UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT DISTRICT OF CONNECTICUT

GARY M. REHO,	71 1 1100)	
	Plaintiff,)	CIVIL ACTION NO.
v.)	
SACRED HEART U	JNIVERSITY, INC.,)	
	Defendant.)	OCTOBER 11, 2016
)	

COMPLAINT

Jurisdiction

1. The jurisdiction of this Court upon 28 U.S.C. § 1331, in that the action arises under the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990, 42 U.S.C. § 12101, as amended, and C.G.S.A. § 46a-60(a)(1).

Venue

2. Venue is proper in this district under 28 U.S.C. § 1391(b) in that a substantial part of the events or omissions giving rise to the Plaintiff's claims occurred in this district and State, and the Defendant is a resident of the State in which the district is located.

The Plaintiff

3. At all relevant times herein, the Plaintiff, Gary M. Reho (the "Plaintiff"), was an individual residing in the State of Connecticut.

The Defendant

4. At all relevant times herein, the Defendant, Sacred Heart University, Inc. (the "Defendant"), was an educational institution, with its principal place of business at 5151 Park Avenue, Fairfield, Connecticut 06825.

The Preliminary Statement

- 5. The Plaintiff seeks by this action to recover damages as a result of the Defendant's willful discrimination against the Plaintiff due to his disability, in violation of the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990 ("ADA"), 42 U.S.C. § 12101, as amended, and C.G.S.A. § 46a-60(a)(1).
- 6. On or about February 24, 2016, the Plaintiff filed a claim with the Connecticut

 Commission on Human Rights and Opportunities ("CHRO") and the United States Equal

 Employment Opportunity Commission ("EEOC"), claiming illegal discrimination on the

 basis of disability.
- 7. On or about September 29, 2016, the CHRO issued a Release of Jurisdiction to the Plaintiff.
- 8. On or about September 29, 2016, the EEOC issued a Notice of Right to Sue Letter to the Plaintiff.

Facts

- 9. The Plaintiff, Gary Reho, was hired by the Defendant, Sacred Heart University, Inc., as the head football coach on or about July 1, 1990.
- 10. On or about October 22, 1990, in the Plaintiff's first "Performance Appraisal for Administrative and Professional Employees," his supervisor stated, "In the short time you've been here you have made our department better. All of us can learn from your organizational and management skills."
- 11. In 1996, in addition to continuing as the head football coach, the Plaintiff accepted a position as the Associate Director of Athletics.

- 12. On or about July 1, 1997, the Plaintiff accepted a newly created position with the Defendant as the Director of the William H. Pitt Health and Recreation Center and Athletic Facilities (the "Pitt Center"), a new facility on the Sacred Heart University campus that housed basketball courts, training facilities, locker rooms, and offices for the Athletics Department staff.
- 13. As Director of the Pitt Center, the Plaintiff's responsibilities included reporting to the Dean of Students, managing and coordinating the day-to-day operations of the Pitt Center, managing and coordinating special events, supervising staff members, and developing the Pitt Center operating budget.
- 14. The Plaintiff never received verbal or written warnings, disciplinary actions, or reprimands during his employment with the Defendant.
- 15. The Plaintiff received high praise in each of his annual performance reviews.
- 16. In December, 2014, the Plaintiff underwent a neurologic consult examination with the Associated Neurologists of Southern Connecticut, P.C. This examination followed a number of cataract surgeries in 2013 and 2014.
- 17. On or about December 22, 2014, after examinations and testing by Neuropsychologist, Dr. Christine McCarthy ("Dr. McCarthy") and Dr. Srinath Kadimi ("Dr. Kadimi"), it was determined that the results of those tests were consistent with a diagnostic impression of Posterior Cortical Atrophy type of Major Neurocognitive Disorder, or, in other words, onset of Dementia.
- 18. On or about December 22, 2014, following an examination, Dr. McCarthy wrote, "Mr. Reho's cognitive functioning and emotional wellbeing will be improved by returning to work."

- 19. In January, 2015, in the spirit of full disclosure, the Plaintiff reported Dr. McCarthy's findings to the Defendant, and provided it with the Neuropsychological Evaluation Report from the Plaintiff's December 22, 2014 evaluation, which included Dr. McCarthy's recommended accommodations and modifications to the Plaintiff's job duties.
- 20. From February, 2015, through June, 2015, there were communications between the Human Resources Department at Sacred Heart University, including Julie Nofri ("Nofri"), the Executive Director for Human Resources, and Sally Schettino ("Schettino"), a Human Resources Project Manager, and the Associated Neurologists of Southern Connecticut, P.C. These communications included an inquiry as to whether the Plaintiff could perform the essential functions of the Plaintiff's job based on the Defendant's job description for the Plaintiff's position.
- 21. On or about June 10, 2015, in a letter from Dr. McCarthy to Ms. Nofri addressed the questions raised in numerous letters from the Defendant. In her letter, Dr. McCarthy states, "Mr. Reho is NOT described as an '... individual who is possibly a candidate for legal conservatorship' in any portion of my report of his December 2014 neuropsychological evaluation."
- 22. In addition, in Dr. McCarthy's response to the May 28, 2015 letter from the Defendant claiming that the Plaintiff's doctor opined that the Plaintiff could not perform the essential functions of his job, Dr. McCarthy wrote that it was "... an entirely incorrect and inaccurate account of the overall gist of the professional opinions that I related over the course of our past telephone conversations."

- 23. The Defendants failed to engage in the interactive process required by the ADA to determine the possible accommodations that may be required.
- 24. On or about August 27, 2015, the Plaintiff was terminated from his position with the Defendant in a letter sent to him from Robert Hardy, the Vice President of Human Resources. The letter stated that "the position of Director of the William H. Pitt Health & Recreation Center/Athletics Facility is no longer a viable position . . . "

FIRST COUNT

- 1-23. Paragraphs 1 through 23 alleged above are incorporated by reference and made a part hereof as though fully set forth.
- 25. The Plaintiff is a member of a protected class based on his disability and/or perceived disability.
- 26. The Defendant terminated the Plaintiff from his employment on the basis of his disability in violation of the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990, 42 U.S.C. § 12101, as amended.
- 27. The Defendant further failed to make reasonable accommodations for the Plaintiff and his job responsibilities when the accommodations were necessary to avoid discrimination on the basis of his disability, in violation of the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990, 42 U.S.C. § 12101, as amended.
- 28. As evidenced in over twenty-five years of employment and excellent performance reviews, the Plaintiff was qualified for his position with the Defendant. In addition, Dr. McCarthy opined that the Plaintiff's "... cognitive functioning and emotional wellbeing ..." would improve by his returning to work.

- 29. As a result of the Defendant's conduct as alleged above, the Defendant violated the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990, 42 U.S.C. § 12101, as amended.
- 30. As a result of the Defendant's unlawful discrimination, the Plaintiff has suffered and continues to suffer damages.

SECOND COUNT

- 1-29. Paragraphs 1 through 23 of the First Count alleged above are incorporated by reference and made a part hereof as though fully set forth.
- 31. The Plaintiff is a member of a protected class based on his disability and/or perceived disability.
- 32. The Defendant terminated the Plaintiff on the basis of his disability, in violation of C.G.S.A. § 46a-60(a)(1).
- 33. The Defendant further failed to make reasonable accommodations for the Plaintiff in his job responsibilities when the modifications were necessary to avoid discrimination on the basis of disability, in violation of C.G.S.A. § 46a-60(a)(1).
- 34. As evidenced in over twenty-five years of employment and excellent performance reviews, the Plaintiff was qualified for his position with the Defendant. In addition, Dr. McCarthy opined that the Plaintiff's "... cognitive functioning and emotional wellbeing ..." would improve by returning to work.
- 35. As a result of the Defendant's conduct as alleged above, the Defendant violated C.G.S.A. § 46a-60(a)(1).
- 36. As a result of the Defendant's unlawful discrimination, the Plaintiff has suffered and continues to suffer damages.

THIRD COUNT

- 1-23. Paragraphs 1 through 23 of the First Count alleged above are incorporated by reference and made a part hereof as though fully set forth.
- 37. The Defendant intended to inflict emotional distress upon the Plaintiff or knew or should have known that emotional distress was a likely result of terminating the Plaintiff because the Plaintiff was a loyal employee for over twenty-five years and the Defendant was aware that continuing to and returning to work would improve his "cognitive functioning and emotional wellbeing."
- 38. The Defendant's conduct of terminating the Plaintiff after twenty-five years of exceptional work due to the Plaintiff's disability was extreme and outrageous.
- 39. The Defendant's conduct caused and still causes the Plaintiff to suffer severe emotional distress.

WHEREFORE, the Plaintiff prays this Court:

- a. Assumes jurisdiction of this action;
- b. Award the Plaintiff compensatory damages as a result of the Defendant's willful violation of the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990, 42 U.S.C. § 12101, as amended;
- c. Award the Plaintiff back pay and front pay under the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990, 42 U.S.C. § 12101, as amended;
- d. Award the Plaintiff punitive damages under the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990, 42 U.S.C. § 12101, as amended;
- e. Award the Plaintiff reasonable attorneys' fees under the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990, 42 U.S.C. § 12101, as amended;
- f. Award the Plaintiff compensatory damages as a result of the Defendant's willful violation of C.G.S.A. § 46a-60(a)(1);
- g. Award the Plaintiff back pay and front pay under C.G.S.A. § 46a-60(a)(1);
- h. Award the Plaintiff punitive damages under C.G.S.A. § 46a-60(a)(1);
- i. Award costs of this action;
- j. Award interest;
- k. Grant such other and further relief as may appear to this Court to be equitable, just, and proper.

THE PLAINTIFF HEREBY REQUIESTS A JURY TRIAL ON ALL COUNTS.

THE PLAINTIFF, GARY M. REHO

BY:

Michael E. Satti (CT01311)

Michael E. Satti, Attorney at Law, LLC

185 South Broad Street, Suite 301

Pawcatuck, CT 06379 Tel.: (860) 599-5988

Fax: (860) 599-5976 HIS ATTORNEY JS 44 (Rev. 08/16)

AMOUNT

RECEIPT#

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 de	ocket sheet. (SEE INSTRUC	TIONS ON NEXT PAGE OF	F THIS FC	DRM.)	,				
I. (a) PLAINTIFFS				DEFENDANTS					
GARY M. REHO				SACRED HEART UNIVERSITY, INC.					
(b) County of Residence of First Listed Plaintiff New Haven (EXCEPT IN U.S. PLAINTIFF CASES)				County of Residence of First Listed Defendant Fairfield (IN U.S. PLAINTIFF CASES ONLY) NOTE: IN LAND CONDEMNATION CASES, USE THE LOCATION OF THE TRACT OF LAND INVOLVED.					
(c) Attorneys (Firm Name, Address, and Telephone Number) Michael E. Satti, Attorney at Law, LLC 185 South Broad Street, Suite 301, Pawcatuck, CT 06379 (860) 599-5988				Attorneys (If Known) James M. Sconzo, One State Street, 9 (860) 392-5000					
II. BASIS OF JURISDI	CTION (Place an "X" in C	ne Box Only)		TIZENSHIP OF P	RINCIPA	L PARTIES			
□ 1 U.S. Government Plaintiff	3 Federal Question (U.S. Government)	Not a Party)		(For Diversity Cases Only) PT en of This State	TF DEF	Incorporated or Pri		PTF 4	DEF
☐ 2 U.S. Government Defendant	☐ 4 Diversity (Indicate Citizensh	ip of Parties in Item III)	Citiz	en of Another State	2 🗖 2	Incorporated and Proof Business In A		□ 5	5
				en or Subject of a reign Country		Foreign Nation		□ 6	□ 6
IV. NATURE OF SUIT			E(DEFITUDE/DEMAITV		for: Nature of Sui			FS
CONTRACT ☐ 110 Insurance ☐ 120 Marine ☐ 130 Miller Act ☐ 140 Negotiable Instrument ☐ 150 Recovery of Overpayment	PERSONAL INJURY 310 Airplane 315 Airplane Product Liability 320 Assault, Libel &	PERSONAL INJURY 365 Personal Injury - Product Liability Pharmaceutical Personal Injury Product Liability Personal Injury Product Liability Personal Injury Product Liability PERSONAL PROPER 370 Other Fraud 371 Truth in Lending 380 Other Personal Property Damage 7385 Property Damage	7	DRFEITURE/PENALTY 25 Drug Related Seizure of Property 21 USC 881 20 Other LABOR 0 Fair Labor Standards Act 20 Labor/Management Relations 10 Railway Labor Act 21 Family and Medical Leave Act 20 Other Labor Litigation 21 Employee Retirement Income Security Act IMMIGRATION 22 Naturalization Application 35 Other Immigration Actions	□ 422 Appe □ 423 With 28 U PROPEN □ 820 Copy □ 830 Paten □ 840 Trade SOCIAL □ 861 HIA 0 □ 862 Black □ 863 DIW0 □ 864 SSID □ 865 RSI (□ FEDERA □ 870 Taxes or Do □ 871 IRS—	SC 157 RTY RIGHTS rights t tmark SECURITY (1395ff) £ Lung (923) C/DIWW (405(g)) Title XVI 405(g)) SL TAX SUITS G (U.S. Plaintiff efendant)	480 Consum	aims Act in (31 USC) apportion t t nd Bankin ree tion er Influen Organizat er Credit at TV es/Commo ge tatutory A tatutory A to Inform ion strative Pr iew or Ap Decision tionality of	ment ng ced and tions odities/ ctions atters nation ocedure
	moved from	Appellate Court	Reo	stated or 5 Transfe pened Anothe (specify)	r District	☐ 6 Multidistri Litigation Transfer	=	Multidis Litigatio Direct F	n -
VI. CAUSE OF ACTIO	ON 42 U.S.C. § 1210	ouse:							
Defendant wrongfully terminated Plaintiff because of Plaintiff's disability. VII. REQUESTED IN COMPLAINT: UNDER RULE 23, F.R.Cv.P. Defendant wrongfully terminated Plaintiff because of Plaintiff's disability. CHECK YES only if demanded in complaint 103,276.23 JURY DEMAND: Yes O No				at:					
COMPLAINT: VIII. RELATED CASI				.00,210.20			2, 103		
IF ANY	Ana	JUDGE OF ACT	ODMEN	DE RECORD	DOCKE	T NUMBER			
DATE 10/11/2016 FOR OFFICE USE ONLY	///inte	SIGNATURE OF ATT	OKNEY	JE RECORD					
	MOUNT	APPLYING IFP		JUDGE		MAG. JUD	OGE		

APPLYING IFP

JUDGE

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

for the

District of Connecticut						
Gary M. Reho Plaintiff v. Sacred Heart University, Inc.) -)) Civil Action No.)					
Defendant SUMMONS IN A CIVIL ACTION						
To: (Defendant's name and address) Sacred Heart University 5151 Park Avenue Fairfield, CT 06825	ty, Inc.					
A lawsuit has been filed against you. Within 21 days after service of this summons on you (not counting the day you received it) — or 60 days if you are the United States or a United States agency, or an officer or employee of the United States described in Fed. R. Civ. P. 12 (a)(2) or (3) — you must serve on the plaintiff an answer to the attached complaint or a motion under Rule 12 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure. The answer or motion must be served on the plaintiff or plaintiff's attorney, whose name and address are: Michael E. Satti Michael E. Satti, Attorney at Law, LLC 185 South Broad Street, Suite 301 Pawcatuck, CT06379						
If you fail to respond, judgment by default will be entered against you for the relief demanded in the complaint. You also must file your answer or motion with the court.						
	CLERK OF COURT					
Date:	Signature of Clerk or Deputy Clerk					

United States District Court

for the District of Connecticut

District of Com-	
Gary M. Reho Plaintiff v. Sacred Heart University, Inc. Defendant)	Civil Action No.
WAIVER OF THE SERVI	ICE OF SUMMONS
To: Michael E. Satti (Name of the plaintiff's attorney or unrepresented plaintiff)	_
I have received your request to waive service of a summ two copies of this waiver form, and a prepaid means of returning	nons in this action along with a copy of the complaint, g one signed copy of the form to you.
I, or the entity I represent, agree to save the expense of s	serving a summons and complaint in this case.
I understand that I, or the entity I represent, will kee jurisdiction, and the venue of the action, but that I waive any ob	ep all defenses or objections to the lawsuit, the court's jections to the absence of a summons or of service.
I also understand that I, or the entity I represent, must fi 60 days from 10/11/2016, the date when the United States). If I fail to do so, a default judgment will be enter	le and serve an answer or a motion under Rule 12 within his request was sent (or 90 days if it was sent outside the red against me or the entity I represent.
Date:	Signature of the attorney or unrepresented party
	Signature of the attorney or unrepresented party
Printed name of party waiving service of summons	Printed name
	Address
	E-mail address
	Telephone number

Duty to Avoid Unnecessary Expenses of Serving a Summons

Rule 4 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure requires certain defendants to cooperate in saving unnecessary expenses of serving a summons and complaint. A defendant who is located in the United States and who fails to return a signed waiver of service requested by a plaintiff located in the United States will be required to pay the expenses of service, unless the defendant shows good cause for the failure.

"Good cause" does not include a belief that the lawsuit is groundless, or that it has been brought in an improper venue, or that the court has no jurisdiction over this matter or over the defendant or the defendant's property.

If the waiver is signed and returned, you can still make these and all other defenses and objections, but you cannot object to the absence of a summons or of service.

If you waive service, then you must, within the time specified on the waiver form, serve an answer or a motion under Rule 12 on the plaintiff and file a copy with the court. By signing and returning the waiver form, you are allowed more time to respond than if a summons had been served.