

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

-----X
SHANNON DOYLE, **REDACTED**, :
CARRIE SUBACS, and SYLVIE THOMPSON, : EEOC Charge No.:
 :
Claimants, :
 :
v. : **SUPPLEMENT TO CHARGE**
 : **OF DISCRIMINATION AND**
 : **RETALIATION**
 :
INFOSYS LIMITED, and INFOSYS :
AMERICAS, :
 :
Respondents. :
 :
-----X

Claimants Shannon Doyle (“Ms. Doyle”), **REDACTED** Carrie Subacs (“Ms. Subacs”) and Sylvie Thompson (“Ms. Thompson”) (collectively “Claimants”) hereby allege as follows against Respondents Infosys Limited and Infosys Americas (together, “Infosys,” the “Company” or “Respondents”) in support of their Charges of Discrimination and Retaliation:

PRELIMINARY STATEMENT

1. On its website, Infosys proudly proclaims that “we strive to provide a work environment free of discrimination and harassment. As an equal opportunity employer all employment decisions are based on merit and business needs.” Women and non-Indian people know that, for all of Infosys’s lofty proclamations, the reality paints a much darker picture.
2. Infosys has repeatedly discriminated in favor of male and Indian employees, especially at senior levels. In the United States, women make up only 14% of leadership roles, and only about 21% of Infosys’s entire domestic workforce.
3. As a result of this systematic discrimination, Infosys has repeatedly been sued by employees who have been mistreated based on their race or gender. Despite this fact, Infosys

has demonstrated a shocking lack of interest in addressing the systemic discrimination that pervades the Company.

4. Claimants experienced this discrimination firsthand when, throughout their employment, Infosys allowed less qualified men and Indian employees to repeatedly take credit for Claimants' hard work and accomplishments. When Claimants complained, Infosys acknowledged the discriminatory environment. For example, one Vice President openly admitted that Infosys "is a very difficult place for females." Another manager claimed that Claimants should accept such conduct because it is "a product of an Indian culture."

5. Rather than take steps to address this discriminatory conduct, Respondents retaliated against Claimants, denying them promotions that they had earned. Indeed, Infosys forced them all out of the Company.

PARTIES

6. Claimant Shannon Doyle is a former employee of Infosys and, at all relevant times, worked at Infosys's New York City Office. Ms. Doyle is a resident of the State of Connecticut, and, at all relevant times herein, met the definition of an "employee" under all relevant statutes.

7. Claimant **REDACTED**

REDACTED
REDACTED at all relevant times herein, met the definition of an "employee" under all relevant statutes.

8. Claimant Carrie Subacs is a former employee of Infosys and, at all relevant times, worked at Infosys's Boston office. Ms. Subacs is a resident of the State of Massachusetts, and, at all relevant times herein, met the definition of an "employee" under all relevant statutes.

9. Claimant Sylvie Thompson is a former employee of Infosys and, at all relevant times, worked in Virginia. Ms. Thompson is a resident of the State of Virginia, and, at all relevant times herein, met the definition of an “employee” under all relevant statutes.

10. Respondent Infosys Limited is a foreign business corporation with a headquarters in Bangalore, Karnataka, India. Infosys Limited has its American headquarters in Richardson, Texas. At all relevant times, Infosys Limited met the definition of an “employer” under all relevant statutes.

11. Respondent Infosys America is a domestic business corporation with its corporate headquarters in New York, New York. At all relevant times, Infosys America met the definition of an “employer” under all relevant statutes.

FACTUAL ALLEGATIONS

I. The History of Discrimination at Infosys

12. Established in 1981, Infosys is a multinational corporation that provides business consulting and information technology (“IT”) services to some of the largest companies in the world. Infosys has more than 240,000 employees across the globe and 23,692 employees in the United States. Infosys generated more than \$12 billion in U.S. revenue in 2019.

13. Despite its multinational presence, Infosys has a notorious history of discriminating against its employees, particularly women and/or non-Indian employees.

14. Such discrimination is reflected in the Company’s management structure. For example, of Infosys’s seven executive officers, only one is a woman and none are white. Of Infosys’s nine members of the Board of Directors, only two are women and neither of whom is white.

15. It is therefore unsurprising that employees who are neither male nor Indian are subjected to unlawful discrimination.

16. The following is a non-exhaustive sample of various instances where employees have attempted to hold Infosys to account for its discriminatory behavior:

- In September 2020, a former female employee alleged that she was directed by management to avoid promoting employees over the age of 50 to partnership positions.¹
- In June 2020, a former employee sued Infosys for retaliation in response to her decision to provide testimony on behalf of the Claimants in the Koehler v. Infosys Techs. Ltd. Inc., action.² In her complaint, the plaintiff, the former head of diversity recruiting at Infosys, “stated that she and other recruiters found little to no support from Infosys management for the Diversity Program since its inception in 2012, and that Infosys has consistently failed to fulfill its own diversity hiring goals.” The plaintiff further alleged that managers were “advised to hire Indians.”
- In 2018, a female member of Infosys’s Board of Directors objected to unethical accounting practices. The Company’s CEO, Salil Parekh, responded by calling the female executive a “diva” and instructing other board members to ignore her objections. In doing so, the CEO endorsed pernicious stereotypes that women who objected to misconduct were “emotional” and could not be trusted.³
- In 2017, Infosys was sued by a female employee alleging race and national origin discrimination.⁴ The plaintiff asserted that executives “consistently lowered performance evaluation scores that plaintiff gave to white and black team members, thereby also eliminating any possibility of promotion for these employees.”

¹ See Prejean v. Infosys Limited et al., No. 20 Civ. 08018 (JPO).

² See Linguist v. Infosys, Ltd., No. 20 Civ. 465 (E.D. Tex. 2020).

³ <https://www.newindianexpress.com/business/2018/may/13/women-recruits-on-the-rise-in-the-tech-world-1813906.html> (last visited November 20, 2020).

⁴ See Green v. Infosys, Ltd., No. 17 Civ. 00432, 2018 WL 1046637, at *1 (E.D. Tex. Feb. 26, 2018)

- In 2014, Infosys was sued by another former employee alleging race and national origin discrimination for systemically denying promotions to non-India employees.⁵
- In 2013, a group of former Infosys employee IT workers brought a class action lawsuit alleging that the Company engaged in systematic race and national origin discrimination.⁶ A former Infosys human resources employee testified that approximately 90 percent of Infosys's employees in the United States are foreign-national workers and the vast majority of those workers are of Indian national origin.
- In 2012 a female Infosys employee sued the Company alleging gender, race and national origin discrimination;⁷
- In 2010, a former Infosys executive sued the Company for age and religious discrimination in California federal court.⁸

17. Of course, these are only some of the publicly available lawsuits filed against the Company. Given Infosys's use of an onerous and unenforceable arbitration agreements, it is likely that countless other employees who have been victimized by the Company's discriminatory practices have been forced into confidential arbitration.⁹

18. Each of the Claimants in this case suffered from similar discrimination, harassment and/or retaliation as a result of their race, national origin, gender and/or age.

⁵ See Watkins v. Infosys, No. 14 Civ. 0247 (JCC), 2015 WL 4493440, at *1 (W.D. Wash. July 23, 2015)

⁶ See Koehler v. Infosys Techs. Ltd. Inc., 107 F. Supp. 3d 940 (E.D. Wis. 2015).

⁷ See Dunn v. Infosys Ltd., No. 12 Civ. 3561 (YGR), 2012 WL 4761901, at *1 (N.D. Cal. Oct. 5, 2012).

⁸ See Gonsalves v. Infosys Techs., Ltd., No. 09 Civ. 04112, 2010 WL 3118861, at *1 (N.D. Cal. Aug. 5, 2010).

⁹ Indeed, at least one court has found Infosys' arbitration provision to be unconscionable, and, therefore, unenforceable. Palmer v. Infosys Techs. Ltd. Inc., 832 F. Supp. 2d 1341, 1345 (M.D. Ala. 2011)!

II. CARRIE SUBACS

19. Ms. Subacs is an accomplished Executive and Management Consulting leader. She holds a Bachelor of Arts degree from the University of Georgia.

20. Prior to joining Infosys, Ms. Subacs worked as the Global Enterprise Account Manager for Blackberry, the Software and Services Product Specialist for Systems Applications and Products (“SAP”) and Experience & Digital Workforce Transformation Leader, IBM Global Business Services.

A. Infosys Discriminates Against Ms. Subacs on the Basis of her Race and/or Gender

21. In January 2018, Infosys recruited Ms. Subacs for the role of Partner in the Retail/Consumer Products/Logistics Practice (“CRL”).

22. Upon being hired, Ms. Subacs was told that she would have to report to her newly hired, male counterpart, Jerry Kurtz.

23. Ms. Subacs and Mr. Kurtz worked together to build a practice to sell Infosys’s CRL services.

24. In March 2018, only a few weeks after Ms. Subacs began working at Infosys, she took the lead as the Retail Consulting Partner for a major account for Client A, which involved significant preparation and group collaboration with the sales team in a corporate initiative called “Tip of the Spear,” in which consulting leaders and the Client Service Group (“CSG”) worked together in a “two in the box model” to drive more strategic business for the Company.

25. Ms. Subacs’ Indian and/or male CSG colleagues, however, consistently disregarded assignments and meetings that were designed to provide Ms. Subacs with the support she needed.

26. For example, Puneet Kapur (Retail Sales) and Amitabah Mudalier (Assistant Vice President, Retail Sales) both failed to attend an eight-hour strategic account planning session led by Ms. Subacs. Mr. Kapur eventually arrived with only 15 minutes left in the eight-hour meeting without any acceptable or reasonable excuse.

27. In addition, at the main meeting on Client A's vendor day, Mr. Kapur arrived 30 minutes late and then blamed Ms. Subacs for failing to properly introduce herself to the executives though he ensured she was not properly introduced.

28. Mr. Kapur and Mr. Mudalier worked together to sideline Ms. Subacs by refusing to send her biography or introduce her to the clients, communicate with Ms. Subacs directly and working to convince Mr. Kurtz that Ms. Subacs was beneath Mr. Mudalier and not at his executive level.

29. Even though she was Client A's "consulting leader" and responsible for growing a significant amount of the work, Ms. Subacs was not permitted to participate in meetings or phone calls with Client A's leadership unless authorized by a male or Indian employee.

30. Ms. Subacs also learned that the sales team were communicating with Client A's executive buyers without having introduced Ms. Subacs or acknowledged her lead role as Consulting Partner on the team.

31. Mr. Kapur's and Mr. Mudalier's behavior continued through 2018, making it nearly impossible for Ms. Subacs to have any traction and ultimately sell projects to clients.

32. It was clear to Ms. Subacs that she could not be successful while on a team with either Mr. Kapur or Mr. Mudalier.

33. Thus, during fall 2018, Ms. Subacs spoke with other Practice Leaders to find a new role at the Company to escape the discriminatory treatment.

34. In November 2018, Ms. Subacs was invited to transfer to the Manufacturing Group, where she was told she would be assigned a potentially lucrative “flagship” account. Ms. Subacs was understandably excited for the opportunity.

35. Ms. Subacs’ hopes were quickly dashed, however. Shortly after joining the team, Ms. Subacs learned that Gurdeep Singh (CSG Assistant Vice President) had specifically requested an American, female consulting Partner because the client wanted to see some diversity.

36. It was clear that Ms. Subacs had been selected for this opportunity not because of her experience or potential to help the team. Instead, Infosys saw her as a token American female employee it could parade before clients to deceive them into believing that it had a diverse workforce.

37. Ms. Subacs was undeterred by the Company’s discriminatory animus and dedicated her efforts to proving that her worth extended past her gender and race. To that end, in the winter of 2018 and into spring 2019, Ms. Subacs worked extremely hard and traveled around the world to support her team.

38. As a result of her work, in or around April 2019, Ms. Subacs learned that Infosys signed the client to an outsourcing contract for over \$300 million. However, Ms. Subacs was shocked to learn that she would receive no “downstream credit” for the win. Her male colleague, Mr. Singh, would instead receive credit for Ms. Subacs’ work.

39. This was not an isolated incident. Ms. Subacs continued to be assigned projects with different teams, not introduced to clients, given unreasonably high expectations in comparison to her male/Indian counterparts and then sidelined by her Indian and/or male coworkers so that they could join the project and take the credit.

B. Infosys Retaliates Against Ms. Subacs

40. In or around October 2019, Ms. Subacs was told that she had been selected for a confidential interview to discuss the Company's anti-discrimination efforts.

41. This was clearly not a "random" selection but rather an opportunity for the Company to determine whether Ms. Subacs – one of the few white female partners at the Company – was a potential litigation threat.

42. Sandra Jackson (Bureau of Personnel and Human Resources ("HR") Senior Unit Manager), Lauren Gillette (Senior HR Associate), and Rozlyn Fulgoni-Britton (Employment Law Lead) met with Ms. Subacs – without giving her the opportunity to invite her own counsel or advocate – and asked Ms. Subacs whether she felt that she had been discriminated against and retaliated against at Infosys.

43. Ms. Subacs made her objections to the discriminatory environment at the Company clear. She explained that her career had been stymied because of her race and gender and expressed fears that she would face retaliation if she protested.

44. Ms. Subacs' complaints and concerns were so comprehensive that this meeting went over the time allotted and a second meeting had to be scheduled shortly thereafter.

45. In the second meeting, Ms. Subacs explicitly told Ms. Fulgoni-Britton, Ms. Jackson, and Ms. Gillette that, "You have a real problem with gender and cultural/racial discrimination here against women and you need to do something about it."

46. Ms. Jackson admitted, "We know. We're working on it."

47. Ms. Subacs also informed her supervisor and Infosys's HR personnel about her concerns of discrimination.

48. Remarkably, Ms. Subacs never heard back from anyone at Infosys concerning her complaints.

49. Predictably, Ms. Subacs experienced the very retaliation she feared.

50. In November 2019, the Infosys account sales team began excluding Ms. Subacs from communications and meetings with her main client and preventing her from making progress growing consulting business at the account.

51. Ms. Subacs sent numerous emails to her supervisor to address this issue but was never provided a business reason for her exclusion.

52. Ms. Subacs was at a standstill and could not participate in driving new consulting business at her main account with the account sales team actively retaliating against her and excluding her.

53. Once again, Ms. Subacs started working towards transferring teams to escape the Company's unlawful conduct. On or about September 2019, she was contacted about managing a large proposal for a major client, Client B.

54. Ms. Subacs accepted the opportunity but was suspicious as to why she – someone with no association with the Change Management Practice – was asked to represent Change Management only when she was the overall Consulting Client Partner for the Client B account.

55. Ms. Subacs quickly learned that the Client B project was destined to fail. Infosys had promised far more than it could reasonably deliver in its proposal, deadlines were quickly approaching and the employees working on the proposal were disorganized and misaligned.

56. Ms. Subacs worked around the clock to try to get this proposal into shape, including doing work assigned to her by her male/Indian colleagues that was behind schedule or had been done incorrectly.

57. After a few weeks, Ms. Subacs began protesting that Infosys was setting itself up for failure and would not be able to meet its contractual obligations, should Infosys be awarded the business, which could put the Company at legal exposure.

58. Incredibly, Luis Zapien (Sales Executive) pressured Ms. Subacs to make unethical decisions and to misrepresent Infosys's ability to meet the client's expectations.

59. Thereafter, in or around December 2020, Infosys increased Ms. Subacs' responsibilities by making her the Practice Head of the Core Analyst Program ("CAP"). This was a substantial increase in Ms. Subacs's responsibilities. As the head of CAP, Ms. Subacs was responsible for supervising over 30 undergraduates and recently employed consultants.

60. Despite being promoted to the position of Practice Head, Ms. Subacs' compensation was not increased to the level of comparable male practice heads.

61. Although a Practice Head, Ms. Subacs was not permitted to attend Practice Head monthly meetings and was not permitted to participate in the year-end evaluations of Associate Partners and Senior Principals.

62. From January through June 2020, Ms. Subacs continued to work on numerous proposals and built a significant pipeline of deals in various stages of client evaluation.

63. While Ms. Subacs received excellent feedback from her clients and colleagues, she continued to be discriminated against and retaliated against at Infosys.

64. For example, Ms. Subacs was forced to file an official complaint against Associate Partner Scott Beckett for being verbally abusive and condescending to her.

65. Shortly after making her complaint, Mr. Beckett repeatedly called Ms. Subacs to harassingly berate her. Ms. Subacs tried to resolve the dispute herself, but Mr. Beckett refused to respond and continued to berate her.

66. Finally, Ms. Subacs copied HR personnel on a retaliatory exchange and demanded something be done.

67. This was not the only retaliatory abuse Ms. Subacs experienced. For example, during one large Client B proposal meeting, Mr. Zapien requested the status of an impossible task that Ms. Subacs had previously explained would not be feasible.

68. Mr. Zapien looked at her angrily and said in front of more than 15 of her male colleagues, “Carrie, I’m sick and tired of your complaining and excuses.”

69. That afternoon, Mr. Zapien and the sales team refused to identify Ms. Subacs as the Lead Partner on the Executive Team page of the proposal, and instead put a male employee, Chis Tebbe, the SAP Partner, as the overall Lead Partner.

70. Throughout spring 2020, Ms. Subacs was consistently removed from proposals and replaced with her Indian and/or male colleagues.

71. Ms. Subacs refused to accept this discriminatory and retaliatory method of forcing her out of the Company, instead continuing to raise complaints to her new Practice Leader, Vice President, Holly Benson, and HR and documenting the ways in which Infosys was treating her unfairly.

72. In one email response, Ms. Benson admitted that Infosys, “is a very difficult place for females.”

73. In or about the last week of May 2020, Ms. Subacs spoke with Brandon Fani (Bureau of Personnel and HR Unit Manager) and George Avery (Global Head of HR)

concerning her complaints of discrimination and retaliation, requesting that Human Resources conduct an investigation into her complaints.

74. Mr. Fani told Ms. Subacs that he would send her a list of required documents and information that HR needed in connection with the investigation.

75. On June 2, 2020, Mr. Fani emailed Ms. Subacs accusing her – falsely – of failing to provide the information and documentation, and demanding that she send all evidence of discrimination and retaliation within 24 hours.

76. Ms. Subacs explained that she had been waiting for the list of required documents and information, and requested additional time because it would clearly take more than 24 hours to collate 2.4 years of information.

77. Mr. Fani ignored her.

78. Instead, one week later, on June 10, 2020, Infosys terminated Ms. Subacs.

79. According to the Company, Ms. Subacs' employment had been terminated because of her performance and because her position was being eliminated.

80. Neither of these reasons are true. Not only was Ms. Subacs' performance objectively outstanding, often head and shoulders above her male and Indian colleagues whom the Company retained, but the Company promptly replaced Ms. Subacs with a man.

81. Upon information and belief, Infosys is paying Ms. Subacs' male replacement more money than Ms. Subacs earned.

III. SHANNON DOYLE

82. Shannon Doyle is a digital marketing strategist with over 20 years of experience in building end-to-end customer experience and marketing strategies for companies.

83. Ms. Doyle graduated from the Kent State University with a Bachelor of Arts degree and from the Ohio University – Athens with a Master of Fine Arts degree.

84. Prior to joining Infosys, Ms. Doyle spent the last decades leading marketing teams and developing marketing strategies for various corporations around the Northeast. Recently, Ms. Doyle spent six years as the Vice President of Digital Marketing and Innovation Strategy for Omnicom, TPN – where she was responsible for building the Bank of America digital marketing business, digital integrated campaigns, omni-channel strategy and execution, as well as consulting and implementing on all advertising technology and emerging technology platforms for the retail banking centers.

85. Thereafter, Ms. Doyle served as the Director of Digital Strategy for Accenture Interactive, where she led marketing strategies for New York Life’s website redesign, including customer experience, user experience marketing and messaging strategy, inclusive of the company’s rebranding effort across their portfolio of insurance and financial services products. Ms. Doyle also served as the strategy lead for marketing to existing and new clients for customer experience strategy, marketing and communications strategy, content strategy and integrated digital marketing strategy.

86. In the fall of 2018, Ms. Doyle was recruited to work for Infosys and met with Rajesh Menon, Managing Global Partner, Financial Services, and Seth Lively, her soon to be supervisor. Ms. Doyle began working as Associate Partner, Digital, on November 19, 2018, to help build out domain experience and marketing capabilities for the Infosys Consulting practice.

87. Mr. Lively stated that Ms. Doyle was being hired under a McKinsey recommendation to hire digital strategy experts with domain expertise (in her case, marketing)

for financial services and assign them to specific verticals and accounts to help Infosys grow its opportunities and expertise.

88. Mr. Lively also stated that Ms. Doyle would not have utilization targets for her first year of the engagement under this program and that she would only handle clients onsite for the New York metropolitan area.

89. Ms. Doyle also confirmed that she would assist the financial services team on Citibank and potentially one or two other priority clients.

90. By all accounts, Ms. Doyle was extremely successful at Infosys.

91. Unfortunately, Ms. Doyle quickly learned that Infosys had no intention of acknowledging or compensating her for her work or allowing her to build her own relationships with its clients, but was instead just using her to bolster its male and/or Indian employees' careers.

A. Infosys Discriminates Against Ms. Doyle Based on her Race and/or Gender

92. On her first project, Ms. Doyle helped sell Infosys's Financial Services team marketing to American Express. This project took approximately 12 weeks, during which time Ms. Doyle worked diligently to create and sell Infosys's marketing strategies. This was the first marketing research project that Infosys was able to sell in Financial Services.

93. On several occasions, Ms. Doyle was expected to rely on her male and/or Indian colleagues to do the work even though they did not have experience in this area. However, their refusal to work with her forced Ms. Doyle to complete the deliverables and entire project on her own.

94. For example, Manishi Varma resisted taking direction from a female manager, and berated Ms. Doyle when she challenged his approach, telling her she "doesn't know what

she's doing" and hanging up the phone when Ms. Doyle attempted to offer her opinion.

Moreover, Mr. Varma often made mistakes and, instead of fixing his errors, attempted to conceal them from Ms. Doyle.

95. Ms. Doyle finally reported Mr. Varma's discriminatory behavior to her supervisor, Mr. Lively.

96. Unfortunately, this did not resolve the issue. Mr. Varma continued to treat Ms. Doyle with aggression and disrespect, all while mismanaging his portion of the project.

97. For example, Mr. Varma screamed at Ms. Doyle for purportedly not completing paperwork for a project, even though that was not her role.

98. Mr. Varma proved incapable of showing a female and/or non-Indian coworker respect and dignity.

99. Despite these discriminatory hurdles, the project was deemed a huge success for Infosys.

100. In March 2019, Ms. Doyle was invited to present to a senior American Express client in the hopes of closing additional business. Ms. Doyle worked diligently to prepare for the presentation, including meeting with the CSG team to educate them on details of the project (even though they should have been well aware of this information).

101. When Ms. Doyle attended the meeting in New York City to give the presentation to the female **REDACTED** Executive, Yogesh Vijayanc, an Indian male employee, took over and spoke for 25 minutes of the 30-minute meeting. Ms. Doyle was unable to present her findings.

102. Immediately thereafter, the client asked Ms. Doyle for a follow-up meeting to review the presentation, provide a proposal based on her recommendations and review the

findings presentation. Ms. Doyle was thrilled and immediately reached out to Infosys to get the client's contact information and email address to set up the meeting.

103. The CSG team ignored Ms. Doyle repeatedly over the course of several weeks. Instead, Ms. Doyle was directed to work through Mr. Vijayanc to pursue this client. It became clear to Ms. Doyle that the Company had brought her in as the token female American executive and then cut her out of the actual profitable work. As a result, any recognition for this proposal went to the CSG, not her.

104. Only a few weeks later, Infosys thrust Ms. Doyle into an almost identical scenario, where she was asked to craft a presentation and proposal, only to be sidelined in favor of her male Indian colleague.

105. This time, Ms. Doyle completed over two weeks of work for the Financial Services team, only to hand her work over to Mahesh Raghavan who took over the proposal from Ms. Doyle.

106. Two days prior to the proposal, Infosys sidelined Ms. Doyle. Specifically, the Company "disinvited" Ms. Doyle from the meeting because Mr. Raghavan was purportedly "more aware" of how Infosys "does things," and purportedly better qualified to handle the proposal. These explanations were false.

107. As a result, Ms. Doyle scheduled a meeting with her supervisor, Mr. Lively, to discuss the discriminatory treatment. Specifically, Ms. Doyle told Mr. Lively that she felt discriminated against. Mr. Lively purported to assure Ms. Doyle that he would escalate her concerns.

108. He did not. Rather, Ms. Doyle was never again permitted to work on another financial services proposal. Upon information and belief, nothing was ever done in response to Ms. Doyle's complaints.

109. In addition, from mid-March to April 2019, Ms. Doyle worked to craft a proposal on a billable project under Philip Philippides.

110. Ms. Doyle was frustrated, as it was clear that CSG lead Ashish Parashar was excluding her (as well as Ms. Subacs) from the process and from email communications.

111. Ms. Doyle, determined to succeed despite these obstacles, completed a 50-page presentation. With less than one hour before the presentation, six male Indian coworkers berated Ms. Doyle about changes to the presentation. Ms. Doyle eventually had to leave to prepare elsewhere because of the abuse.

112. Ms. Doyle did not observe her male and/or Indian coworkers being mistreated in this way.

113. Following the presentation, Mr. Philippides admitted that Ms. Doyle was being treated differently because of her sex and race. According to Mr. Philippides, Ms. Doyle should accept the mistreatment because it was "a product of an Indian culture."

114. Ms. Doyle continued to work on various projects with Ms. Subacs in the Manufacturing Practice.

115. However, she experienced so much stress and anxiety from the discrimination and retaliation that she developed a stress-induced ulcer, which required multiple medical procedures in Summer of 2019.

116. On or around August 22, 2019, Ms. Doyle was assigned to lead a project in North Carolina. Even though Ms. Doyle had previously agreed with Infosys that she would only assist

the New York Metropolitan area team (which did not include North Carolina), she was forced to accept this position given that she needed to meet her utilization numbers.

117. The Company wanted Ms. Doyle to “handl[e] the female CCO.”

118. When Ms. Doyle arrived in North Carolina one day later, she realized that she had been set up to fail. She was given no information about the assigned project and did not know what was expected of her.

119. Ms. Doyle learned from Michelle Donnelly (Chief Commercial Officer) that Infosys expected her to be a project manager to manage a technical implementation, which Ms. Doyle was not qualified to do.

120. Ms. Doyle was concern that any success she achieved would be attributed to her male, Indian colleagues. Predictably, in the first week, no one answered Ms. Doyle’s emails or provided Ms. Doyle the documentation necessary to present to the client.

121. Ms. Doyle tirelessly tried to manage her team and accomplish Infosys’s goals, but when she tried to even schedule a meeting, her team refused to attend.¹⁰

B. Infosys Retaliates Against Ms. Doyle

122. Ms. Doyle protested to management that she did not have the resources to meet the client’s expectations in the price range but was met with hostility.

123. Instead, Infosys demoted Ms. Doyle and replaced her with an Indian woman, Tina Patel.

¹⁰ On five separate occasions, Ms. Doyle tried to schedule a team meeting. Each time none of her male team members attended.

124. Thereafter, Ms. Doyle was assigned work with unreasonable deadlines, forcing her to work late into the night and through the weekend. She was later terminated from the project in its entirety and given no recognition for the work she had done.

125. Throughout late fall 2019 and early 2020, Ms. Doyle continued to be treated like a second-class employee. By way of example, Ms. Doyle was assigned potential clients and given an exorbitant and unrealistic workload.

126. In another instance, Ms. Doyle worked on a project for **REDACTED** where she was consistently told she could not discuss business or build a relationship with the Head of North American marketing, **REDACTED**. As a last-ditch effort, Ms. Doyle reached out to Ms. Pacek to discuss a current project in attempts of closing additional business.

127. Two weeks later, Ms. Doyle was removed from the project and was replaced by a man.

128. At the same time, Ms. Doyle joined Infosys's diversity council and voiced her complaints to the other council members that Infosys was not doing enough to support its female employees.

129. Ms. Doyle quickly realized that the diversity council was merely a formality and Infosys did not adopt any of her recommended changes. Instead of implementing meaningful changes or offering women meaningful professional opportunities, the Company was merely interested in hosting publicity events like "women's breakfasts" to project an image of diversity while refusing to address its systemic problems.

130. As a result, when Infosys later asked Ms. Doyle to be part of a New York City college recruitment effort as the token "female participant," Ms. Doyle understandably declined as she felt uncomfortable recruiting young women to join the Company. Ms. Doyle felt like her

professional accomplishments and years of experience were not as important to Infosys as the fact that she, a white female, added to their image of diversity.

131. In January 2020, Sentil Kumar, an Indian man, became Ms. Doyle's supervisor.

132. By February 2020, Ms. Doyle was completely sidelined with nearly no new business opportunities. Ms. Doyle continued to be "benched out" and every opportunity she sought was quickly put on hold.

133. Throughout the spring of 2020, Mr. Kumar only allowed Ms. Doyle to work on pitches and digital service offerings, neither of which afforded Ms. Doyle opportunities to grow or meet the arbitrary productivity markers Infosys set for her.

134. Remarkably, Infosys continues to use the offerings and decks created by Ms. Doyle to pitch Infosys services to potential clients even though Ms. Doyle is no longer employed by Infosys. Despite their obvious continued value to the Company, Ms. Doyle was not awarded any recognition or praise for this work.

135. In late February through March 2020, Ms. Doyle observed her practice take a hit as a result of COVID-19. However, by April and May 2020, the Financial Services team recovered any revenue loss related to the pandemic. Despite the substantial business growth in Financial Services, Ms. Doyle was still excluded from meaningful opportunities to engage with both her team and clients.

136. Throughout spring 2020, Ms. Doyle continued to complain that her male and/or Indian coworkers on the Financial Services team, such as Matthew Browher and David Sauls, were being assigned new projects while Ms. Doyle was repeatedly overlooked.

137. Finally, on June 2, 2020, after systematically preventing Ms. Doyle from achieving Infosys's unrealistic benchmarks, Infosys terminated Ms. Doyle's employment.

IV. SYLVIE THOMPSON

138. Ms. Thompson is an extraordinary supply chain professional with a unique combination of traditional, operational and emerging technologies experience.

139. Ms. Thompson earned a Bachelor of Public Administration from Carleton University and holds a Master of Business Administration from the University of Western Ontario, where she graduated with Highest Honors.

140. Ms. Thompson has an extensive career in management consulting and supply chain management. Prior to joining Infosys, Ms. Thompson worked for Deloitte Consulting as a Manager of the firm's Management Consulting practice; The Worldwide Retail Exchange as the Senior Director and Global Sourcing Product Owner; Capgemini Consulting as a Senior Manager in the Supply Chain Management department; Resources Global Professionals as the Client Service Director in Supply Chain Management; FedBid, Inc. as the Vice President in Implementation & Training Services; and Optoro, Inc. as the Vice President in Supply Chain Strategy and Enablement.

141. She is a widely published expert in the field on cutting-edge topics, including the impact of COVID-19 on supply chains and is a proficient blogger on various topics such as blockchain, virtual change rooms and reverse logistics.

142. Ms. Thompson joined Infosys in 2016 as an Associate Partner in the Supply Chain Practice. Her responsibilities included building and maintaining relationships within the retail, consumer brands and logistics industries, including increasing profitable revenue, guiding engagements and ensuring the delivery of quality products.

143. She was highly successful in this role, leading sales efforts that resulted in "first consulting projects" at two major target accounts.

144. Ms. Thompson worked to create sales materials, was a key presenter during the sales cycle and created a team to successfully deliver projects. She increased the value of her account pipeline, doubling her year-over-year sales credits each performance year and demonstrated a strong track record for success with Infosys.

145. In addition, Ms. Thompson worked with the Global Logistics Provider to build a digital logistics ecosystem focused on empowering various business lines. This ecosystem included a digital freight marketplace, a driver application tool that enabled independent and small operators to manage job assignments and bid on new work real-time, and a consumer/shipper application that provided users real-time tracking of deliveries.

146. In recognition of her excellent work, Ms. Thompson earned a promotion to Supply Chain Practice Leader in February 2020 where she was responsible for building and maintaining relationships both within Infosys Consulting and externally with clients and partners.

147. Ms. Thompson nearly doubled her team utilization from 33% to 62% within four months, achieving the highest utilization for the practice since its inception in 2016. She also took on leadership of the Third Party Logistics Study and completed the COVID-19 Supply Chain Impact Survey, as well as launched and coordinated a monthly supply chain blog, which was widely published.

A. Infosys Discriminates Against Ms. Thompson Based on her Race and/or Gender

148. Ms. Thompson's professional success in an environment that discriminated against non-Indian and/or female employees did not come easily. Throughout her tenure, she was routinely excluded from email correspondence and meetings even though she was responsible for the entire practice team.

149. Too often, Ms. Thompson found it almost impossible to access information that she needed to successfully perform her job.

150. Despite her unquestionable success, Ms. Thompson was disappointed that Infosys routinely overlooked her and other talented female colleagues for promotions to Partner. Given her extraordinary professional history – both prior to and during her time at Infosys – Ms. Thompson was an obvious candidate for more prestigious and high earning roles at the Company. Her sex held her back.

151. For example, in 2017, Ms. Thompson learned that she had been excluded from a project despite her seemingly unparalleled qualifications.

152. Remarkably, Kishor Gummaraju, Partner & Practice Leader for Consumer Brands, Retail, and Logistics (CRL), admitted that Ms. Thompson was not included because she is a woman.

153. According to Mr. Gummaraju, male Infosys employees “have families to support and the Indian men not only have families, but if they lose their jobs, they would likely be forced to have to move their families back to India.”

154. Moreover, in Mr. Gummaraju’s view, women have husbands to support them and, therefore, it is not as devastating for their families if they are unemployed.

155. Incredibly, this was a constant refrain at Infosys. Ms. Thompson was repeatedly excluded from staffing consideration while male employees who “needed” utilization numbers got staffed.

156. For example, Ms. Thompson was excluded from a project with **REDACTED** and the project was instead staffed with an all-male team.

157. Ms. Thompson, like other women at Infosys, had to earn utilization numbers to meet her target. However, unlike her male counterparts, Ms. Thompson was not gifted projects sold by others and did not receive a single billable hour for any project she did not sell herself – which is highly unusual at Infosys and notably distinct from Ms. Thompson’s male coworkers’ experience.

158. Instead, she was forced to earn her own utilization figures, as well as support her male colleagues’ utilization figures without reciprocity.

159. Ms. Thompson’s experience at Infosys was not unique.

160. During her tenure, not one female Associate Partner was promoted to Partner and only one woman has been promoted to Partner in the last decade. These results are not the product of chance. They are the consequence of a system that fosters the professional careers of men – especially Indian men – to the detriment of their often-better qualified female colleagues.

161. In or around April 2019, while Ms. Thompson was critiquing Anna Zhang’s (Change Management, Senior Consultant) work on a presentation for a major client, a male consultant subordinate to Ms. Thompson jumped out of his seat and charged at Ms. Thompson while yelling abusively at her.

162. Everyone in the room froze. Ms. Thompson informed the male consultant that she would not tolerate his bullying behavior and that the project would be executed the way she wanted it because she was the one in charge. She further firmly explained that his outburst was not appropriate.

163. While Ms. Thompson tried to maintain her composure, she was terrified that the male consultant would assault her. When Ms. Thompson went back to her hotel that night, she

started shaking and crying because of the way the male consultant had made her feel both threatened and undermined in her position.

164. Shortly thereafter, Ms. Thompson called Dan Albright (Practice Leader) and informed him of what had happened. He agreed, the consultant's behavior was abhorrent and suggested that Ms. Thompson should submit a complaint to HR.

165. As such, Ms. Thompson filed a complaint with HR regarding the discriminatory and harassing behavior of the male consultant. Infosys took no remedial action. Instead, the Company chastised Ms. Thompson for purportedly failing to "diffuse the conflict."

166. Once again, Infosys showed that it would always protect its male employees, even when their actions potentially endangered the safety and well-being of a valuable female employee.

B. Infosys Retaliates Against Ms. Thompson

167. Ms. Thompson tried to change the culture. She implored Infosys to set a diversity and inclusion goal of 25% female representation at the executive level, which is still well below representation levels at the Company's peer organizations. (This would still leave three-quarters of executive level jobs for men who, according to Mr. Gummaraju, needed them more than women.) Ms. Thompson's reasonable training and recruitment initiatives could have improved this embarrassing sex-based gap.

168. Infosys, however, refused. Rather than provide sufficient financial resources and support, Chief Executive Officer Mark Livingston ignored the persistent discrimination problem, deeming it "too big of a topic to tackle now."

169. His "solution" was to fund a women's monthly "breakfast" event. This paltry effort was nothing more than a public relations stunt designed to draw attention away from the

continuing harm the Company’s discriminatory practices have had – and continue to have – on the careers of its female employees.

170. Throughout the spring and summer of 2020, the Supply Chain Practice was severely understaffed at senior levels and Ms. Thompson worked fervently to finish the work of numerous associate partners.

171. Despite repeated requests and attempts by Ms. Thompson to hire an Associate Partner, Infosys refused to provide approval for such a hire.

172. In August 2020, Mark Livingston recruited a new Partner – a man – Andrew Hogenson.

173. Throughout July and August of 2020, Mr. Livingston’s references about Mr. Hogenson to Ms. Thompson made it clear that Mr. Hogenson would effectively replace her as the Supply Chain Practice leader.

174. Not only did Ms. Thompson have no opportunity for upward mobility and no path to partnership, she would soon be out of work.

175. Accordingly, on August 22, 2020, Infosys constructively discharged Ms. Thompson’s employment.

REDACTED

REDACTED

REDACTED

REDACTED

REDACTED

REDACTED

178. Prior to joining Infosys, [REDACTED]

[REDACTED] where she managed business stakeholder relationships with consumer brands at global and regional levels, navigated marketing technology needs, and provided strategic and IT operational input to programs and enterprise technology decisions.

179. In September 2018, [REDACTED]

[REDACTED] was responsible for leading internal and client teams through deployment of digital product information platforms, leading workshops to define and transform end-to-end client business processes for enabling their digital stack and preparing executive level deliverables, including business cases, transformation roadmaps and executive summaries.

180. [REDACTED] first few months at Infosys were extremely successful. In fact, in June 2019, [REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

181. [REDACTED] early work was so impressive that Mr. Lively discussed a five-year partner trajectory with [REDACTED] and mentioned her as a rising star to Ms. Subacs.

A. Infosys Discriminates Against [REDACTED] Based on her Race and/or Gender

182. However, [REDACTED] upward career trajectory came to an end when David Sauls (Financial Services) was staffed to the [REDACTED] project above [REDACTED].

183. Throughout July 2019, Mr. Sauls was dismissive, standoffish and condescending towards women, which was apparent to one of Infosys's female clients, [REDACTED]

184. For example, Mr. Sauls purposefully excluded [REDACTED] from several meetings, including meetings where expectations for final deliverables were changed. Mr. Sauls' exclusion of Ms. [REDACTED] made it impossible for her to do her job effectively because she

had incomplete information compared to her male peers. Mr. Sauls then reprimanded [REDACTED] [REDACTED] in front of a client for not having up to date information on the deliverables, making [REDACTED] appear incompetent.

185. [REDACTED] protested to Mr. Sauls that he needed to better communicate with her and asked that he not talk down to her in front of clients.

186. Mr. Sauls ignored [REDACTED] complaint. He instead began retaliating against her.

187. For example, Mr. Sauls refused to call [REDACTED] by her name. He instead referred to [REDACTED] as “she” or “her” when speaking to a male Infosys consultant.

188. This reduced [REDACTED] to her gender, erasing her personhood and individuality. This is not something he did with his male employees.

189. When another female employee, Samantha Rogers, was assigned to the [REDACTED] team, Mr. Sauls extended his discriminatory campaign against her as well.

190. Mr. Sauls was aggressive towards Ms. Rogers and treated her like his personal assistant. Mr. Sauls required Ms. Rogers to pick him up from his hotel and drive him to the office. Ms. Rogers was a Junior Consultant; driving her supervisor to work was not part of her job description.

B. Infosys Retaliates Against [REDACTED]

191. In or around August 2019, [REDACTED] pulled [REDACTED] aside and complained that Mr. Sauls was biased and particularly disrespectful to women and stated that she was going to report Mr. Sauls’s behavior to the managing partner, Mr. Lively.

192. [REDACTED] agreed that something needed to be done. She contacted Mr. Lively separately to complain about Mr. Saul’s sexist behavior.

193. She recommended that Mr. Sauls be provided – at the very least – unconscious bias training. Mr. Lively responded that he would speak to Mr. Sauls.

194. Despite Mr. Lively’s promise, Mr. Sauls continued to act in a condescending and aggressive manner towards [REDACTED], including being condescending and aggressive during a team meeting with Mr. Lively present. [REDACTED] eventually left the [REDACTED] project as a result of Mr. Sauls’s sexism and Infosys’s failure to address her concerns.

195. In March 2020, [REDACTED] was invited to rejoin the [REDACTED] team. However, [REDACTED] was concerned about working with Mr. Sauls again and declined the assignment. She instead met with Human Resources associate Beth Hewson to discuss staffing opportunities that would enable her to continue her upward career trajectory.

196. [REDACTED] also spoke to Mr. Sauls (who was now in charge of staffing) and Ms. Hewson concerning opportunities in Los Angeles, California, or Raleigh, North Carolina. [REDACTED] was told no such opportunities were available.

197. In April 2020, [REDACTED] spoke with Ms. Doyle, who was her Infosys counselor. [REDACTED] learned that the Company had labeled [REDACTED] as “unstaffable,” purportedly because she had communicated her preference for opportunities in Los Angeles and Raleigh.

198. To the contrary, Infosys made [REDACTED] “unstaffable” in retaliation for her complaints of discrimination.

199. In May 2020, Infosys sent [REDACTED] a “bench warning” notification. [REDACTED] immediately reached out to Ms. Hewson again about her openness to staffing and stated that she was willing to take a position in any location.

200. Although Ms. Hewson suggested that there may be a staffing opportunity for Ms. [REDACTED] [REDACTED] never heard back regarding this opportunity, and later found out that that, in fact, Infosys gave this opportunity to a man.

201. On June 2, 2020, Infosys terminated [REDACTED] employment for purportedly failing to meet staffing utilization expectations.

202. In fact, [REDACTED] was a good performer, achieving a cumulative rating of a “4” out of “5” for her annual performance rating.

203. However, Mr. Sauls had retaliatorily given [REDACTED] a poor evaluation, labeling her “aggressive” and “borderline insubordinate” because of her complaints of discriminatory treatment.