later, Mr. Villot contacted Ms. Cho, requesting a meeting at the Company's headquarters in New York City to discuss her email.

47. On November 4, 2024, Ms. Cho attended the meeting with the hope of addressing the workplace issues she had raised, including the pervasive discrimination and harassment she was experiencing.

48. At the outset of the meeting, Mr. Villot invited Ms. Cho to share her concerns. She explained that during her recent absence, team morale had noticeably declined, as reported by three employees.

49. She also recounted a specific incident where she had attempted to collaborate with Ms. Petrova to address the issue of team morale, only to be met with sarcasm.

50. Ms. Cho described suggesting that all team members receive equal attention during status update meetings, to which Ms. Petrova sarcastically replied, "You can close the door too." Ms. Cho highlighted how such behavior was unprofessional and contrary to the Company's values.

51. Ms. Cho then reiterated her broader concerns, including the insults, discrimination, intimidation, and wrongful accusations she had endured in just three weeks under Ms. Petrova's leadership.

52. While Mr. Villot acknowledged that some of her points were “valid,” he attempted to dismiss her experiences by suggesting they were a matter of “perception.”

53. He used an unrelated and hypothetical scenario—working in an environment where everyone spoke French—as an attempt to downplay the discriminatory language directive imposed by Ms. Petrova.

54. When Ms. Cho challenged the relevance of this analogy, Mr. Villot emphasized that Ms. Petrova had the authority to manage as she saw fit and accused Ms. Cho of “taking it personally.”

55. As a result of the foregoing, Ms. Cho has been unlawfully discriminated and retaliated against, humiliated, and degraded, and thus has suffered loss of rights, emotional distress, as well as loss of income and earnings.

56. The conversation then took an abrupt and unsettling turn when Mr. Villot shifted focus to question Ms. Cho’s management of timecards—a practice she had handled since joining the company without prior issue.

57. Ms. Cho explained that she had received no indication that her role in managing timecards had changed under Ms. Petrova.

58. Nonetheless, Mr. Villot deemed it “unprofessional” and threatened HR involvement. He did not ask further questions about the harassment or discrimination concerns Ms. Cho raised, instead appearing to use the timecard issue as a pretext to intimidate her.

59. This meeting underscored the dismissive and retaliatory approach Ms. Cho faced from senior leadership when attempting to address legitimate workplace concerns.

60. As a result of the ongoing discrimination, harassment, and retaliation that Ms. Cho has endured under Ms. Petrova's leadership—compounded by the inaction of HR and Mr. Villot—her mental and physical well-being have significantly deteriorated.

61. Ms. Cho now suffers from severe depressive disorder, a condition that has profoundly impacted her quality of life and ability to function.

62. The persistent hostility and lack of support from the Company have left Ms. Cho feeling devalued and powerless, undermining the resilience and determination that have defined her career.

63. For Ms. Cho, the toll is particularly devastating given her journey. She immigrated to the United States from the Philippines in November 2016, seeking to build a better life through hard work and determination.

64. From her early days in retail to her rise to Assistant Store Director of a \$12 million luxury retail operation, Ms. Cho demonstrated an unrelenting commitment to excellence and a belief in the promise of opportunity.

65. Yet, instead of being recognized for her achievements, she was met with hostility, exclusion, and retaliation, eroding the sense of hope and belonging she had worked so hard to cultivate.

66. Despite Charging Party's determination to remain optimistic about and committed to her career at Tourneau, the ruthless discrimination and retaliation she has suffered at her workplace has rendered her distraught and crestfallen. Indeed, Charging Party's emotional distress is cognizable given the reality that the Company has allowed Ms. Petrova to openly express her discriminatory remarks towards Charging Party without repercussion, while ignoring its obligations to seriously investigate Charging Party's complaints of discrimination, and instead, terminating her employment

for no valid reason. Instead of disciplining her harasser, Tourneau retaliated against Charging Party. Due to her unlawful termination from the Company and the discrimination, harassment, and retaliation she has endured, Charging Party now suffers from severe depressive disorder, a condition that has profoundly impacted her quality of life and ability to function.

67. Charging Party's unwavering determination to pursue a career in luxury sales has been shattered by the relentless discrimination and subsequent retaliation she endured at Tourneau.

68. The emotional toll inflicted upon her is evident, leaving her distraught and deeply disheartened.

69. It is undeniably clear that Tourneau not only permitted but actively cultivated a discriminatory and hostile work environment, disregarding its obligations to thoroughly investigate and act in response to Charging Party's complaints of discrimination.

70. Moreover, the Tourneau repeatedly retaliated against Charging Party, culminating in her unjust firing simply for having the courage to speak out against the discrimination she faced.

71. Tourneau's complete failure to foster a fair and inclusive workplace has had a severe impact on Charging Party's well-being and outlook on her career.

72. As a result, Charging Party prays that the EEOC thoroughly investigate her claims and return a finding of probable cause that she has been subjected to race-based (Asian) and ethnicity (Filipino) based discrimination and retaliation in violation of Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, as codified, 42 U.S.C. §§ 2000e to 2000e-17 (amended in 1972, 1978 and by the Civil Rights Act of 1991, Pub. L. No. 102-166 ("Title VII") and Section 1981 of the Civil Rights Act of 1866, 42 U.S.C. § 1981 ("§ 1981").