

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24

ØŠÖÖ  
GEG ÁÉÜÄÏ ÁHK JÁÚT  
SÖ ÖÁÖUWÞVÝ  
ÙWÚÖÜQÜÁÖUWÜVÁÖŠÖÜS  
ÖÖŠÖÖ  
ÔÖÜÖÁÖG ÉËËËË ÁÖÖE

IN KING COUNTY SUPERIOR COURT

COREY FOY

NO.

Plaintiff,

vs.

COMPLAINT FOR DAMAGES

CITY OF SEATTLE,

Defendant.

I. NATURE OF THE ACTION

1.1 This is an employment discrimination, harassment, and retaliation action brought by the Plaintiff, Corey Foy pursuant RCW 49.60 and the tort of outrage. Plaintiff Foy alleges that the Seattle Police Department has subjected him to unlawful employment discrimination, including harassment, hostile work environment, disparate treatment and retaliation based upon his race.

1.2 Plaintiff Foy has been Seattle Police Officer for years. The process of becoming an officer was not only difficult because of the training and expertise necessary to be a police officer, but also because he faced race discrimination on a daily basis. This discrimination has been ongoing and continuous throughout his entire career. The level of discrimination Plaintiff Foy experienced at the hands of his fellow officers and superiors has had a significant impact on his

1 emotional, mental and physical wellbeing. Plaintiff Foy continues to serve as a member of the  
2 Seattle Police Department because of his deep commitment to service and being an example for  
3 the younger generation. He has stuck with this job for decades because he believes that  
4 he can make a positive difference in the lives of others. Plaintiff Foy files this claim for damages  
5 in the hopes that the department will authentically address issues related to the racism and other  
6 forms of discrimination he has faced during her career. He notes that the hostile work environ-  
7 ment he has been subjected to has increased dramatically in recent years.

## 8 II. THE PARTIES

9 2.1 Plaintiff Corey Foy is currently a police officer for the Seattle Police Department who re-  
10 sides in King County, Washington.

11 2.2 Defendant City of Seattle is a municipal corporation located in King County, Washing-  
12 ton. At all times material to this Complaint, the Seattle Police Department was an agent of the  
13 City of Seattle, acting under color of state law.

## 14 III. JURISDICTION AND VENUE

15 3.1 This Court has jurisdiction over the claims that have been brought by the Plaintiff.

16 3.2 This Court is the proper venue for this claim because the events giving rise to the claims  
17 asserted herein occurred in King County.

## 18 IV. FACTS

19 4.1 The following recitation of facts is not exhaustive of the number of instances from recent  
20 years is too voluminous to include and the degradation and hostility in Plaintiff Foy's work envi-  
21 ronment has been ongoing and continuous. The following merely provides support of Plaintiff  
22 Foy's claims.

TREATMENT OF PLAINTIFF FOY

4.2 Plaintiff Foy was asked and approached by fellow officer, Domisi Thrash, who was asked by the Sgt. Jennifer Samson why Plaintiff Foy “Why does he looks like that?” “Why does he look this way?” Ofc. Thrash asked Sgt. Samson to clarify. A few days later Sgt Samson, yet again, asked Ofc. Thrash “why does he look like that?” Plaintiff Foy was confused and taken back because he was being judged on the color of his skin.

4.3 Later on, Plaintiff Foy and his partner Ofc. Thrash were invited to the Guild office as they were serving lunch. Sgt. Jennifer Samson was present with her family, including her mother. Sgt. Samson introduced her mother to Plaintiff Foy. After the introduction, Ms. Samson’s mother stated “Um, wow I’ve never met a brother before.” Everyone within earshot heard this and began laughing at Plaintiff Foy. Plaintiff Foy was humiliated and left the event shortly thereafter.

4.4 On another occasion, Plaintiff Foy was told there would be some changes and he was being moved to a different squad and would have a different supervisor. During this meeting, Sgt. Samson claimed that Plaintiff Foy was angry because she claimed Plaintiff Foy wanted to date a Black female officer, Jesscia Chandler, and alleged Plaintiff Foy was upset because this Black female officer was dating a Caucasian male officer. Plaintiff Foy was perplexed by this accusation because he had no desire to date Ofc. Chandler.

4.5 Sgt. Samson then told Plaintiff Foy he and Ofc. Thrash would be separated and no longer working together as partners. The reason given was because Plaintiff Foy and Ofc. Thrash took calls together, which followed policy at that time of employment in going out as a two Officer unit.

4.6 Plaintiff Foy was informed he was being moved and transferred because of his veteran leadership. Plaintiff Foy switched positions with Ofc. Rogers. However, Ofc. Rogers had more

1 time with the Seattle Police Department; thus, more experience than Plaintiff Foy. Plaintiff Foy  
2 was confused why he was being transferred to this unit, and felt it was retaliation.

3 4.7 On another occasion, Plaintiff Foy and Ofc. Thrash arrived approximately five (5)  
4 minutes late for a training class. When Plaintiff Foy got the precinct for the training, the supervi-  
5 sor turned them away and denied them access to the training because they were approximately 5  
6 minutes late. Plaintiff Foy and Ofc. Thrash then went to the precinct to inform the Acting Sgt  
7 and ask for guidance on how to move forward. Plaintiff Foy was told he was given a special ser-  
8 vice day. Later on, that day, Sgt. Samson became of aware of the special service given to Plain-  
9 tiff Foy and Ofc. Thrash and became visibly angry. Sgt. Samson stated, "I'm sick of this I got  
10 something for this, I'll take care of this."

11 The next day, Sgt. Edward Medlock approached Plaintiff Foy and said "Hey what did  
12 you guys to Sgt. Samson?" Sgt. Medlock then said something to the effect "She has a hard on  
13 for you, for some reason."

14 No one told Plaintiff Foy that it was inappropriate to have a special service day.

15 4.8. Sgt. Samson called Plaintiff Foy a "slug" and badmouthed him to other officers about not  
16 doing his job even though Plaintiff Foy met all expectations on his job performance evaluations.

#### 17 RACIST WORKPLACE PROPAGANDA

18 4.9 On another occasion, Plaintiff Foy came into the precinct and before the start of roll call.  
19 Plaintiff Foy walked by Ofc. AJ Marks and was told by Ofc. Marks "Why are you coming in  
20 here looking like a damn thug?" with demeaning and racial undertones. There were several other  
21 officers present when Ofc. Mark made this statement and the whole room went quiet after this  
22 comment. After this comment, Plaintiff Foy walked into the locker room and changed into his  
23 police uniform. Plaintiff Foy then came out and asked, Ofc. Mark "How do I look now?" The  
24 reply was "you look like a damn thug." Plaintiff Foy felt humiliated, embarrassed and harassed

1 by his fellow officers.

2 4.10 Ofc. Foy was treated differently from other nonblack officers because other nonblack of-  
3 ficers could show up to roll call late or not in uniform, and not be reprimanded, and this occurred  
4 on several multiple occasions. On one occasion, Ofc. Cody Alidon, Ofc. Chang and Ofc. Mat-  
5 thew Chang were late to roll call. Ofc. Chang was not fully dressed in uniform as he did not have  
6 on his uniform vest. Multiple Sargent's were present during this time including Captain Truong.  
7 These Officers were not reprimanded even though Ofc. Foy was in the past for the same identical  
8 behavior. Ofc. Foy was reprimanded for coming into roll call late even though his fellow  
9 nonblack officers were not. Ofc. Foy was reprimanded by Lt. Matthew Hendry for not wearing  
10 his police vest to roll call.

11 On another occasion, Ofc. Scott Gerber came into roll call late. Sgt. Chris Toman joked  
12 with him about it stating "Hey Scott, We can just adjust roll call time for you" they both laughed  
13 about it and roll call continued as normal. However, when Ofc. Foy was late in the past he was  
14 ridiculed for it and Sgt. Toman told him, "You need to leave early because you're late almost  
15 every day."

16 Plaintiff Foy brought these discrepancies in treatment up to Cpt. Moss' attention and in-  
17 formed him of how Plaintiff Foy was treated differently than other nonblack officers for being  
18 late to roll call or not having his vest on. Cpt. Moss witnessed the other officers coming to roll  
19 late and not being reprimanded. Plaintiff Foy made Cpt. Moss aware of how he was being  
20 treated differently than nonblack officers and Cpt. Moss acknowledged and witnessed the differ-  
21 ent treatment.

22 4.11 The discipline given to Ofc. Marks was not comparable to discipline given to others in a  
23 similar fashion.

24 4.12 A poster on the outside of a locker inside the South precinct read "I love all my white  
COMPLAINT FOR DAMAGES

1 friends.” On a separate occasion, Plaintiff Foy witnessed another African American Officer be-  
2 ing ridiculed as he put lotion away in the locker room. An officer walked into the locker room  
3 and exaggerated sniffed the air and said, “What kind of lotion is that? Its gotta be cocoa butter.

4 4.13 On several occasions, Plaintiff Foy was mocked and officers taunted him because of his  
5 accent. Plaintiff Foy was born in the State of Georgia and speaks with a southern accent. Sev-  
6 eral officers, have even gone so far as correcting his pronunciation of certain words, which is de-  
7 meaning to Plaintiff Foy.

8 4.14 On a separate occasion after the college football national championship game, in which  
9 University of Washington lost, a fellow officer said out loud, “Well there’s going to a bunch of  
10 kids over in Africa wearing UW gear now!” Plaintiff Foy was the only African American pre-  
11 sent during the time this was said in front of 7-10 other white male officers.

12 4.15 On a separate occasion Plaintiff Foy saw the officers put a black suspect up on the wall and  
13 remove the black suspect’s face and scratch out his name. The officers then cut out Ofc. Grif-  
14 fin’s picture face and put in over the black suspect face and wrote Ofc. Griffin’s name on it.  
15 This poster was left up for weeks. Plaintiff Foy was humiliated and embarrassed as a black  
16 male. No supervising officers removed this poster from the wall.

17 4.16 On a separate occasion, Plaintiff Foy arrived at the south precinct and parked in the front  
18 lot. Plaintiff Foy entered the secured (locked Police Only Gate) gate at which time Ofc. Cody  
19 Alidon looked at Plaintiff Foy and stated, "You look sketchy coming into work with a hoody on  
20 carting a plastic bag." Plaintiff Foy then asked him "Why, is it because I'm black?" Ofc. Aldion  
21 responded by laughing out loud and got into his patrol vehicle and closed the door. Plaintiff Foy  
22 was humiliated and embarrassed as a black male.

1 A CULTURE OF RETALIATION

2 4.17 Plaintiff Foy was reprimanded for being out of uniform even though it was due to an in-  
3 jury, while there were several occasions that other officers out of uniform and they were never  
4 reprimanded for being out of uniform.

5 4.18 Plaintiff Foy was given different individualized expectations that were not given to other  
6 officers who engaged in the same behavior as Plaintiff Foy.

7 4.19 Plaintiff Foy was accused of taking too long to respond to calls even though other offic-  
8 ers were not reprimanded for the same behavior.

9 4.20 Other officers have been given priority for overtime over Plaintiff Foy.

10 4.21 Plaintiff Foy was denied overtime to work with SPD mobile precinct, and was treated dif-  
11 ferently from other officers with the same qualifications and training who were allowed this  
12 same overtime.

13 4.22 Plaintiff Foy was denied resumption of Field Training Officers for claims of his job per-  
14 formance; even though he had no issues of job performance being reflected in his job perfor-  
15 mance evaluations or brought to his attention.

16 4.23 Plaintiff Foy was denied overtime by his north precinct superior as retaliation for him re-  
17 porting concerns about discrimination to the precinct Captain.

18 4.24 Plaintiff Foy has been repeatedly overlooked regarding opportunities for career advance-  
19 ment.

20 TORTIOUS MISCONDUCT

21 4.25 On September 17, 2024, Plaintiff Foy filed a tort claim against the City of Seattle con-  
22 taining the allegations pleaded herein.

23 4.26 The City of Seattle did conducted an EEO investigation based on the some of the asser-  
24 tions from Plaintiff Foye's tort claim, and investigation is still ongoing.

COMPLAINT FOR DAMAGES

JAMES BIBLE LAW GROUP/  
VALDEZ LEHMAN PLLC  
14205 SE 36<sup>TH</sup> St. Ste. 100  
Bellevue, Washington 98006

1 4.27 The City of Seattle failed to respond meaningfully and therefore, Plaintiff Foy pursues  
2 this lawsuit in hopes of achieving justice.

3 4.28 Defendant engaged in all of the above unlawful conduct and the unlawful conduct was  
4 motivated by Plaintiff's race and/or opposition to Defendant's discriminatory conduct.

5 4.29 Defendant retaliated against Plaintiff for engaging in protected activity and for his oppo-  
6 sition to activity to the above referenced unlawful employment practices.

7 4.30 The effect of the practices complained of herein have been to deprive Plaintiff of his  
8 equal employment opportunities and otherwise adversely affect his status as an employee be-  
9 cause of his opposition and reporting of Defendant's misconduct.

10 4.31 Defendant failed to eliminate discrimination, harassment and the retaliation that created a  
11 hostile work environment for Plaintiff Foy.

12 4.32 Defendant intentionally committed unlawful employment practices based on the facts  
13 complained of herein.

14 4.33 Defendant has made disparaging comments to Plaintiff regarding his race, including that  
15 instead of filing grievances and complaints, he should just suck it up.

16 4.34 When committing the herein mentioned unlawful employment practices, Defendant acted  
17 with malice or reckless indifference to Plaintiff's rights as protected by federal and state law.

18 4.35 On a separate occasion, Plaintiff Foy was brought into Lt Matthew Hendry's office and  
19 berated and cussed out on false allegations. Plaintiff Foy was given individualized expectations  
20 from Lt. Matthew Hendry such as being on time for roll, which was different treatment than  
21 nonblack officers. Plaintiff Foy was told he did not need an attorney or Guild representation,  
22 and this was Lt. Hendry telling Plaintiff Foy this was Lt. Hendry's expectations of Ofc. Foy.

23 4.36 Two days later, after being cussed out, Lt. Hendry then came out with list of expectations  
24 for the south precinct, which were different than the verbal expectations given to Ofc. Foy.



1                                   **V.      CAUSES OF ACTION:**  
2                                   **Discrimination on the Basis of Race in Violation of the Washington Law Against Discrimi-**  
3                                   **nation**  
4                                   **RCW 49.60**

5            5.1      Plaintiff incorporates paragraphs 1.1 through 4.36 as though fully set forth herein.

6            5.2      Defendant's actions and/or omissions constitute disparate treatment, a hostile work envi-  
7                      ronment, and discrimination in Plaintiff's terms or conditions of employment (Section 4.4 of the  
8                      Seattle Police Department Employment Agreement) on the basis of his race, religion and na-  
9                      tional origin in violation of the Washington Law Against Discrimination (WLAD).

10           5.3      Defendant's actions and/or omissions constitute retaliation in violation of WLAD against  
11                      Plaintiff for her having engaged in protected activities under RCW 49.60.

12           5.4      As a result of Defendant's violations, Plaintiff has been damaged in an amount to be  
13                      proven at trial.

14                                   **Retaliation in Violation of the Washington Law Against Discrimination**  
15                                   **RCW 49.60**

16           6.1      Plaintiff incorporates all of the above paragraphs as though fully set forth herein.

17           6.2      Defendant's actions and/or omissions constitute disparate treatment, a hostile work envi-  
18                      ronment, and discrimination in Plaintiff's terms or conditions of employment (Section 4.4 of the  
19                      Seattle Police Department Employment Agreement) on the basis of his reporting such disparate  
20                      treatment in the form of grievances and complaints, in violation of the Washington Law Against  
21                      Discrimination (WLAD).

22           6.3      Defendant's actions and/or omissions constitute retaliation in violation of WLAD against  
23                      Plaintiff for him having engaged in protected activities under RCW 49.60.

24           6.4      As a result of Defendant's violations, Plaintiff has been damaged in an amount to be  
                    proven at trial.

1       **Hostile Work Environment in Violation of the Washington Law Against Discrimination**  
2                                   **RCW 49.60**

3       7.1       Plaintiff incorporates all of the above paragraphs as though fully set forth herein.

4       7.2       Defendant's actions and/or omissions constitute a hostile work environment for creating,  
5       fostering, perpetuating, and refusing to eliminate discrimination against the Plaintiff in violation  
6       of the terms or conditions of his employment (Section 4.4 of the Seattle Police Department Em-  
7       ployment Agreement) and in violation of the Washington Law Against Discrimination (WLAD).

8       7.3       Defendant's actions and/or omissions constitute retaliation in violation of WLAD against  
9       Plaintiff for him having engaged in protected activities under RCW 49.60.

10      7.4       As a result of Defendant's violations, Plaintiff has been damaged in an amount to be  
11      proven at trial.

12                                   **Tort of Outrage**  
                                 **Washington Common Law**

13      8.1       Plaintiff incorporates all of the above paragraphs as though fully set forth herein.

14      8.2       Defendant's actions and/or omissions constitute negligent or intentional infliction of  
15      emotional distress, also known as tort of outrage.

16      8.3       As a result of the Defendant's violations, Plaintiff has been damaged in an amount to be  
17      proven at trial.

18  
19                                   **IX.     JURY DEMAND**

20           The Plaintiff, by and through his attorney of record, hereby demands a jury trial in this  
21      action upon all their claims in the complaint, and as may be hereafter amended, and all other re-  
22      lated issues, pursuant to FRCP 38.

23      WHEREFORE, Plaintiff seeks the following relief:

24           1.   Compensatory, general and special damages in amounts to be proven at trial:  
COMPLAINT FOR DAMAGES

JAMES BIBLE LAW GROUP/  
VALDEZ LEHMAN PLLC  
14205 SE 36<sup>TH</sup> St. Ste. 100  
Bellevue, Washington 98006

2. Injunctive relief, including but not limited to, implementation of measures that protect Plaintiff Foy and other employees from further discrimination and retaliation;
3. Punitive damages for Defendant's conduct, in amounts to be determined at trial to the fullest extent allowed by law;
4. Order requiring Defendant to pay Plaintiff for any and all tax consequences associated with the damages and cost award, including but not limited attorney's fees;
5. Reasonable attorney's fees and expenses;
6. Costs of suit; and
7. Any other relief deemed appropriate by the Court.

DATED this 16<sup>th</sup> date of April, 2025.

/s/ Jesse Valdez  
James Bible, WSBA #33985  
Jesus ("Jesse") Valdez, WSBA #35378  
james@biblelawgroup.com  
jesse@valdezlehman.com  
*Counsel for Plaintiff*