

SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF NEW YORK
COUNTY OF BRONX

-----X
TISHA HATCH

Plaintiff,

-against-

Summons

Index No.

Jury Demand

THE CITY OF NEW YORK; DARCEL CLARK; ODALYS
CARIDAD ALONSO; DARLENE A. MARTINEZ; ANA
MATEO; KIM HERNANDEZ; LISA MCNEAR; CONCETTA
PETRILLO,

Defendants
-----X

To the Defendant named above:

You are hereby summoned and required to serve a written answer to the attached Verified
Complaint upon the Plaintiff's attorney at the address below.

If this Summons is personally delivered to you within the State of New York, you must
serve your answer within twenty (20) days after such service, exclusive of the service date.

If this Summons is served upon you in any other manner authorized by law, you must
serve your answer within thirty (30) days after service is complete, as provided by the New York
Civil Practice Law and Rules.

Should you fail to appear or answer within the applicable period stated above, judgment
may be entered against you by default for the relief demanded in the Verified Complaint, without
further notice.

This action is venued in the Supreme Court of the State of New York, County of the
Bronx, 851 Grand Concourse, Bronx, New York 10451.

Dated: January 24, 2026
New York, N.Y.

Respectfully submitted,

By: /s/Eric Sanders _____
Eric Sanders

Eric Sanders, Esq.
THE SANDERS FIRM, P.C.
30 Wall Street, 8th Floor
New York, NY 10005
(212) 652-2782 (Business Telephone)
(212) 652-2783 (Facsimile)

Website: <http://www.thesandersfirmpc.com>

DEFENDANT ADDRESSES

THE CITY OF NEW YORK
c/o New York City Law Department
Office of the Corporation Counsel
100 Church Street
New York, New York 10007

DARCEL CLARK
District Attorney, Bronx County
Office of the District Attorney, Bronx County
215 East 161st Street
Bronx, New York 10451

ODALYS CARIDAD ALONSO
Chief of Staff
Office of the District Attorney, Bronx County
215 East 161st Street
Bronx, New York 10451

DARLENE A. MARTINEZ
Chief Human Resources Officer
Office of the District Attorney, Bronx County
215 East 161st Street
Bronx, New York 10451

ANA MATEO

Recruitment Specialist Supervisor
Office of the District Attorney, Bronx County
215 East 161st Street
Bronx, New York 10451

KIM HERNANDEZ

Equal Employment Opportunity Officer
Office of the District Attorney, Bronx County
215 East 161st Street
Bronx, New York 10451

LISA MCNEAR

Senior Equal Employment Opportunity Investigator
Office of the District Attorney, Bronx County
215 East 161st Street
Bronx, New York 10451

CONCETTA PETRILLO

Former Deputy Director
Early Case Assessment Bureau
Office of the District Attorney, Bronx County
215 East 161st Street
Bronx, New York 10451

SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF NEW YORK
COUNTY OF BRONX

-----X
TISHA HATCH

Plaintiff,

Verified Complaint

Index No.

-against-

Jury Demand

THE CITY OF NEW YORK; DARCEL CLARK; ODALYS
CARIDAD ALONSO; DARLENE A. MARTINEZ; ANA
MATEO; KIM HERNANDEZ; LISA MCNEAR; CONCETTA
PETRILLO,

Defendants
-----X

Plaintiff TISHA HATCH, by her attorney THE SANDERS FIRM, P.C., complaining of
Defendants THE CITY OF NEW YORK; DARCEL CLARK; ODALYS CARIDAD ALONSO;
DARLENE A. MARTINEZ; ANA MATEO; KIM HERNANDEZ; LISA MCNEAR; and
CONCETTA PETRILLO, alleges as follows:

INTRODUCTION

This action arises from racial discrimination, a hostile work environment, and retaliation perpetrated by the Office of the District Attorney, Bronx County, through its senior leadership, human resources officials, equal employment opportunity personnel, and supervisory staff, culminating in the pretextual termination of Plaintiff TISHA HATCH.

Plaintiff TISHA HATCH was a long-serving City employee who engaged in protected activity by filing grievances and complaints concerning working out of title, racially disparate investigative practices, and discriminatory treatment of Black and Hispanic employees within the District Attorney's Office. Rather than address those complaints, Defendants subjected Plaintiff to escalating adverse treatment, including targeted questioning limited to employees of color,

denial of overtime and transfer opportunities, workplace isolation, fabricated accusations, and ultimately termination based on alleged overtime theft for which no proof was ever produced.

At all relevant times, Defendants DARCEL CLARK, ODALYS CARIDAD ALONSO, DARLENE A. MARTINEZ, ANA MATEO, KIM HERNANDEZ, LISA MCNEAR, and CONCETTA PETRILLO exercised supervisory, investigatory, human resources, or policymaking authority over Plaintiff's employment and participated in, ratified, or failed to remediate the unlawful conduct described herein.

Defendants' actions were not isolated or inadvertent. They reflected institutional practices and customs within the Office of the District Attorney, Bronx County that tolerated or encouraged racially disparate treatment, hostile workplace conditions, retaliatory discipline, and the denial of procedural protections afforded to similarly situated employees.

As a direct and proximate result of Defendants' conduct, Plaintiff TISHA HATCH-LOVELESS suffered economic loss, emotional distress, reputational harm, and loss of career opportunities, and was deprived of the protections guaranteed by the New York State Human Rights Law, the New York City Human Rights Law.

JURISDICTION AND VENUE

1. This Court has subject matter jurisdiction over this action pursuant to Article VI of the New York State Constitution, the New York State Human Rights Law, Executive Law § 290 et seq., the New York City Human Rights Law, and Administrative Code of the City of New York § 8-101 et seq.

2. This Court has personal jurisdiction over Defendants THE CITY OF NEW YORK, DARCEL CLARK, ODALYS CARIDAD ALONSO, DARLENE A. MARTINEZ, ANA MATEO, KIM HERNANDEZ, LISA MCNEAR, and CONCETTA PETRILLO pursuant

to CPLR §§ 301 and 302, because Defendants reside in, are domiciled in, are employed in, conduct business in, and committed the acts complained of within the State of New York.

3. Venue is proper in Bronx County pursuant to CPLR § 503(a) because Plaintiff TISHA HATCH resides in Bronx County and because a substantial part of the acts, omissions, employment decisions, and injuries giving rise to the claims asserted herein occurred in Bronx County.

4. Venue is further proper in Bronx County because it is the location of Plaintiff TISHA HATCH's previous employment with the Office of the District Attorney, Bronx County, and the place where Defendants exercised supervisory, investigatory, human resources, and disciplinary authority over Plaintiff.

5. Venue is additionally proper pursuant to CPLR § 509 because Bronx County is the situs where the discriminatory practices, hostile work environment, and retaliatory actions alleged in this Complaint were implemented, enforced, and carried out.

PROCEDURAL REQUIREMENTS

6. Plaintiff TISHA HATCH has satisfied all conditions precedent to the commencement of this action, or such conditions have been waived, excused, or are not required.

7. Plaintiff TISHA HATCH timely filed complaints with internal grievance and equal employment opportunity channels concerning the discriminatory, hostile, and retaliatory conduct alleged herein and participated in related investigative processes.

8. Plaintiff TISHA HATCH filed a charge of discrimination with the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission and, on or about March 2025, received a Notice of Right to Sue.

9. No notice of claim is required for Plaintiff TISHA HATCH's claims brought pursuant to the New York State Human Rights Law, Executive Law § 290 et seq., or the New York City Human Rights Law, Administrative Code of the City of New York § 8-101 et seq.

10. To the extent Defendants THE CITY OF NEW YORK, DARCEL CLARK, ODALYS CARIDAD ALONSO, DARLENE A. MARTINEZ, ANA MATEO, KIM HERNANDEZ, LISA MCNEAR, and CONCETTA PETRILLO contend that any additional procedural requirements apply, such requirements have been satisfied, waived, or excused by Defendants' conduct.

11. This action has been commenced within the applicable statutes of limitation for all claims asserted herein.

PLAINTIFF

12. Plaintiff TISHA HATCH is an adult resident of Bronx County, New York, and at all relevant times was employed by the Office of the District Attorney, Bronx County, previously holding the civil service title of Community Associate.

DEFENDANTS

13. Defendant THE CITY OF NEW YORK is a municipal corporation organized and existing under the laws of the State of New York and is responsible for the operation, management, and oversight of the Office of the District Attorney, Bronx County, including the actions of the individually named Defendants.

14. Defendant DARCEL CLARK is, and at all relevant times was, the District Attorney of Bronx County, and the final policymaker for the Office of the District Attorney, Bronx County, with authority over employment, discipline, and personnel practices.

15. Defendant ODALYS CARIDAD ALONSO is, and at all relevant times was, the Chief of Staff of the Office of the District Attorney, Bronx County, with supervisory authority over human resources and employment decisions.

16. Defendant DARLENE A. MARTINEZ is, and at all relevant times was, the Chief Human Resources Officer of the Office of the District Attorney, Bronx County, and was directly involved in investigations, suspension, and termination decisions affecting Plaintiff.

17. Defendant ANA MATEO is, and at all relevant times was, the Recruitment Specialist Supervisor of the Office of the District Attorney, Bronx County, and had knowledge of and participation in discriminatory and retaliatory employment practices.

18. Defendant KIM HERNANDEZ is, and at all relevant times was, the Equal Employment Opportunity Officer of the Office of the District Attorney, Bronx County, responsible for receiving and addressing discrimination complaints, including Plaintiff's.

19. Defendant LISA MCNEAR is, and at all relevant times was, a Senior Equal Employment Opportunity Investigator with the Office of the District Attorney, Bronx County, and participated in investigations and meetings concerning Plaintiff.

20. Defendant CONCETTA PETRILLO is a former Deputy Director of the Early Case Assessment Bureau (ECAB) of the Office of the District Attorney, Bronx County, and at all relevant times exercised supervisory authority over Plaintiff and engaged in the conduct alleged herein.

BACKGROUND

Plaintiff's Employment and Protected Activity

21. Plaintiff TISHA HATCH was employed by the Bronx County District Attorney's Office, an agency of Defendant THE CITY OF NEW YORK, beginning in or about 2017, and held the civil service title of Community Associate as of 2020.

22. Plaintiff TISHA HATCH had more than seven (7) years of continuous City service at the time of her termination.

23. In or about June 2022, Plaintiff TISHA HATCH filed a formal grievance against a police officer and supervisory staff for working employees out of title in the Case Discovery Analyst (DAT Writer) and Complaint Room units. That grievance remains pending. The majority of staff involved in or connected to the grievance were later terminated.

24. Plaintiff's grievance constituted protected activity.

25. Following Plaintiff TISHA HATCH's filing of the June 2022 grievance, Plaintiff experienced a change in the terms and conditions of her employment, including increased scrutiny, heightened monitoring of her work, and differential treatment by supervisory personnel.

26. From June 2022 forward, Plaintiff TISHA HATCH was treated as a problem employee because of her grievance, was excluded from opportunities routinely afforded to similarly situated employees, and was subjected to an increasingly hostile work environment.

27. The adverse treatment that followed Plaintiff TISHA HATCH's grievance was ongoing and continuous, forming the beginning of a pattern of discriminatory and retaliatory conduct that persisted through her termination on March 4, 2024.

Targeted Investigation and Racially Disparate Questioning (March 2023)

28. In March 2023, an incident arose in the DAT Unit involving Defendant CONCETTA PETRILLO, a Caucasian female, and staff member Elmore Murray, a Black

female, who was accused of entering PETRILLO's office without permission. Murray was removed from the DAT Unit and reassigned.

29. On or about March 15, 2023, while Plaintiff TISHA HATCH was out sick, an email was sent directing select Desk Appearance Ticket [DAT] staff to report to Human Resources to be questioned by Defendant DARLENE MARTINEZ, a Hispanic female.

30. Plaintiff later learned that only Black and Hispanic staff members were questioned and asked the same three questions regarding access to Defendant PETRILLO's office. White staff members were not questioned.

31. Plaintiff TISHA HATCH was subsequently questioned by Defendant MARTINEZ by phone and instructed not to discuss the matter with coworkers, despite the fact that coworkers had already been discussing it openly.

32. Plaintiff TISHA HATCH filed an EEO complaint with Defendant KIM HERNANDEZ, Equal Employment Opportunity Director, alleging racially discriminatory investigative practices. No corrective action was taken, and Plaintiff received no follow-up or resolution.

33. The questioning conducted by Defendant DARLENE MARTINEZ followed a uniform script and focused exclusively on access to Defendant CONCETTA PETRILLO's office, despite the absence of any individualized basis to suspect Plaintiff TISHA HATCH of misconduct.

34. Plaintiff TISHA HATCH was aware that similarly situated White employees who worked in the same unit, had similar access to office space, and were subject to the same physical layout and practices were not questioned, interviewed, or investigated.

35. The selective questioning of only Black and Hispanic employees created fear, distrust, and division within the unit and conveyed to Plaintiff TISHA HATCH and other employees of color that they were being singled out on the basis of race.

36. Plaintiff TISHA HATCH reasonably understood the investigation to be retaliatory and racially motivated, particularly in light of her prior June 2022 grievance and the absence of any neutral investigative criteria.

37. Despite Plaintiff TISHA HATCH's EEO complaint, Defendants failed to suspend, correct, or meaningfully review the racially disparate investigative practices, thereby ratifying and permitting the continuation of discriminatory conduct within the DAT Unit.

Retaliatory Overtime Restrictions and Workplace Interference (March–June 2023)

38. In or about March 2023, Defendant PETRILLO instructed supervisory staff that Plaintiff TISHA HATCH was not to be offered overtime unless it was on her day off, a restriction not imposed on similarly situated non-Black employees.

39. Defendant PETRILLO repeatedly interfered with Plaintiff's work, made demeaning remarks regarding Plaintiff's competence, and intentionally assigned conflicting workloads that undermined Plaintiff's productivity.

40. Plaintiff TISHA HATCH regularly performed work outside normal hours without requesting overtime in order to meet deadlines, despite the hostile environment.

41. On June 13, 2023, Plaintiff TISHA HATCH met with Defendants KIM HERNANDEZ, LISA MCNEAR, and her union representative and formally complained of Defendant PETRILLO's conduct and retaliation. Defendant HERNANDEZ suggested Plaintiff might be reassigned but took no action.

42. As part of the retaliatory conduct, Defendant CONCETTA PETRILLO routinely questioned Plaintiff TISHA HATCH's competence in front of others and made disparaging remarks concerning Plaintiff's ability to assist Assistant District Attorneys, including comments minimizing Plaintiff's skills and professional judgment.

43. Defendant PETRILLO interfered with Plaintiff TISHA HATCH's assigned work by directing Plaintiff not to assist professional staff or Assistant District Attorneys outside narrowly defined DAT tasks, even when such assistance was requested by attorneys handling active matters.

44. On multiple occasions, Plaintiff TISHA HATCH was assigned live Early Case Assessment Bureau matters while simultaneously being required to assist on other complex cases, creating conflicting obligations that impeded Plaintiff's ability to complete assignments within normal working hours.

45. Despite these conflicting assignments, Plaintiff TISHA HATCH continued to complete her work without requesting overtime, including performing work after hours, in order to meet deadlines and avoid further scrutiny or discipline.

46. The overtime restrictions, interference with Plaintiff TISHA HATCH's work, and demeaning treatment by Defendant PETRILLO were not imposed on similarly situated non-Black employees and contributed to an increasingly hostile and retaliatory work environment.

47. Following the June 13, 2023 meeting, Defendants failed to take corrective or protective action, and Plaintiff TISHA HATCH remained under the supervision of Defendant PETRILLO, allowing the retaliatory and hostile conduct to continue.

National Night Out Disparate Treatment and Retaliation (July 2023)

48. In July 2023, Plaintiff TISHA HATCH volunteered for National Night Out at the 46th Precinct and was approved.

49. Defendant PETRILLO later intervened and had Plaintiff reassigned to a different precinct with incompatible hours, while White and Hispanic employees were accommodated and allowed schedule changes.

50. Plaintiff TISHA HATCH was forced to use personal leave to attend National Night Out, while similarly situated non-Black employees were permitted to work the event on City time.

51. Defendant CONCETTA PETRILLO further imposed restrictive scheduling requirements on Plaintiff TISHA HATCH that did not correspond with the official National Night Out event times for the reassigned precinct, effectively preventing Plaintiff from meaningfully participating in the event on City time.

52. The scheduling restrictions imposed on Plaintiff TISHA HATCH were inconsistent with the accommodations granted to White and Hispanic employees, including schedule changes that allowed those employees to work their assigned precinct events without using personal leave.

53. As a result of Defendant PETRILLO's actions, Plaintiff TISHA HATCH was placed in the position of either forfeiting participation in National Night Out or using her own accrued leave, a burden not imposed on similarly situated non-Black employees.

54. Defendant PETRILLO's interference with Plaintiff TISHA HATCH's National Night Out participation occurred shortly after Plaintiff engaged in protected activity and further reflected retaliatory and discriminatory treatment.

Escalation, False Accusations, and Retaliatory Isolation (July 2023)

55. On July 25–26, 2023, Plaintiff TISHA HATCH was falsely accused of yelling and intimidation following an incident involving a hostile complainant at the Complaint Room.

56. Plaintiff overheard staff conspiring to fabricate allegations that she was “scary” and posed a safety concern.

57. Shortly thereafter, Plaintiff TISHA HATCH was moved into an office, isolated from coworkers, and her cases were intentionally delayed or skipped by supervisors, undermining her performance record.

58. Numerous Assistant District Attorneys later complained about Petrillo’s conduct, leading to Defendant PETRILLO’s removal from the DAT Unit in November 2023 and her subsequent retirement in January 2024, corroborating Plaintiff’s complaints.

59. Following the false accusations, Plaintiff TISHA HATCH was subjected to increased scrutiny and monitoring by supervisory staff, while similarly situated employees were not.

60. Plaintiff TISHA HATCH’s work product was routinely delayed, bypassed, or left unreviewed on supervisory tracking systems, even when live matters required timely review, impairing Plaintiff’s ability to perform her duties and exposing her to unwarranted criticism.

61. On multiple occasions, Plaintiff TISHA HATCH observed that her cases were skipped in favor of reviewing cases submitted by other employees, despite being placed in the queue earlier, and despite the time-sensitive nature of the work.

62. Plaintiff TISHA HATCH was aware that documentation reflecting these skipped or delayed reviews existed on her assigned office computer, which she later lost access to following her suspension.

63. The isolation of Plaintiff TISHA HATCH, the delay and obstruction of her work, and the failure to address the fabricated accusations contributed to an increasingly hostile and retaliatory work environment.

64. Defendants failed to take corrective action to remedy the false accusations, isolation, or interference with Plaintiff TISHA HATCH's work, despite being on notice of these issues through complaints and internal discussions.

Blocked Transfers, Pretextual Discipline, and Termination (2023–2024)

65. Between July and November 2023, Plaintiff TISHA HATCH repeatedly applied for transfers and promotions and was either blocked or falsely told that lateral moves required pay cuts.

66. Plaintiff TISHA HATCH was never given an annual performance evaluation in the DAT Unit.

67. On February 23, 2024, Plaintiff TISHA HATCH was informed, without evidence, that she had been under investigation since November 2023 and was suspended without pay.

68. On March 4, 2024, Plaintiff TISHA HATCH was terminated for allegedly stealing overtime, despite the fact that all overtime was pre-approved by supervisors, CityTime was used for clock-in and clock-out, no swipe-card system existed in Plaintiff's building, and no video or documentary proof was ever produced.

69. Plaintiff TISHA HATCH was denied due process and denied access to evidence and was falsely told she was not entitled to procedural protections.

70. Prior to her suspension and termination, Plaintiff TISHA HATCH repeatedly sought clarification regarding the alleged investigation and requested documentation supporting any claims of misconduct, but no such documentation was provided.

71. At the time Plaintiff TISHA HATCH was suspended and terminated, Defendants asserted that they possessed proof of overtime theft, including swipe data and video evidence; however, no such proof was produced to Plaintiff or to her union representative.

72. Plaintiff TISHA HATCH was informed that she was not entitled to due process or an explanation for her termination, despite having more than seven years of City service and despite similarly situated employees being afforded procedural protections.

73. All overtime and timesheets submitted by Plaintiff TISHA HATCH had been reviewed and approved by supervisory personnel prior to submission, including supervisors responsible for reviewing and certifying time records.

74. The stated reason for Plaintiff TISHA HATCH's termination was inconsistent with the timekeeping practices in Plaintiff's work location, where employees did not use swipe-card systems and routinely accessed work areas without card entry.

75. The termination of Plaintiff TISHA HATCH followed a sustained pattern of retaliation and disparate treatment and was pretextual in nature.

Post-Termination Evidence of Pretext and Systemic Discrimination

76. The New York State Department of Labor released Plaintiff TISHA HATCH's unemployment benefits after the Bronx County District Attorney's Office failed to provide proof supporting the termination.

77. Throughout 2024 and 2025, Plaintiff TISHA HATCH became aware of multiple instances in which Black employees were terminated for alleged timekeeping issues while White and Hispanic employees received suspensions or were allowed to present proof and retain employment.

78. In March 2025, Plaintiff TISHA HATCH received a Notice of Right to Sue from the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission.

79. In July 2025, union representatives admitted that Plaintiff TISHA HATCH was on a list of employees wrongfully terminated and slated for reinstatement, yet no reinstatement occurred and Plaintiff's repeated follow-ups were ignored.

80. During the unemployment benefits process, representatives of the New York State Department of Labor contacted the Bronx County District Attorney's Office and requested documentation substantiating the claim that Plaintiff TISHA HATCH had been terminated for misconduct, including alleged overtime theft.

81. Despite those requests, the Bronx County District Attorney's Office failed to provide documentation, records, or other evidence supporting the stated reason for Plaintiff TISHA HATCH's termination.

82. The failure to substantiate the termination during the unemployment proceedings was consistent with Defendants' prior refusal to produce evidence to Plaintiff TISHA HATCH or her union representative and further demonstrated the pretextual nature of the termination.

83. Plaintiff TISHA HATCH experienced continued economic hardship, emotional distress, and reputational harm as a result of Defendants' post-termination conduct, including the dissemination of allegations that she had engaged in misconduct.

84. Defendants' post-termination actions, including their representations to the New York State Department of Labor and their failure to correct false allegations, were a continuation of the discriminatory and retaliatory conduct that began after Plaintiff TISHA HATCH engaged in protected activity.

**Continuation of Hostile Work Environment and Retaliatory Actions
Through Termination and Post-Termination**

85. Following Plaintiff TISHA HATCH's initial grievance in or about June 2022, the discriminatory and hostile conditions of her employment did not abate. Instead, the conduct escalated over time and persisted through Plaintiff's termination on March 4, 2024.

86. From June 2022 forward, Plaintiff TISHA HATCH was subjected to increased scrutiny, isolation, denial of opportunities, and disparate enforcement of workplace rules, including targeted investigations, restrictions on overtime, interference with work assignments, and obstruction of transfer and promotion opportunities.

87. After Plaintiff TISHA HATCH filed complaints with Human Resources and the Equal Employment Opportunity Office, the hostility intensified rather than diminished. Supervisory personnel failed to intervene or correct the conduct, and Plaintiff was repeatedly placed in positions that undermined her performance and professional standing.

88. The retaliatory conduct culminated in Plaintiff TISHA HATCH's suspension without pay on February 23, 2024, followed by her termination on March 4, 2024, purportedly for overtime-related misconduct. Plaintiff was denied access to evidence, denied an opportunity to respond meaningfully to the allegations, and denied procedural protections afforded to other employees.

89. Defendants' retaliatory actions continued after Plaintiff TISHA HATCH's termination. When Plaintiff applied for unemployment benefits, Defendants represented to the New York State Department of Labor that Plaintiff had been terminated for stealing time, yet failed to provide documentation or proof to substantiate that claim when requested.

90. As a result of Defendants' failure to produce evidence, the New York State Department of Labor released Plaintiff TISHA HATCH's unemployment benefits. Defendants'

post-termination conduct caused additional delay, stress, and economic harm to Plaintiff and further reflected the pretextual and retaliatory nature of the termination.

91. The hostile work environment and retaliatory actions described herein were continuous, interrelated, and part of an ongoing course of conduct that began after Plaintiff TISHA HATCH engaged in protected activity and extended through and beyond her termination.

92. The course of conduct described herein was not episodic or isolated, but reflected a sustained pattern in which Plaintiff TISHA HATCH was treated differently from similarly situated employees who had not engaged in protected activity.

93. At no point between June 2022 and Plaintiff TISHA HATCH's termination did Defendants take effective remedial action to address the discriminatory or retaliatory conditions of Plaintiff's employment, despite repeated notice through grievances, complaints, and meetings with Human Resources and Equal Employment Opportunity personnel.

94. Defendants' failure to intervene, correct, or prevent the continuation of hostile and retaliatory conduct reinforced and emboldened the discriminatory practices directed at Plaintiff TISHA HATCH.

95. The adverse actions taken against Plaintiff TISHA HATCH, including suspension, termination, and post-termination conduct affecting unemployment benefits, were causally connected to Plaintiff's protected activity and were reasonably likely to deter a reasonable person from engaging in similar protected activity.

96. Defendants' conduct, taken as a whole, constituted a continuing violation that extended from Plaintiff TISHA HATCH's initial grievance through and beyond her termination, resulting in ongoing harm to Plaintiff's employment prospects, financial stability, and emotional well-being.

Comparators and Race-Based Disparate Discipline

97. At all relevant times, Plaintiff TISHA HATCH observed and became aware of racially disparate disciplinary practices within the Bronx County District Attorney's Office, including differences in how alleged timekeeping and workplace infractions were investigated, substantiated, and punished based on race.

98. Plaintiff TISHA HATCH became aware of instances in which Black employees were terminated for alleged timekeeping or policy violations without being afforded an opportunity to present proof, documentation, or explanation.

99. In contrast, Plaintiff TISHA HATCH became aware of instances in which White and Hispanic employees accused of similar or more serious timekeeping violations were permitted to present documentation, were afforded due process, and received suspensions with or without pay rather than termination.

100. Plaintiff TISHA HATCH became aware that LIZETTE VISNER, a White employee, was accused of workplace misconduct and received a suspension rather than termination, and was afforded procedural protections not provided to Plaintiff.

101. Plaintiff TISHA HATCH became aware that KASIME MIRSKY, a White Hispanic employee, was permitted schedule accommodations and differential treatment not afforded to Plaintiff under similar circumstances.

102. Plaintiff TISHA HATCH became aware of incidents involving JACKIE RODRIGUEZ, a Professional Staff supervisor in the Early Case Assessment Bureau, who was accused of significant overtime irregularities and was not terminated, but instead received a suspension and reassignment.

103. Plaintiff TISHA HATCH became aware of situations involving ELIZABETH DIAZ, Hispanic mother and JULISSA SALDIVAR, her daughter employed within the Office who were accused of timekeeping misconduct and were afforded opportunities to present proof and retain their employment.

104. In contrast, Plaintiff TISHA HATCH became aware of a Black mother and daughter employed within the Office who were terminated for alleged timekeeping issues without being afforded comparable procedural protections.

105. Plaintiff TISHA HATCH became aware of disciplinary disparities involving CARL CHEN, a non-Black employee, who was permitted to contest allegations and retain employment, while Black employees accused of similar conduct were terminated.

106. Plaintiff TISHA HATCH became aware of race-based disparities in discipline involving supervisory and managerial personnel, including unequal enforcement of policies under the authority of senior officials within the Office.

107. These comparator incidents reinforced Plaintiff TISHA HATCH's understanding that her suspension and termination were not based on neutral enforcement of policy, but were consistent with a broader pattern of race-based disparate discipline within the Bronx County District Attorney's Office.

108. The disparate disciplinary outcomes described herein occurred during the same general time period as Plaintiff TISHA HATCH's suspension and termination and involved similar allegations of timekeeping or workplace misconduct.

109. The comparator evidence described above further demonstrated that Plaintiff TISHA HATCH was treated less favorably than similarly situated non-Black employees under similar circumstances.

VIOLATIONS AND CLAIMS ALLEGED**FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION
(New York State Human Rights Law – Race Discrimination)
(Against All Defendants)**

110. Plaintiff TISHA HATCH repeats and realleges each and every allegation contained in the foregoing paragraphs as if fully set forth herein.

111. At all relevant times, Plaintiff TISHA HATCH was a member of a protected class on the basis of race.

112. Defendants THE CITY OF NEW YORK, DARCEL CLARK, ODALYS CARIDAD ALONSO, DARLENE A. MARTINEZ, ANA MATEO, KIM HERNANDEZ, LISA MCNEAR, and CONCETTA PETRILLO subjected Plaintiff to disparate treatment on the basis of race, including but not limited to racially selective investigations, denial of overtime opportunities, obstruction of transfers and promotions, heightened scrutiny, and termination.

113. Pursuant to the 2019 amendments to the New York State Human Rights Law, Executive Law § 296, Plaintiff is not required to demonstrate that the discrimination was severe or pervasive. Defendants' conduct subjected Plaintiff to inferior terms, conditions, and privileges of employment because of her race.

114. Defendants' actions were intentional, knowing, and carried out with reckless disregard for Plaintiff TISHA HATCH's rights under the New York State Human Rights Law.

115. As a direct and proximate result of Defendants' unlawful conduct, Plaintiff suffered economic loss, emotional distress, reputational harm, and loss of career opportunities.

**SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION
(New York State Human Rights Law – Hostile Work Environment)
(Against All Defendants)**

116. Plaintiff TISHA HATCH repeats and realleges each and every allegation contained in the foregoing paragraphs as if fully set forth herein.

117. Defendants THE CITY OF NEW YORK, DARCEL CLARK, ODALYS CARIDAD ALONSO, DARLENE A. MARTINEZ, ANA MATEO, KIM HERNANDEZ, LISA MCNEAR, and CONCETTA PETRILLO subjected Plaintiff to a hostile work environment on the basis of race through a pattern of discriminatory conduct, including racially disparate questioning, isolation, interference with job duties, fabricated accusations, denial of supervisory support, and toleration of racially hostile conduct by supervisors and coworkers.

118. Under the post-2019 amendments to the New York State Human Rights Law, Plaintiff is not required to establish that the harassment was severe or pervasive. It is sufficient that Plaintiff was subjected to inferior working conditions because of her race.

119. Defendants knew or should have known of the hostile work environment and failed to take immediate and appropriate corrective action.

120. Defendants' conduct was willful, knowing, and in reckless disregard of Plaintiff TISHA HATCH-LOVELESS's protected rights.

**THIRD CAUSE OF ACTION
(New York State Human Rights Law – Retaliation)
(Against All Defendants)**

121. Plaintiff TISHA HATCH repeats and realleges each and every allegation contained in the foregoing paragraphs as if fully set forth herein.

122. Plaintiff engaged in protected activity by filing grievances and complaints concerning racially discriminatory practices, hostile working conditions, and unlawful employment practices.

123. Defendants THE CITY OF NEW YORK, DARCEL CLARK, ODALYS CARIDAD ALONSO, DARLENE A. MARTINEZ, ANA MATEO, KIM HERNANDEZ, LISA MCNEAR, and CONCETTA PETRILLO retaliated against Plaintiff for engaging in protected activity by subjecting her to adverse actions, including increased scrutiny, denial of opportunities, suspension without pay, termination, and post-termination interference with unemployment benefits.

124. Pursuant to the New York State Human Rights Law as amended, retaliatory conduct need not result in a materially adverse employment action. It is sufficient that Defendants' actions would deter a reasonable person from engaging in protected activity.

125. Defendants' retaliatory actions were intentional and causally connected to Plaintiff TISHA HATCH-LOVELESS's protected activity.

**FOURTH CAUSE OF ACTION
(New York City Human Rights Law – Race Discrimination)
(Against All Defendants)**

126. Plaintiff TISHA HATCH repeats and realleges each and every allegation contained in the foregoing paragraphs as if fully set forth herein.

127. Defendants THE CITY OF NEW YORK, DARCEL CLARK, ODALYS CARIDAD ALONSO, DARLENE A. MARTINEZ, ANA MATEO, KIM HERNANDEZ, LISA MCNEAR, and CONCETTA PETRILLO discriminated against Plaintiff on the basis of race in violation of the New York City Human Rights Law, Administrative Code § 8-107, by treating Plaintiff less well than similarly situated employees outside her protected class.

128. The New York City Human Rights Law must be construed liberally and independently of federal and state law, and Plaintiff need only show that race was a motivating factor in Defendants' conduct.

129. Defendants' actions subjected Plaintiff TISHA HATCH to unequal terms, conditions, and privileges of employment.

**FIFTH CAUSE OF ACTION
(New York City Human Rights Law – Hostile Work Environment)
(Against All Defendants)**

130. Plaintiff TISHA HATCH repeats and realleges each and every allegation contained in the foregoing paragraphs as if fully set forth herein.

131. Defendants THE CITY OF NEW YORK, DARCEL CLARK, ODALYS CARIDAD ALONSO, DARLENE A. MARTINEZ, ANA MATEO, KIM HERNANDEZ, LISA MCNEAR, and CONCETTA PETRILLO subjected Plaintiff to a hostile work environment on the basis of race by engaging in conduct that treated Plaintiff less well than other employees because of her protected status.

132. Under the New York City Human Rights Law, Plaintiff is not required to demonstrate severity or pervasiveness. Defendants' conduct need only rise above the level of petty slights or trivial inconveniences.

133. Defendants' conduct exceeded that standard and materially altered Plaintiff TISHA HATCH's working conditions.

**SIXTH CAUSE OF ACTION
(New York City Human Rights Law – Retaliation)
(Against All Defendants)**

134. Plaintiff TISHA HATCH repeats and realleges each and every allegation contained in the foregoing paragraphs as if fully set forth herein.

135. Plaintiff engaged in protected activity under the New York City Human Rights Law by opposing discriminatory practices and filing complaints.

136. Defendants THE CITY OF NEW YORK, DARCEL CLARK, ODALYS CARIDAD ALONSO, DARLENE A. MARTINEZ, ANA MATEO, KIM HERNANDEZ, LISA MCNEAR, and CONCETTA PETRILLO retaliated against Plaintiff by engaging in conduct reasonably likely to deter a person from engaging in protected activity, including termination and post-termination adverse actions.

137. Defendants' retaliatory conduct was intentional and in violation of Administrative Code § 8-107.

JURY TRIAL

138. Plaintiff TISHA HATCH hereby demands a trial by jury of all issues so triable as of right.

PRAYER FOR RELIEF

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff TISHA HATCH respectfully requests that judgment be entered in her favor and against Defendants, awarding the following relief:

- a. A declaration that Defendants' acts, policies, and practices complained of herein violated the New York State Human Rights Law and the New York City Human Rights Law;
- b. An award of compensatory damages for lost wages, lost benefits, and other economic losses in an amount to be determined at trial;
- c. An award of compensatory damages for emotional distress, mental anguish, humiliation, and loss of enjoyment of life in an amount to be determined at trial;
- d. An award of punitive damages to the extent permitted by law;
- e. An award of reasonable attorneys' fees, costs, and disbursements as provided by law;

- f. Pre-judgment and post-judgment interest as permitted by law;
- g. Such other and further legal and equitable relief as the Court deems just and proper.

Dated: January 24, 2026
New York, N.Y.

Respectfully submitted,

By: /s/Eric Sanders _____
Eric Sanders

Eric Sanders, Esq.
THE SANDERS FIRM, P.C.
30 Wall Street, 8th Floor
New York, NY 10005
(212) 652-2782 (Business Telephone)
(212) 652-2783 (Facsimile)

Website: <http://www.thesandersfirmpc.com>

ATTORNEY VERIFICATION

STATE OF NEW YORK

ss:

COUNTY OF WESTCHESTER

ERIC SANDERS, ESQ., affirms as follows:

I am an attorney admitted to practice in the State of New York courts. As the attorney for the plaintiff in the action, I am familiar with all the facts and circumstances.

The Verified Complaint is true to the knowledge of the affirmant, except for those matters stated to be alleged upon information and belief, and he believes those matters to be factual.

The affirmant further states that this verification is made by the affirmant and not by the Plaintiff because the Plaintiff is not within the county of Westchester, where the affirmant maintains his office.

The undersigned attorney affirms that the previous statements are true under the penalties of perjury and Rule 2106 CPLR.

Dated: January 24, 2026
New York, N.Y.

Respectfully submitted,

By: /s/Eric Sanders _____
Eric Sanders

Eric Sanders, Esq.
THE SANDERS FIRM, P.C.
30 Wall Street, 8th Floor
New York, NY 10005
(212) 652-2782 (Business Telephone)
(212) 652-2783 (Facsimile)

Website: <http://www.thesandersfirmpc.com>

SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF NEW YORK
COUNTY OF BRONX

INDEX NO.:

TISHA HATCH

Plaintiff,

-against-

THE CITY OF NEW YORK; DARCEL CLARK; ODALYS
CARIDAD ALONSO; DARLENE A. MARTINEZ; ANA
MATEO; KIM HERNANDEZ; LISA MCNEAR; CONCETTA
PETRILLO,

Defendants

SUMMONS WITH VERIFIED COMPLAINT

Duly submitted by:

Eric Sanders, Esq.
THE SANDERS FIRM, P.C.
30 Wall Street, 8th Floor
New York, NY 10005
(212) 652-2782 (Business Telephone)
(212) 652-2783 (Facsimile)

Website: <http://www.thesandersfirmpc.com>
