

1 Daniel Low (Bar #218387)
2 **KOTCHEN & LOW LLP**
3 1918 New Hampshire Avenue NW
4 Washington, DC 20009
5 Telephone: (202) 471-1995
6 Fax: (202) 280-1128
7 Email: dlow@kotchen.com

8 *Attorney for Plaintiff and Putative Class*

9 **UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**
10 **NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**
11 **SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION**

12 PURUSHOTHAMAN RAJARAM,

13 Plaintiff,

14 v.

15 META PLATFORMS, INC.,

16 Defendant.

17 Case No. 3:22-cv-02920

18 **COMPLAINT**

19 FOR EMPLOYMENT DISCRIMINATION

20 CLASS ACTION

21 JURY TRIAL DEMANDED

22 Plaintiff Purushothaman Rajaram brings this action on behalf of himself and a class of
23 similarly situated individuals to remedy pervasive, ongoing citizenship discrimination by Defendant
24 Meta Platforms, Inc.¹ (hereafter referred to as “Facebook”) and alleges as follows:

25 **NATURE OF THE ACTION**

26 1. Facebook is an American technology conglomerate that builds products designed to
27 enable users to connect with each other through mobile and in-home devices, computers, and virtual
28 reality headsets. Its most popular products include Facebook (a social networking platform),

¹ Facebook, Inc. changes its corporate name from Facebook, Inc. to Meta Platforms, Inc. in October 2021, but is still commonly known as Facebook. See Meta Platforms, Inc. Form 10-K at 3, available at <https://bit.ly/3LxDXMT>.

1 Instagram (a photo and videosharing platform), Messenger (a messaging application), WhatsApp (a
2 secured messaging application), and Meta Quests (which designs virtual reality products). Facebook
3 employs 60,600 individuals globally, and as of 2019 (the most recent EEO-1 data available), 34,634
4 of these employees were located in the United States.

5 2. When hiring for U.S. positions, Facebook considers United States citizens, lawful
6 permanent residents (e.g., green card holders), and foreign citizens with proper work permits (e.g.,
7 H-1B or L-1 visa holders). But while visa holders make up just a fraction of the United States labor
8 market,² Facebook prefers to hire visa-dependent workers for certain U.S. positions, as it can pay
9 these employees less than American workers performing the same work. The Department of Justice
10 has sued Facebook for this very practice and entered into a settlement agreement with Facebook in
11 October 2021 to resolve the claims.³

12 3. Facebook’s employment practices violate the Civil Rights Act of 1866, as amended,
13 42 U.S.C. § 1981 (“§ 1981”). Plaintiff seeks, on his own behalf, and on behalf of a class of similarly
14 situated individuals, declaratory, injunctive, and other equitable relief, compensatory and punitive
15 damages, including pre- and post-judgment interest, attorneys’ fees, and costs to redress Facebook’s
16 pervasive pattern and practice of citizenship discrimination.

17 **PARTIES**

18 4. Plaintiff Purushothaman Rajaram is a naturalized United States citizen, and is a
19 resident of Pennsylvania.

20 5. Plaintiff is a member of a protected class, as recognized by § 1981.

21 6. Defendant Meta Platforms, Inc. (“Facebook”) is an American social networking and
22 technology company. It develops products which allow users to share information, photographs,
23
24

25 ² As of September 2019, there were approximately 583,420 H-1B visa holders in the United
26 States. *See* Priyanka Sangani, US has just over 580,000 H-1B holders, says USCIS, THE ECONOMIC
27 TIMES (June 29, 2020), <https://bit.ly/3txmo75>.

28 ³ *See* Settlement Agreement at 2, available at <https://bit.ly/3nxZifd>.

1 messages, and videos with other users. Facebook was created in 2004. It is incorporated in Delaware
2 and maintains its corporate headquarters in Menlo Park, California.

3 **JURISDICTION**

4 7. This Court has subject matter jurisdiction pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1331 and 42 U.S.C.
5 § 1981(a).

6 8. This Court has subject matter jurisdiction pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1332(a), as the
7 amount in controversy exceeds the sum or value of \$75,000, exclusive of interest and costs, and is
8 between citizens of different states.

9 9. This Court also has subject matter jurisdiction pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1332(d) as this
10 matter is a class action with an amount in controversy of greater than \$5 million, exclusive of interest
11 and costs, and involves at least one class member who is a citizen of a state and is brought against a
12 corporation that is a citizen of a different state.

13 10. This Court has personal jurisdiction over Facebook because it engages in continuous
14 and systematic business contacts within the State of California and maintains a substantial physical
15 presence in this State, including the operation of its corporate headquarters and more than ten offices.
16 Additionally, as described below, Plaintiff's claims arise, in part, out of Facebook's activities in
17 California.

18 **VENUE AND INTRADISTRICT ASSIGNMENT**

19 11. Venue is proper in the Northern District of California pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1391(b)-
20 (c) because Facebook resides in this District, conducts business in this District, and engaged in
21 discriminatory conduct in this District. Additionally, Facebook engages in continuous and systematic
22 business contacts within this District, and maintains a substantial physical presence in this District,
23 including the operation of its headquarters in Menlo Park, California (where almost one-third of its
24 global employees work) and offices in Burlingame, Foster City, Fremont, Mountain View, San
25 Francisco, Santa Clara, Sausalito, and Sunnyvale. Further, a substantial part of the events giving rise
26 this action occurred in this District. For example, Mr. Rajaram was contacted by a Facebook recruiter
27 who was located in Menlo Park, California, and Mr. Rajaram subsequently discussed and applied to
28

1 an open position with Facebook through that recruiter. As such, assignment in this Division is proper
2 pursuant to Civil L.R. 3-2(c) because a substantial part of the events giving rise to this matter’s claims
3 occurred in this Division.

4 **STATEMENT OF FACTS**

5 *Overview of Facebook’s Business Model and Discriminatory Scheme*

6 12. Facebook has approximately 37 offices in the United States and employs over 34,600
7 employees domestically. The company earned over \$86 billion in revenue in the past fiscal year, with
8 a net income of \$29.1 billion. Facebook derives approximately 45% of its revenue from the United
9 States and Canada. Facebook has grown and expanded its U.S. operations over the years through
10 hiring.

11 13. Hiring employees increases costs, as it adds individuals to payroll, and there are
12 additional costs associated with recruiting, hiring, and onboarding new employees. In order to reduce
13 costs, Facebook prefers to hire visa workers for certain positions—namely, H-1B visa workers. *See*
14 *Compl. ¶¶ 2-4, United States of America v. Facebook, Inc.*, OCAHO Case No. 2021B00007 (Dec. 3,
15 2020), available at <https://bit.ly/3rMJzbF>.

16 14. H-1B visas are intended to bring foreign workers to the United States to perform
17 services in specialty occupations when there are insufficient workers in the U.S. to perform a specific
18 job. *See* 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(1)(ii)(B); 8 C.F.R. § 214(i)(1). By law, H-1B visa workers must be paid
19 by their employer at least as much as other individuals with similar experience and qualifications for
20 the specific employment in question. *See* 20 C.F.R. § 655.731(a). Thus, the only reason Facebook
21 would choose to hire and relegate certain positions to visa holders is to pay them less than American
22 counterparts, an unlawful practice that is known in the industry as “wage theft.” If Facebook in fact
23 paid its visa workers the same as it paid American workers, it would have every incentive to hire, for
24 all positions, the most qualified individual (regardless of his or her visa status).

25 15. Facebook hires visa workers in two ways. First, Facebook hires visa workers directly
26 from the labor market, utilizing its own recruiters and job postings to attract candidates. Facebook
27 must sponsor visas for these employees to allow them to legally work in the U.S., and Facebook
28

1 therefore retains considerable control over these employees. Over the past nine years, Facebook has
 2 secured over 20,000 H-1B visas (including fresh visas, visa extensions, and visa amendments) for its
 3 U.S. workforce. Facebook is an H-1B visa dependent employer, meaning that 15% or more of its U.S.
 4 workforce is on an H-1B visa. And as Facebook’s U.S. workforce continues to grow, so does its
 5 reliance on H-1B visa workers, as indicated by the increased number of H-1B visa approvals below.

Year	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	2022
H-1B Visa Approvals ⁴	412	527	894	1,107	1,566	2,467	3,552	4,408	5,100

6
 7
 8 The vast majority of these visas are secured for employees who will perform software engineer roles
 9 in the United States. *See id.* A large numbers of H-1B visas are also secured for Facebook’s Research
 10 Scientists, Data Scientists, Data Engineers, and Engineering Managers. *See id.*

11
 12 16. Second, Facebook contracts with third party vendors such as Infosys and Accenture
 13 that provide it with visa workers who work out of one of Facebook’s 42 U.S. offices. While the
 14 consulting or contracting companies sponsor visas for these employees, Facebook interviews them,
 15 maintains control over their hiring and termination from Facebook projects, and supervises and
 16 directs their day-to-day activities and assignments.

17
 18 17. Facebook’s preference for hiring and employing visa workers is no secret. In fact, in
 19 December 2018, the Immigrant and Employee Rights Section (“IER”) within the Civil Rights
 20 Division of the U.S. Department of Justice launched an investigation into Facebook’s recruitment
 21 and hiring practices, focusing specifically on whether Facebook engaged in unfair recruitment and
 22 hiring practices based on citizenship or immigration status in violation of 8 U.S.C. § 1324b(a)(1). *See*
 23 *Compl. ¶ 9, United States of America v. Facebook, Inc.*, OCAHO Case No. 2021B00007 (Dec. 3,
 24 2020), available at <https://bit.ly/3rMJzbf>. Following an almost two-year investigation, on October 9,
 25 2020, the IER notified Facebook that it had “found reasonable cause to believe that Facebook had
 26

27
 28 ⁴ *See* H-1B Employer Data Hub Files, U.S. CITIZENSHIP AND IMMIGRATION SERVICES (last
 accessed Mar. 30, 2022), available at <http://bit.ly/2OpEyr2>.

1 engaged in a pattern or practice of unfair immigration-related employment practices violating 8
2 U.S.C. § 1324b(a)(1),” which prohibits discrimination based on an individual’s citizenship status. *Id.*
3 ¶ 10.

4
5 18. The Department of Justice subsequently filed a complaint against Facebook on
6 December 3, 2020, alleging that Facebook intentionally discriminates against U.S. workers because
7 of their citizenship or immigration status by failing to recruit, consider, or hire these workers for
8 permanent positions that it earmarks for the company’s visa holders. *Id.* ¶¶ 2-3. The complaint alleges
9 that from at least January 1, 2018 to at least September 18, 2019, “Facebook’s standard operating
10 procedure was to decline to hire . . . U.S. worker[s] for [2,606] PERM-related position[s],” despite
11 the applicants’ qualifications, and to instead fill these vacancies only with PERM beneficiaries
12 (Facebook employees who were temporary visa holders seeking permanent positions within
13 Facebook and lawful permanent residency in the U.S.). *Id.* ¶¶ 42, 48-49. Facebook took active steps
14 to discourage U.S. workers from applying to the positions reserved for its visa holders, including by
15 failing to advertise the open positions on its website, refusing to accept online applications for the
16 roles, and requiring all interested candidates to mail in copies of their applications. *Id.* ¶ 2. Through
17 this practice, Facebook was able to ensure that its temporary visa holders secured permanent positions
18 through the permanent labor certification process, allowing them to remain in the U.S. beyond the 6-
19 year period afforded by their H-1B visas. *Id.* ¶¶ 2, 17.

20 19. In October 2021, Facebook and the Department of Justice entered into a settlement
21 agreement under which Facebook is required to pay \$4,750,000 to the United States Treasury in civil
22 penalties and \$9,500,000 to a Settlement Fund for potential victims of Facebook’s discrimination.
23 *See* Settlement Agreement at 2, available at <https://bit.ly/3nxZifd>. In addition to agreeing not to
24 discriminate in hiring and recruitment on the basis of citizenship or immigration status, Facebook
25 also agreed to make changes to its recruitment process in connection with its PERM applications,
26 including posting all PERM-related positions on Facebook’s Career website in the same manner as
27 other non-PERM roles, accepting electronic applications for PERM-related positions, entering all
28

1 applicants to PERM-related positions into Facebook's recruiting system, and only rejecting a U.S.
2 worker for the position for lawful, job-related reasons. *See id.* at 2-3.

3 20. Facebook's 2013 to 2020 PERM applications figures are as follows, showing again its
4 increased reliance on visa workers.

Year	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020
PERM Applications ⁵	95	256	419	732	692	1,443	1,481	1,547

7 21. Like Facebook's H-1B visa applications, its PERM applications are mostly filed for
8 Software Engineers, with a high number of applications also filed for Research Scientists, Data
9 Scientists, Data Engineers, and Engineering Managers at Facebook.⁶

10 *Plaintiff Rajaram's Experiences*

11 22. Mr. Rajaram is an experienced and highly skilled information technology professional
12 with almost twenty years of experience in solution architecting and delivering enterprise PLM
13 software solutions to Fortune 500 companies. Mr. Rajaram holds a Bachelor of Engineering degree
14 from Madras University in Chennai and a Diploma in Mechanical Engineering from the Directorate
15 of Technical Education in Chennai. Throughout the course of his career, he has developed an array
16 of technical skills, including in PLM administration, implementation, integration, and support, project
17 and vendor management, solution architecture, requirements gathering, business process mapping,
18 and data migration. From June 2014 forward, Mr. Rajaran has worked as an independent PLM
19 Technical Consultant servicing aerospace, energy, and technology customers (among others).

20 23. Mr. Rajaram was considered for employment with Facebook on two occasions in
21 2020, but Facebook failed to hire him each time because of the company's systematic and continuous
22 discriminatory scheme.

23 24. First. In May 2020, Mr. Rajaram was contacted via WhatsApp by Prashanth
24 Sadasivaiah, an employee of Infosys Limited, regarding a PLM architect position with Facebook.

25
26 ⁵ See Performance Data, U.S. DEPARTMENT OF LABOR (last accessed Jan 10, 2022), *available*
27 *at* <https://bit.ly/3HP5KpF>.

28 ⁶ *See id.*

1 Infosys Limited is a third party vendor with whom Facebook contracts to hire employees to perform
2 IT work. Mr. Rajaram expressed interest in the position and submitted a copy of his resume, which
3 listed his citizenship status as a naturalized U.S. citizen (the same is also mentioned on his LinkedIn
4 profile page).

5 25. Mr. Rajaram was then interviewed by three Infosys employees, Mr. Sadasivaiah, J.
6 Moorthy, and Aravind Tungaturi. The video interview took place via Skype on May 31, 2020. Mr.
7 Rajaram performed well during the interview and received positive feedback from his interviewers.
8 He was told he was the “right guy” and “perfect” for the role.

9 26. On June 1, 2020 Mr. Rajaram received a telephone call from Pradeep Kulkarni, the
10 Infosys client partner for Facebook, asking whether Mr. Rajaram would be available in approximately
11 thirty minutes to interview with Facebook employee Rajesh Pralayakaveri regarding the PLM
12 architect role so that Facebook could make a hiring decision. Later that evening, Mr. Rajaram
13 underwent a telephone interview with Mr. Pralayakaveri, whom Mr. Rajaram understands to be
14 working for Facebook in the U.S. on an H-1B visa. Mr. Pralayakaveri was a junior employee, which
15 was evident by his questioning of Mr. Rajaram. Despite performing well in his interviews and being
16 well-qualified for the role, Mr. Rajaram was not hired by Facebook.

17 27. Second. On June 19, 2020, Bobb Omel, a PLM Analyst at Facebook, referred Mr.
18 Rajaram for a full-time position with the company. Prior to this referral, Mr. Rajaram shared a copy
19 of his resume with Mr. Omel, which notes that he is a naturalized U.S. citizen. Mr. Rajaram was
20 subsequently contacted by Khaled Mansour, a Technical Sourcer for Facebook on June 23 who
21 worked out of Facebook’s Menlo Park, California location. Mr. Rajaram discussed the PLM Analyst
22 position with Mr. Mansour on June 29 for approximately 45 minutes to 1 hour. During that time, Mr.
23 Rajaram detailed his experience in the PLM field. Mr. Mansour stated that Facebook was very
24 interested in Mr. Rajaram’s candidacy and that Mr. Mansour would present him to the team that was
25 hiring for the role. However, on July 6, Mr. Mansour informed Mr. Rajaram that “the team decided
26 not to move forward with the next steps” and Facebook did not hire him for the PLM Analyst role.

1 No further explanation was provided for Facebook’s rejection of Mr. Rajaram’s candidacy. On
2 information and belief, Facebook staffed the role with an H-1B visa holder.

3 28. In both instances, Facebook did not hire Mr. Rajaram because of his citizenship, and
4 Mr. Rajaram would have been hired absent Facebook’s systematic preference for visa holders in
5 hiring for certain U.S. positions.

6 **CLASS ACTION ALLEGATIONS**

7 29. Plaintiff brings this Class Action pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 23(a),
8 (b)(2), (b)(3), and (c)(4), seeking injunctive, declaratory, equitable, and monetary relief for
9 Facebook’s systematic pattern and practice of discrimination against and non-visa holding individuals
10 in the United States. This action is brought on behalf of the following class:

11 All individuals who are not visa holders who applied for the following positions with
12 (or within) Facebook in the U.S., either directly or through a third party vendor, and
13 were not hired: Software Engineer, Research Scientist, Data Scientist, Data Engineer,
14 Engineering Manager, PLM Architect, and/or PLM Analyst.

15 30. Members of the class are so numerous and geographically dispersed across the United
16 States that joinder is impracticable. While the exact number of class members is unknown to Plaintiff,
17 it is believed to be in the thousands. Furthermore, class members are readily identifiable from
18 information and records in Facebook’s possession.

19 31. There are numerous questions of law and fact common to members of the class.
20 Among the common questions of law or fact are: (a) whether Facebook has intentionally
21 discriminated against individuals who are not visa holders in making hiring decisions; (b) whether
22 Facebook has intentionally favored visa holders in hiring decisions, and/or whether Facebook has
23 intentionally disfavored non-visa holders in hiring decisions; (c) whether Facebook’s policy and
24 practice of relying on visa holders is intentionally discriminatory; (d) whether Facebook has violated
25 § 1981; (e) whether equitable and injunctive relief is warranted for the class; and (f) whether
26 compensatory and/or punitive damages are warranted for the class.

27 32. Plaintiff’s claims are typical of the class. Members of the class were damaged by the
28 same discriminatory practices employed by Facebook.

1 33. Plaintiff will fairly and adequately protect the interest of other class members because
2 he has no interest that is antagonistic to or which conflicts with those of any other class member, and
3 Plaintiff is committed to the vigorous prosecution of this action and has retained competent counsel
4 experienced in class litigation to represent him and the class.

5 34. Plaintiff and the class he seeks to represent have suffered substantial losses in earnings
6 and other employment benefits and compensation as a result of Facebook's actions.

7 35. Class certification is appropriate pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 23(b)(2)
8 because Facebook has acted and/or refused to act on grounds generally applicable to the class, making
9 declaratory and injunctive relief appropriate with respect to Plaintiff and the class as a whole.
10 Members of the class are entitled to declaratory and injunctive relief to end Facebook's systematic,
11 common, uniform, unfair, and discriminatory policies and practices.

12 36. Class certification is appropriate pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 23(b)(3)
13 because the issue of liability is common to the class and the common nucleus of operative facts forms
14 the central issue, which predominates over individual issues of proof. The primary question common
15 to the class is whether Facebook has discriminated on the basis of citizenship in its hiring practices.
16 This question is central to the case and predominates over individual issues among the members of
17 the proposed class. Facebook has engaged in a common course of discriminatory conduct in a manner
18 that has harmed all class members. Class certification under Rule 23(b)(3) would be superior to other
19 methods for fair and efficient resolution of the issues because certification will avoid the need for
20 repeated litigation by each individual class member. The instant case will be eminently manageable
21 as a class action. Plaintiff knows of no difficulty to be encountered in the maintenance of this action
22 that would preclude its maintenance as a class action.

23 37. Class certification is appropriate pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 23(c)(4)
24 to litigate Plaintiff's claims for prospective classwide compliance and affirmative injunctive relief
25 necessary to eliminate Facebook's discrimination. Certification under this rule is also appropriate to
26 decide whether Facebook has adopted a systemic pattern and practice of citizenship discrimination
27
28

1 in hiring. Certification under this rule is also appropriate to determine classwide damages, including
2 punitive damages.

3 **COUNT I**

4 **Disparate Treatment on the Basis of Citizenship in Violation of 42 U.S.C. § 1981**
5 **(On behalf of Plaintiff and the Class)**

6 38. Plaintiff re-alleges each preceding paragraph as though fully set forth herein.

7 39. This claim is brought by Plaintiff on behalf of himself and the class.

8 40. Throughout the class liability period, Facebook has engaged in a pattern and practice
9 of discriminating against individuals who are not visa holders by: (a) knowingly and intentionally
10 favoring individuals with visas in job placement (*i.e.*, hiring/staffing) decisions, and (b) knowingly
11 and intentionally disfavoring individuals who are not visa holders (including Plaintiff) in job
12 placement (*i.e.*, hiring/staffing) decisions.

13 41. As a direct and proximate result of Facebook's intentional discrimination, Plaintiff
14 and class members have been denied employment and positions with Facebook.

15 42. Facebook's actions constitute unlawful discrimination on the basis of citizenship in
16 violation of 42 U.S.C. § 1981.

17 **PRAYER FOR RELIEF**

18 WHEREFORE, Plaintiff and the class pray for relief as follows:

- 19 a. Certification of the case as a class action pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 23;
- 20 b. Designation of Plaintiff as representative of the class;
- 21 c. Designation of Plaintiff's counsel as counsel for the class;
- 22 d. A declaratory judgment that the practices complained of herein are unlawful and
23 violates the Civil Rights Act of 1866, 42 U.S.C. § 1981;
- 24 e. A permanent injunction against Defendant and its officers, agents, successors,
25 employees, representatives, and any and all persons acting in concert with them, from
26 engaging in unlawful policies, practices, customs, and usages set forth herein;
- 27 f. Order Defendant to adopt a valid, non-discriminatory method for hiring, staffing, and
28 other employment decisions;
- g. Order Defendant to post notices concerning its duty to refrain from discriminating
against employees on the basis of citizenship;

- 1 h. Award Plaintiff and the Class damages – including (without limitation) compensatory,
2 exemplary, and punitive damages for the harm they suffered as a result of Defendant’s
3 violations of § 1981;
4 i. Award Plaintiff and the Class pre- and post-judgment interest at the prevailing rate on
5 the compensatory damages as a result of Defendant discriminating against them in
6 violation of § 1981;
7 j. Award Plaintiff and the Class front- and back-pay, instatement, and such other
8 equitable relief as the Court deems just and appropriate;
9 k. Award reasonable attorneys’ fees, expert witness fees, expenses, and costs of this
10 action and of prior administrative actions; and
11 l. Award Plaintiff and the Class such other relief as this Court deems just and
12 appropriate.

13 **JURY TRIAL DEMAND**

14 Pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 38, Plaintiff and the Class respectfully demand a trial by jury on
15 all issues properly triable by a jury in this action.

16 DATED: May 17, 2022

17 Respectfully submitted,

18 By: /s/Daniel Low
19 Daniel Low, SBN 218387
20 **KOTCHEN & LOW LLP**
21 1918 New Hampshire Avenue NW
22 Washington, DC 20009
23 Telephone: (202) 471-1995
24 Email: dlow@kotchen.com

25 *Attorney for Plaintiff and Putative Class*

CIVIL COVER SHEET

The JS 44 civil cover sheet and the information contained herein neither replace nor supplement the filing and service of pleadings or other papers as required by law, except as provided by local rules of court. This form, approved by the Judicial Conference of the United States in September 1974, is required for the use of the Clerk of Court for the purpose of initiating the civil docket sheet. (SEE INSTRUCTIONS ON NEXT PAGE OF THIS FORM.)

I. (a) PLAINTIFFS

Rajaram, Purushothaman

(b) County of Residence of First Listed Plaintiff Cumberland Cnty., PA (EXCEPT IN U.S. PLAINTIFF CASES)

(c) Attorneys (Firm Name, Address, and Telephone Number)

Daniel Low, Kotchen & Low LLP, 1918 New Hampshire Ave. NW, Washington, DC 20009 (202)-471-1995

DEFENDANTS

Meta Platforms, Inc.

County of Residence of First Listed Defendant (IN U.S. PLAINTIFF CASES ONLY)

NOTE: IN LAND CONDEMNATION CASES, USE THE LOCATION OF THE TRACT OF LAND INVOLVED.

Attorneys (If Known)

II. BASIS OF JURISDICTION (Place an "X" in One Box Only)

- 1 U.S. Government Plaintiff, 2 U.S. Government Defendant, 3 Federal Question (U.S. Government Not a Party), 4 Diversity (Indicate Citizenship of Parties in Item III)

III. CITIZENSHIP OF PRINCIPAL PARTIES (Place an "X" in One Box for Plaintiff and One Box for Defendant)

- Citizen of This State, Citizen of Another State, Citizen or Subject of a Foreign Country, PTF DEF, 1 1, 2 2, 3 3, 4 4, 5 5, 6 6

IV. NATURE OF SUIT (Place an "X" in One Box Only)

Click here for: Nature of Suit Code Descriptions.

Table with columns: CONTRACT, REAL PROPERTY, TORTS, CIVIL RIGHTS, PRISONER PETITIONS, FORFEITURE/PENALTY, LABOR, IMMIGRATION, BANKRUPTCY, SOCIAL SECURITY, FEDERAL TAX SUITS, OTHER STATUTES. Includes codes like 110 Insurance, 310 Airplane, 365 Personal Injury, etc.

V. ORIGIN (Place an "X" in One Box Only)

- 1 Original Proceeding, 2 Removed from State Court, 3 Remanded from Appellate Court, 4 Reinstated or Reopened, 5 Transferred from Another District, 6 Multidistrict Litigation - Transfer, 8 Multidistrict Litigation - Direct File

VI. CAUSE OF ACTION

Cite the U.S. Civil Statute under which you are filing (Do not cite jurisdictional statutes unless diversity): 42 U.S.C. § 1981. Brief description of cause: Employment discrimination based on citizenship

VII. REQUESTED IN COMPLAINT:

CHECK IF THIS IS A CLASS ACTION UNDER RULE 23, F.R.Cv.P. DEMAND \$ CHECK YES only if demanded in complaint: JURY DEMAND: Yes No

VIII. RELATED CASE(S) IF ANY

(See instructions): JUDGE DOCKET NUMBER

DATE SIGNATURE OF ATTORNEY OF RECORD

5/17/2022 /s/Daniel Low

FOR OFFICE USE ONLY

RECEIPT # AMOUNT APPLYING IFP JUDGE MAG. JUDGE

INSTRUCTIONS FOR ATTORNEYS COMPLETING CIVIL COVER SHEET FORM JS 44

Authority For Civil Cover Sheet

The JS 44 civil cover sheet and the information contained herein neither replaces nor supplements the filings and service of pleading or other papers as required by law, except as provided by local rules of court. This form, approved by the Judicial Conference of the United States in September 1974, is required for the use of the Clerk of Court for the purpose of initiating the civil docket sheet. Consequently, a civil cover sheet is submitted to the Clerk of Court for each civil complaint filed. The attorney filing a case should complete the form as follows:

- I.(a) Plaintiffs-Defendants.** Enter names (last, first, middle initial) of plaintiff and defendant. If the plaintiff or defendant is a government agency, use only the full name or standard abbreviations. If the plaintiff or defendant is an official within a government agency, identify first the agency and then the official, giving both name and title.
- (b) County of Residence.** For each civil case filed, except U.S. plaintiff cases, enter the name of the county where the first listed plaintiff resides at the time of filing. In U.S. plaintiff cases, enter the name of the county in which the first listed defendant resides at the time of filing. (NOTE: In land condemnation cases, the county of residence of the "defendant" is the location of the tract of land involved.)
- (c) Attorneys.** Enter the firm name, address, telephone number, and attorney of record. If there are several attorneys, list them on an attachment, noting in this section "(see attachment)".
- II. Jurisdiction.** The basis of jurisdiction is set forth under Rule 8(a), F.R.Cv.P., which requires that jurisdictions be shown in pleadings. Place an "X" in one of the boxes. If there is more than one basis of jurisdiction, precedence is given in the order shown below.
 United States plaintiff. (1) Jurisdiction based on 28 U.S.C. 1345 and 1348. Suits by agencies and officers of the United States are included here. United States defendant. (2) When the plaintiff is suing the United States, its officers or agencies, place an "X" in this box.
 Federal question. (3) This refers to suits under 28 U.S.C. 1331, where jurisdiction arises under the Constitution of the United States, an amendment to the Constitution, an act of Congress or a treaty of the United States. In cases where the U.S. is a party, the U.S. plaintiff or defendant code takes precedence, and box 1 or 2 should be marked.
 Diversity of citizenship. (4) This refers to suits under 28 U.S.C. 1332, where parties are citizens of different states. When Box 4 is checked, the citizenship of the different parties must be checked. (See Section III below; **NOTE: federal question actions take precedence over diversity cases.**)
- III. Residence (citizenship) of Principal Parties.** This section of the JS 44 is to be completed if diversity of citizenship was indicated above. Mark this section for each principal party.
- IV. Nature of Suit.** Place an "X" in the appropriate box. If there are multiple nature of suit codes associated with the case, pick the nature of suit code that is most applicable. Click here for: [Nature of Suit Code Descriptions](#).
- V. Origin.** Place an "X" in one of the seven boxes.
 Original Proceedings. (1) Cases which originate in the United States district courts.
 Removed from State Court. (2) Proceedings initiated in state courts may be removed to the district courts under Title 28 U.S.C., Section 1441.
 Remanded from Appellate Court. (3) Check this box for cases remanded to the district court for further action. Use the date of remand as the filing date.
 Reinstated or Reopened. (4) Check this box for cases reinstated or reopened in the district court. Use the reopening date as the filing date.
 Transferred from Another District. (5) For cases transferred under Title 28 U.S.C. Section 1404(a). Do not use this for within district transfers or multidistrict litigation transfers.
 Multidistrict Litigation – Transfer. (6) Check this box when a multidistrict case is transferred into the district under authority of Title 28 U.S.C. Section 1407.
 Multidistrict Litigation – Direct File. (8) Check this box when a multidistrict case is filed in the same district as the Master MDL docket.
PLEASE NOTE THAT THERE IS NOT AN ORIGIN CODE 7. Origin Code 7 was used for historical records and is no longer relevant due to changes in statute.
- VI. Cause of Action.** Report the civil statute directly related to the cause of action and give a brief description of the cause. **Do not cite jurisdictional statutes unless diversity.** Example: U.S. Civil Statute: 47 USC 553 Brief Description: Unauthorized reception of cable service.
- VII. Requested in Complaint.** Class Action. Place an "X" in this box if you are filing a class action under Rule 23, F.R.Cv.P.
 Demand. In this space enter the actual dollar amount being demanded or indicate other demand, such as a preliminary injunction.
 Jury Demand. Check the appropriate box to indicate whether or not a jury is being demanded.
- VIII. Related Cases.** This section of the JS 44 is used to reference related pending cases, if any. If there are related pending cases, insert the docket numbers and the corresponding judge names for such cases.

Date and Attorney Signature. Date and sign the civil cover sheet.