

<p>CHARGE OF DISCRIMINATION</p> <p><small>This form is affected by the Privacy Act of 1974. See enclosed Privacy Act Statement and other information before completing this form.</small></p>	<p>Charge Presented to: Agency(ies) Charge No(s):</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> FEPA <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> EEOC</p>
--	---

_____ **California Civil Rights Department** _____ and EEOC
State or local Agency, if any

Name (indicate Mr. Ms. Mrs.) [REDACTED]	Home Phone (Incl. Area Code) [REDACTED]	Date of Birth [REDACTED]
--	--	-----------------------------

Street Address _____ City, State and ZIP Code _____
[REDACTED]

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 Loyalkaspar	No. Employees, Members 20+	Phone No. (Include Area Code) (212) 343-1037
----------------------------	-------------------------------	---

Street Address _____ City, State and ZIP Code _____
93 Pearl Street, 3rd Floor, New York, NY 10004

Name	No. Employees, Members	Phone No. (Include Area Code)
------	------------------------	-------------------------------

Street Address _____ City, State and ZIP Code _____

Name	No. Employees, Members	Phone No. (Include Area Code)
------	------------------------	-------------------------------

Street Address _____ City, State and ZIP Code _____

<p>DISCRIMINATION BASED ON (Check appropriate box(es).)</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> RACE <input type="checkbox"/> COLOR <input type="checkbox"/> SEX <input type="checkbox"/> RELIGION <input type="checkbox"/> NATIONAL ORIGIN</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> RETALIATION <input type="checkbox"/> AGE <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> DISABILITY <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> OTHER (Specify below.)</p>	<p>DATE(S) DISCRIMINATION TOOK PLACE</p> <table style="width:100%;"> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">Earliest (ADEA/EPA)</td> <td style="text-align: center;">Latest (All)</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">02/01/2025</td> <td style="text-align: center;">06/11/2025</td> </tr> <tr> <td colspan="2" style="text-align: center;"><input type="checkbox"/> CONTINUING ACTION</td> </tr> </table>	Earliest (ADEA/EPA)	Latest (All)	02/01/2025	06/11/2025	<input type="checkbox"/> CONTINUING ACTION	
Earliest (ADEA/EPA)	Latest (All)						
02/01/2025	06/11/2025						
<input type="checkbox"/> CONTINUING ACTION							

THE PARTICULARS ARE (If additional paper is needed, attached extra sheet(s)):

Please see the narrative statement of facts below.

<p><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.</p>	<p>NOTARY – When necessary for State and Local Agency Requirements</p>
--	--

<p>I declare under penalty of perjury that the above is true and correct.</p> <p>Nov 25, 2025 _____ Date Charging Party Signature</p>	<p>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.</p> <p>SIGNATURE OF COMPLAINANT [REDACTED]</p> <p>SUBSCRIBED AND SWORN TO BEFORE ME THIS DATE (month, day, year) Nov 25, 2025</p>
---	---

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

-----X

██████████,

Claimant,

-against-

LOYALKASPAR.

Respondent.

-----X

**EEOC CHARGE
OF DISCRIMINATION:
NARRATIVE STATEMENT**

Charging Party ██████████ hereby alleges the following against Loyalkaspar (“Loyalkaspar” or the “Company”) in support of her claims of discrimination, harassment, and retaliation based on disability (chronic neck pain and anxiety) in violation of the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990, as amended, 42 U.S.C. §§ 12101 et seq. (“ADA”); Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973, 29 U.S.C. § 794; the Family and Medical Leave Act of 1993, 29 U.S.C. §§ 2601 et seq. (“FMLA”); the New York State Human Rights Law, New York State Executive Law, §§ 296 et seq. (“NYSHRL”); the New York City Human Rights Law, NYC Administrative Code §§ 8-107, et seq. (“NYCHRL”); and the California Fair Employment and Housing Act, Gov. Code, §12940, *et seq.* (“FEHA”), as codified, 42 U.S.C. §§ 2000e to 2000e-17, the compendium of which gives rise to compensatory damages based on lost wages and emotional distress, as well as punitive damages, interest, attorneys' fees, and legal costs.

NARRATIVE STATEMENT OF MATERIAL FACTS

Preliminaries

1. At all times relevant hereto, Charging Party ██████████ (“Charging Party”) was a resident of the State of California and Los Angeles County.

2. At all times relevant hereto, Respondent Loyalkaspar is a privately held corporation with its headquarters at 93 Pearl Street, 3rd Floor, New York, NY 10004, which maintained operations where Charging Party provided services remotely from California.

3. Upon information and belief, Respondent employs approximately 20+ employees on a full-time or full-time equivalent basis and thus is subject to the statutes upon which Charging Party is proceeding herein.

Material Facts

I. Charging Party's Distinguished Career in Photography and Production

4. Charging Party brought extensive and impressive professional experience to Loyalkaspar, having worked as a photographer and director for over 16 years and in production roles for more than 5 years. Her distinguished career includes work with major clients such as Adidas, eBay, Netflix, Apple, Sony Music, Rolling Stone, and Neiman Marcus. As a lead photographer and director, Charging Party demonstrated exceptional leadership skills by managing teams of 3 to 50+ crew members, negotiating rates and budget allocations for projects up to \$200,000, and maintaining direct communication with clients and agencies to achieve project goals.

5. From 2008 to present, Charging Party operated as a self-employed photographer and director, building relationships with prestigious commercial and editorial clients across the entertainment, fashion, and technology industries. Her freelance production work since 2019 encompassed equipment rental and transportation, craft services, talent management, crew bookings and onboarding, securing permits, payment coordination, and team management for various high-profile projects.

6. Charging Party's technical expertise as a digitech since 2018 involved live, on-set duties including image intake and organization, creating naming conventions, retouching and color correction, file exports, and direct client interaction for image presentation with celebrity talent and major brand executives. This role required fast-paced management of thousands of images of various sizes without delay, demonstrating her ability to perform under pressure while maintaining the highest professional standards.

7. Charging Party's educational background includes an Associates of Liberal Arts degree from Collin College in Plano, Texas, which she completed in 2014. Her extensive experience in managing high-stakes commercial photography projects, combined with her proven ability to work with Fortune 500 companies and major entertainment brands, made Charging Party exceptionally qualified for her role at Loyalkaspar.

8. Charging Party joined Loyalkaspar in 2023 as a Production Coordinator and Associate Producer, where she served as an assistant to the producers, executive producers, and owners of the company. She designed freelance outreach and tracking systems, organized files, booked freelancers, handled onboarding paperwork, and delivered or assisted in the delivery of projects for major clients including Macy's, Disney, Starz, CNN, Youth Impact Council, and NFL.

II. Charging Party Requests Reasonable Accommodations for her Disabilities, But Instead of Loyalkaspar Engaging in Any Interactive Process as Required, Charging Party is Instead Subjected to a Hostile Work Environment

9. The workplace discrimination and harassment that ultimately led to Charging Party's wrongful termination began in February 2025, immediately after Owner David Herbruck and Executive Producer/Managing Director Scott Lakso learned of her disability-related needs. During this time, Charging Party experienced flare-ups of her chronic neck pain condition and anxiety episodes, conditions that she had been managing with medical treatment, including

prescription antidepressant medication (Wellbutrin/bupropion). Charging Party's chronic neck pain and anxiety disorders substantially limited major life activities and required her to manage her work responsibilities in conjunction with her medical needs.

10. Charging Party directly communicated with Mr. Herbruck and Mr. Lakso about her medical limitations and need for reasonable accommodations related to both her chronic neck pain and anxiety conditions, including ergonomic workspace adjustments, flexible work arrangements to manage pain flare-ups, and modifications to reduce workplace stress that could trigger anxiety episodes. Both her chronic neck pain and anxiety conditions qualified as serious health conditions under the FMLA, entitling her to job-protected leave when necessary for medical treatment and management of her conditions. However, Mr. Herbruck and Mr. Lakso failed to inform Charging Party that she may be eligible for FMLA leave or provide her with the required FMLA notices and information about her rights under the Act. They also failed to engage in the required interactive process under the ADA and failed to provide the requested accommodations.

11. Senior Producer Shannon Hall, who held significant influence over Charging Party's work environment, learned of Charging Party's disabilities through these accommodation requests and workplace communications. Rather than showing understanding or support for a colleague dealing with medical conditions, Ms. Hall immediately targeted Charging Party with hostile and discriminatory behavior specifically designed to make her work environment more difficult and stressful, thereby exacerbating both her chronic neck pain and anxiety conditions.

12. On February 4, 2025, despite being told she was receiving a "promotion" in that her title was changing and her job responsibilities were increasing, Mr. Herbruck denied Charging Party the corresponding salary increase that should have accompanied such an advancement. When Charging Party requested a discussion about this alleged promotion and whether her compensation

would increase commensurate with her job responsibilities, he told her the matter would be addressed "when more jobs come in" - an indefinite postponement that demonstrated their lack of good faith regarding her career advancement, particularly troubling given her recent disclosure of her disability status.

13. Ms. Hall's harassment of Charging Party also escalated significantly, manifesting in various forms of workplace abuse that appeared to target Charging Party's disability and need for accommodations. The harassment included public humiliation and professional sabotage, where Ms. Hall publicly corrected Charging Party using aggressive language in group Slack channels, undermining her professional reputation. On one occasion, Ms. Hall stated, "word, yeah you should always have the fonts to QC" when Charging Party made an innocent comment about not being able to properly proofread without having fonts installed, deliberately making Charging Party appear incompetent in front of colleagues. Ms. Hall's public humiliation tactics also included calling Charging Party's work "painful or difficult to look at" during a public meeting, creating professional embarrassment in front of other team members. In another particularly egregious example, Ms. Hall publicly criticized Charging Party's work quality, stating "can you do a much more detailed pass? I found a lot of typos, missed punctuations and formatting things...just need a final detailed pass since I had to correct a lot, it wasn't final for me."

14. Ms. Hall's misconduct also included excessive micromanagement and control, as she exceeded her authority by unilaterally changing Charging Party's job responsibilities without proper approval and demanding excessive oversight of Charging Party's schedule. In one instance, Ms. Hall stated, "Yeah, lemme know when it's good to go, please. I didn't see a hard out or anything on your calendar," when Charging Party mentioned leaving for a haircut appointment, demonstrating inappropriate monitoring of Charging Party's personal time and calendar. Ms. Hall's

boundary violations became so extreme that Ms. Hall forced Charging Party to work 14 minutes in overtime and inappropriately monitored her personal appointments. Mr. Lakso, commenting on Ms. Hall's expectations, asked "did you know she was expecting you to QC a deck at 6:45pm?" when Charging Party was at a personal appointment.

15. Ms. Hall's behavior created an atmosphere where Charging Party felt isolated and scrutinized, creating a hostile work environment that particularly impacted Charging Party's ability to manage her work in conjunction with her medical needs. As documented in Slack messages, Charging Party stated, "yeah I felt myself isolate a little more again this week. don't want that!" and "I have wanted to keep everything as professional as possible" in response to Ms. Hall's conduct. Charging Party also expressed feeling "disrespected" and stated she felt like she was "out here on an island, being ignored when I ask people to watch a video."

16. Ms. Hall's inappropriate prioritization of her own needs over legitimate business requirements was further demonstrated when she unilaterally moved a scheduled call to a different day at the last minute. When Charging Party requested to maintain the original meeting time because she needed to catch up on tasks for their superiors, Ms. Hall insisted that her thoughts and schedule were the priority, showing a complete disregard for the company's operational needs and Charging Party's legitimate work responsibilities.

17. The harassment created such a toxic work environment that Charging Party's disability-related symptoms worsened due to the stress and hostile treatment. By February 19, 2025, Charging Party felt compelled to formally report Ms. Hall's behavior to management, specifically reaching out to Mr. Herbruck and Mr. Lakso via a detailed email complaint. In her email, Charging Party articulated the serious nature of Ms. Hall's conduct and specifically requested privacy and asked management to observe Ms. Hall's behaviors firsthand.

III. Management Acknowledges the Harassment but Fails to Take Meaningful Action

18. Rather than taking swift corrective action, Mr. Herbruck and Mr. Lakso provided inadequate responses to Charging Party's complaints and ultimately enabled the harassment to continue. Shockingly, both Mr. Herbruck and Mr. Lakso knew about Ms. Hall's behavior and actively participated in discussions that acknowledged the harassment while failing to implement meaningful remedial measures.

19. Mr. Lakso acknowledged Ms. Hall's problematic behavior on multiple occasions in documented Slack communications. On February 21, 2025, Mr. Lakso acknowledged Ms. Hall's "pretty chilly attitude" and noted her concerning behaviors. On February 25, 2025, Mr. Lakso again recognized Ms. Hall's inappropriate conduct, specifically noting that she had publicly insulted Charging Party's work and improperly changed Charging Party's responsibilities. Mr. Lakso even stated that "from experience, any time an employee has tried to sabotage or mess with a colleague, it has never ended well for them. She needs to be careful with how she interacts with you, because **we're not ok with abuse.**"

20. The situation deteriorated further as Mr. Lakso himself experienced conflict with Ms. Hall similar to what Charging Party had been enduring. On March 13, 2025, he explicitly characterized Ms. Hall's behavior as "harassment" and stated he would escalate the matter up the chain of command. On March 19, 2025, Mr. Lakso discussed Ms. Hall's behavior in detail, explaining that there was clear "manipulation" taking place.

21. Most significantly, on March 21, 2025, Mr. Lakso made several critical admissions in Slack messages that demonstrate his full awareness of the illegal conduct. Mr. Lakso acknowledged that Ms. Hall was "on a power trip" and explicitly stated that "**intimidation has a chilling effect on purpose**" and that "**the fear is the point.**" He warned that if Ms. Hall retaliated

against Charging Party after being spoken to, "she'll be fired immediately." Mr. Lakso noted that Ms. Hall's behavior was now affecting four employees total, demonstrating the widespread impact of her misconduct. He explicitly told Charging Party that **"leading through fear, guilt and intimidation is NOT LEADERSHIP"** and called it **"dictatorship."**

22. In a particularly shocking exchange on March 21, 2025, Mr. Lakso made the following definitive statement: "to be completely honest, if we have a talk with her and she turns around and takes it out on you she'll be fired immediately. we don't fuck around with that." This statement proves that Mr. Lakso knew Ms. Hall's conduct warranted termination, yet he and Mr. Herbruck deliberately chose not to take action. Instead, they allowed the harassment to continue while making empty promises to Charging Party.

23. The Slack communications reveal numerous additional instances where Mr. Lakso acknowledged the harassment but failed to act. On the same day, March 21, 2025, Ms. Hall's boundary violations reached their most extreme point when she forced Charging Party to work "14 MINUTES OF OVERTIME" and inappropriately monitored her personal appointments, asking "did you know she was expecting you to QC a deck at 6[:45 p.m.]?" when Charging Party was at a haircut appointment. When Charging Party expressed frustration about this treatment, Mr. Lakso acknowledged Ms. Hall "has no work boundaries." Throughout March 2025, when Charging Party mentioned feeling "disrespected" and like she was "out here on an island, being ignored," Mr. Lakso acknowledged the problem but took no corrective action.

24. Mr. Lakso assured Charging Party that "none of this is my fault" and repeatedly promised corrective action. However, despite Mr. Lakso's explicit acknowledgments of harassment and threats of termination for Ms. Hall made on March 21, 2025, neither he nor Mr. Herbruck took any meaningful disciplinary action against Ms. Hall.

IV. Charging Party Engages in Protected Activity and is Retaliated Against, Culminating in Her Termination

25. By April 1, 2025, it became clear that despite management's acknowledgment of the harassment and explicit promises of corrective action, no conversation had taken place with Ms. Hall. When Charging Party inquired about this, Mr. Lakso even admitted that no action had been taken. Charging Party continued to document Ms. Hall's inappropriate behavior, including unnecessary corrections and aggressive language in group communications.

26. The Company's discriminatory intentions then became apparent during direct message conversations on April 1, 2025, between Charging Party and Mr. Herbruck. Rather than addressing Ms. Hall's well-documented misconduct or Charging Party's disability-related needs, Mr. Herbruck made victim-blaming statements. He asked Charging Party if she had "kick[ed] [Shannon's] dog or something?" and "[Did you] steal her man?" - suggesting that Charging Party must have provoked Ms. Hall's harassment. When Charging Party explained that "[s]omething I said was misinterpreted and she threatened my job security," Mr. Herbruck stated he was "starting to question her," but crucially noted that Charging Party was "stuck in limbo" because "it is clear she doesn't want to work with [you] anymore."

27. In the same April 1, 2025, conversation, Mr. Herbruck made the definitive statement that would later prove the discriminatory basis for termination: "[I] know, but now because of this relationship[,] you are stuck in limbo, just resourcing, which isn't a [full-time] job anyway." This statement shows that management had already decided to marginalize Charging Party rather than address Ms. Hall's misconduct.

28. On April 2, 2025, during a scheduled call with both Mr. Herbruck and Mr. Lakso about Charging Party's future, the Company's discriminatory intent became fully apparent. Mr. Herbruck made several appalling statements, including dismissing Charging Party's chronic neck

pain and anxiety conditions as "irrelevant" and telling her to "*suck it up*." Mr. Herbruck callously stated he "*isn't our therapist*" when Charging Party attempted to explain how the hostile work environment was exacerbating her medical conditions and affecting her ability to manage her anxiety symptoms.

29. Mr. Herbruck then explicitly declared that the dynamic between Ms. Hall and her cannot continue. It's clear Ms. Hall doesn't want to work with her, and we're a small company, so that can't continue to go on. One of you will have to go, and I can't replace Ms. Hall. This statement reveals the Company's clear preference for the documented harasser over Charging Party.

30. Following this meeting, rather than correcting Ms. Hall's behavior, the harassment continued in more subtle forms. Ms. Hall minimized interactions with Charging Party and removed her from projects that were within Charging Party's job description, further isolating her. The harassment had become so pervasive that Charging Party expressed feeling "disrespected" and stated she felt like she was "out here on an island, being ignored when I ask people to watch a video see I can do it too."

31. On June 9, 2025, just two days before scheduling Charging Party's termination meeting, Mr. Herbruck made several telling statements in Slack messages that directly contradict the later claim that the position was eliminated due to moving east. He stated: "[B]ut [I] need someone in your position here in NY because [I'm] trying to do my job AND pack up this office and [I'm] losing my fucking mind" and "it has just made it painfully obvious to me that [I] need a local coordinator who can help both with projects but also with office and ops stuff." These June 9, 2025, statements show that Mr. Herbruck recognized the need for someone in Charging Party's exact position in New York.

32. On June 11, 2025, Mr. Herbruck contacted Charging Party to schedule a meeting to terminate her, citing the company's decision to change her position from remote work to requiring in-person presence in New York City as the cause for her termination. However, this explanation was immediately revealed to be pretextual when Charging Party inquired whether she could keep her job if she relocated from Los Angeles to New York City to work in-person. Mr. Herbruck explicitly responded that it would not be an option "**because of the dynamic between Shannon and you.**"

33. This definitive statement confirms that Charging Party's termination was directly related to her the fact that she had filed a protected complaint against Ms. Hall, rather than any legitimate business reason. Ultimately, the Company chose to terminate Charging Party rather than address Ms. Hall's well-documented discriminatory behavior.

34. Despite his determination to remain optimistic about, and committed to, his career at the Gap, the ruthless discrimination and retaliation he has continued to suffer at the Gap rendered Mr. Ronsini distraught and crestfallen.

35. As a direct result of the Company's unlawful conduct, Charging Party has suffered significant damages, including but not limited to lost wages and benefits, loss of career advancement opportunities, severe emotional distress and mental anguish, exacerbation of her underlying medical condition, additional medical expenses for treatment of her worsened condition, damage to professional reputation, and significant pain and suffering.

36. It is clear from the foregoing that Respondent has engaged in unlawful discrimination, harassment, and retaliation on the basis of disability (chronic neck pain and anxiety) in violation of the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990, as amended, 42 U.S.C. §§ 12101 et seq. ("ADA"); Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973, 29 U.S.C. § 794; the Family

and Medical Leave Act of 1993, 29 U.S.C. §§ 2601 et seq. ("FMLA"); the New York State Human Rights Law, New York State Executive Law, §§ 296 et seq. ("NYSHRL"); the New York City Human Rights Law, NYC Administrative Code §§ 8-107, et seq. ("NYCHRL"); and the California Fair Employment and Housing Act, Gov. Code, §12940, *et seq.* ("FEHA"), as codified, 42 U.S.C. §§ 2000e to 2000e-17.

37. As a result of the foregoing, Charging Party has been and continues to be unlawfully discriminated against, humiliated, and degraded, and thus has suffered loss of rights, severe emotional distress, loss of income and earnings, and damage to her professional reputation.

38. Respondent's flagrant disregard of the above-referenced laws – including those not enforced by the EEOC – evidences a pattern and practice of discrimination and retaliation that falls squarely within the EEOC's investigatory and enforcement statutory mandates to investigate, and enforce prohibitions against, discriminatory conduct in the workplace.