


FILED  
Clerk  
District Court  
JUN 20 2023

for the Northern Mariana Islands  
By   
(Deputy Clerk)

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE NORTHERN MARIANA ISLANDS

ÖZCAN GENÇ, HASAN GÖKÇE, and  
SÜLEYMAN KÖŞ, on behalf of themselves  
and all others similarly situated,

Plaintiffs,

v.

IMPERIAL PACIFIC INTERNATIONAL  
(CNMI), LLC and IMPERIAL PACIFIC  
INTERNATIONAL HOLDINGS LTD.,

Defendants.

Case No. 1:22-cv-00002

DECISION AND ORDER DENYING  
MOTION TO DISMISS  
SECOND AMENDED COMPLAINT

Previously, the Court granted Defendant Imperial Pacific International (CNMI), LLC’s (“IPI”) motions to dismiss the original complaint and the first amended complaint (“FAC”), but granted Plaintiffs leave to amend both times. (Mem. Decision Granting Mot. Dismiss FAC 1, ECF No. 34.) Plaintiffs Özcan Genç, Hasan Gökçe, and Süleyman Köş (collectively “Plaintiffs”) subsequently filed their second amended complaint (“SAC,” ECF No. 35). Before the Court is IPI’s motion to dismiss the SAC with prejudice. (Mot., ECF No. 38.) Plaintiffs filed an opposition (Opp’n, ECF No. 39), to which IPI filed a reply (Reply, ECF No. 40). The matter came on for a hearing, at which time the Court took the matter under submission. (Min., ECF No. 43.) The Court now issues this decision and order DENYING the motion to dismiss the SAC and memorializes its reasoning as follows.

//

1 **I. FACTUAL BACKGROUND AND PROCEDURAL HISTORY**

2 The following facts are taken from the SAC, and the attached exhibits, which include  
3 various declarations from former IPI employees and Plaintiffs’ Equal Employment Opportunity  
4 Commission (“EEOC”) charges and right to sue letters. (ECF Nos. 35, 35-1– 35-13).  
5

6 “Plaintiffs are [three] individuals with Turkish national origin and who were, at all  
7 relevant times, employees of IPI admitted to the United States under the H-2B temporary foreign  
8 worker program as construction workers to build the Imperial Palace casino/hotel resort in  
9 Garapan[.]” (SAC ¶ 4.) Genç started working for IPI in January 2020 as a foreman and leader of  
10 the welding and drywall team—with an employment certificate title of “Construction Carpenter.”  
11 (*Id.* ¶ 5.) Gökçe started working for IPI in January 2020 as a plumber, plumbing foreman, and  
12 master of pipe installation—with an employment certificate title of “Plumber.” (*Id.* ¶ 6.) Köş  
13 started working for IPI in January 2020 as an electrician—with an employment certificate title of  
14 “Electrician”—and was later promoted to foreman in June 2020. (*Id.* ¶ 7.)  
15

16 Towards the end of June 2020, “when H-2B workers were negotiating with IPI to extend  
17 [their] contracts for another six months, one Taiwanese worker showed [Plaintiffs] his paycheck,”  
18 which is when Plaintiffs “learned that the Taiwanese were being paid \$23 an hour, nearly three  
19 times what IPI was paying [Plaintiffs], for the same work.” (ECF Nos. 35-8, 35-10, 35-12.)  
20 Plaintiffs further learned that “the Italians were being paid \$30 an hour, also for the same work  
21 that [Plaintiffs] were doing.” (ECF Nos. 35-8, 35-10, 35-12.)  
22

23 IPI then started to miss paydays around the same time in June 2020, and Plaintiffs filed a  
24 lawsuit with this Court in November 2020 pursuant to the Fair Labor Standards Act (FLSA).  
25 (ECF Nos. 35-8, 35-10, 35-12.) Plaintiffs were subsequently terminated on December 16, 2020.  
26 (ECF Nos. 35-8, 35-10, 35-12; *see* SAC ¶¶ 5-7.) Around the same time in December 2020,  
27  
28

1 Plaintiffs each individually filed a charge of discrimination with the EEOC, alleging  
2 discrimination on the basis of both national origin and retaliation.<sup>1</sup> (ECF Nos. 35-8, 35-10, 35-  
3 12.)

4 After receiving their respective right to sue letters from the EEOC, (ECF Nos. 35-9, 35-  
5 11, 35-13), Plaintiffs filed this class action lawsuit on January 20, 2022 against IPI and IPI's  
6 parent company Imperial Pacific International Holdings Ltd. (Compl., ECF No. 1.) Having  
7 received leave to amend their FAC after the Court granted IPI's motion to dismiss, (*see* Mins.,  
8 ECF No. 17), Plaintiffs timely filed their SAC, alleging employment discrimination under Title  
9 VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, 42 U.S.C. §§ 2000e et. seq., and asserting the Court's original  
10 jurisdiction under Title VII. (SAC ¶¶ 1-2.)

11  
12 Plaintiffs claim that “IPI engaged in a company-wide practice of employment  
13 discrimination, both intentional and systemic, on the basis of national origin, against Plaintiffs  
14 and a class of similarly situated Turkish employees/former employees as alleged in this  
15 Complaint.” (*Id.* ¶ 1.) Even though the Turkish, Italian, and Taiwanese teams were each assigned  
16 floors that “were based on the same plan and the same productions,” Plaintiffs assert that “those  
17 Taiwanese and Italian workers were paid by IPI at a wage rate significantly higher—as much as  
18 three times higher—than Plaintiffs and members of the class.” (*Id.* ¶¶ 19, 51-52 (quoting Barut  
19 Decl. 1, ECF No. 35-6).) A former Turkish employee observed that while “Taiwanese and Italian  
20 workers doing the same job as he worked fewer hours (no overtime) each week[, they] were paid  
21 substantially more.” (SAC ¶ 49.)  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26

---

27 <sup>1</sup> Their retaliation claim formed part of the lawsuit in *Genç v. Imperial Pac. Int'l (CNMI) LLC*, No. 1:20-cv-00031,  
28 albeit under the FLSA.

1           Additionally, Plaintiffs contend that “[w]ithin each ethnic national team, all the  
2 construction workers were paid at the same rate, all foremen were paid at the same rate, and all  
3 supervisors were paid at the same rate.” (*Id.* ¶ 25.) “IPI employed those Taiwanese and Italian  
4 workers to perform the same types of work that Plaintiffs and members of the class performed”  
5 and those “Taiwanese and Italian workers had the same or similar level of skills, qualifications,  
6 and experience as Plaintiffs and members of the class.” (SAC ¶¶ 17-18.)

7  
8           Fiden T. Hamo, a U.S. citizen that worked in general construction at IPI’s construction  
9 site, observed the Turkish, Italian, and Taiwanese construction workers. (Hamo Decl. ¶¶ 2-6, ECF  
10 No. 35-3.) He states that “[t]here was no difference that [he] could see in the work that Turkish  
11 construction workers doing welding, masonry, carpentry, and electrical work were doing, as  
12 opposed to work that welders, mason, carpenters, and electricians from other nations were doing.”  
13 (*Id.* ¶ 11.) Glenn Bell, project manager for a team of Italian construction workers, attests that  
14 while “[t]he nature and quality of work that the Turks did was comparable to the nature and  
15 quality of the work the Italians did . . . the Turks were paid approximately one-third the hourly  
16 rate as the Italians.” (Bell Decl. ¶¶ 3, 9, 13, ECF No. 35-1.) Additionally, Bell states that “the  
17 Turks and Taiwanese were performing the same type of construction work, and the skill level,  
18 workmanship, and the nature and scope of the work cannot account for any disparity in pay rates  
19 between the Turks and the Taiwanese.” (*Id.* ¶ 16.) Genç attests that “the work that Taiwanese  
20 welders and Italian welders, dry wall specialists, and carpenters [i.e. the Taiwanese and Italian  
21 construction workers] did . . . required no greater skill or training than the work that similar  
22 Turkish workers were doing. It was the same work that the Turks were doing. There was no  
23 difference.” (Genç Decl. ¶ 10, ECF 35-7.) Senol Barut, who was a Turkish supervisor, states that  
24 all of his fellow supervisors, except one, were paid much more than he. (Barut Decl. 1, ECF No.  
25  
26  
27  
28

1 35-6.) Genç attests that “IPI asked us to support the Italians in drywall system installation, ceiling  
2 carpentry, and welding on the 14th floor[.]” (Genç Decl. ¶ 5.) He further provides that “[t]he  
3 Italians also were sent to other floors for aluminum curtain wall installation, and we assisted them  
4 in that work.” (*Id.* ¶ 6.)

5  
6 Further, Plaintiffs provide wage rates for the H-2B program from the Department of Labor  
7 (DOL). They list the wage range the DOL authorized for various construction worker positions  
8 such as plumbers and welders. (SAC ¶ 22.) Plaintiffs assert that because IPI paid Turkish  
9 employees minimum wage, they were paid below the range that the DOL had approved IPI to pay  
10 its H-2B employees. (*Id.* ¶¶ 20-23.)

11 Plaintiffs bring their Title VII claim on behalf on themselves and as a class action pursuant  
12 to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 23(b)(3), seeking to represent an estimated class of 107  
13 “persons of Turkish national origin who were employed by IPI under the H-2B visa program  
14 during 2020 and 2021.” (SAC ¶¶ 66-72.)

15  
16 In addition to suing IPI, Plaintiffs also sue Imperial Pacific International Holdings Ltd.  
17 under an alter ego theory. (SAC ¶¶ 3, 14). As relief, Plaintiffs seek: for the case to be expedited  
18 pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 2000e-5(f)(5); class certification; compensatory and punitive damages;  
19 costs, expenses, and attorneys’ fees pursuant to 42 U.S.C. 2000e-5(k); and any other such relief  
20 that is just. (*Id.* at 15.)

## 21 22 **II. LEGAL STANDARD**

23 To survive a motion to dismiss for failure to state a claim upon which relief can be granted  
24 under Rule 12(b)(6) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, a pleading “must contain sufficient  
25 factual matter, accepted as true, to ‘state a claim to relief that is plausible on its face.’” *Ashcroft v.*  
26 *Iqbal*, 556 U.S. 662, 678 (2009) (quoting *Bell Atlantic Corp. v. Twombly*, 550 U.S. 544, 570  
27  
28

1 (2007)). The factual allegations need not be detailed, but a plaintiff must provide “more than an  
2 unadorned, the-defendant-unlawfully-harmed-me accusation.” *Iqbal*, 556 U.S. at 678. “For  
3 purposes of ruling on a Rule 12(b)(6) motion, the Court ‘accept[s] factual allegations in the  
4 complaint as true and construe[s] the pleadings in the light most favorable to the nonmoving  
5 party.’” *P&G v. QuantifiCare Inc.*, 288 F. Supp. 3d 1002, 1010 (N.D. Cal. 2017) (quoting  
6 *Manzarek v. St. Paul Fire & Marine Ins. Co.*, 519 F.3d 1025, 1031 (9th Cir. 2008)). Further “[a]t  
7 the motion to dismiss phase, the trial court must . . . draw all reasonable inferences in favor of the  
8 plaintiff.” *Tracht Gut, LLC v. L.A. Cty. Treasurer & Tax Collector*, 836 F.3d 1146, 1150 (9th Cir.  
9 2016) (citation omitted). In determining whether a motion to dismiss should be granted, there is a  
10 two-step process: first, “identify[] pleadings that, because they are no more than conclusions, are  
11 not entitled to the assumption of truth,” and second, “[w]hen there are well-pleaded factual  
12 allegations, a court should assume their veracity and then determine whether they plausibly give  
13 rise to an entitlement to relief.” *Iqbal*, 556 U.S. at 679.

14  
15  
16 Generally, when ruling on a 12(b)(6) motion, a court may consider only the pleadings and  
17 limited materials, such as “documents attached to the complaint, documents incorporated by  
18 reference in the complaint, or matters of judicial notice[.]” *United States v. Ritchie*, 342 F.3d 903,  
19 908 (9th Cir. 2003). If a court considers other evidence, “it must normally convert the 12(b)(6)  
20 motion into a Rule 56 motion for summary judgment, and it must give the nonmoving party an  
21 opportunity to respond.” *Id.* at 907.

### 22 **III. DISCUSSION**

23  
24 The Court finds that Plaintiffs plausibly allege a prima facie case of Title VII  
25 discrimination. The differences that IPI cites are immaterial. Additionally, the SAC alleges  
26 plausible facts to show that each named Plaintiff was discriminated against. The Court further  
27  
28

1 finds the DOL statistics anecdotally supportive of the claim of Title VII discrimination. The facts  
2 alleging systemic discrimination also support the claim of discrimination. In reaching these  
3 findings, the Court first turns to the primary issue of Title VII employment discrimination.

4  
5 **A. Plaintiffs plausibly allege a claim for Title VII employment discrimination**  
6 **because they demonstrate other circumstances giving rise to an inference of**  
7 **discrimination.**

8 The Court is mindful that a plaintiff does not need to plead a prima facie case in order to  
9 survive a motion to dismiss. *McGary v. City of Portland*, 386 F.3d 1259, 1262 (9th Cir. 2004)  
10 (quoting *Swierkiewicz v. Sorema N.A.*, 534 U.S. 506, 510-11 (2002)). The analysis at the motion  
11 to dismiss phase for an employment discrimination case is focused on whether there are “enough  
12 facts to state a claim to relief that is *plausible* on its face[.]” *United States v. Valdez-Novoa*, 780  
13 F.3d 906, 916 n.1 (9th Cir. 2015) (quoting *Twombly*, 550 U.S. at 569-70) (noting the Supreme  
14 Court’s holding that the plausibility standard is not contrary to its prior holding that an employment  
15 discrimination complaint does not need to contain facts establishing a prima facie case of  
16 discrimination). Nevertheless, district courts in the Ninth Circuit look to the elements of a prima  
17 facie case in analyzing the sufficiency of an employment discrimination complaint. *See Sablan v.*  
18 *A.B. Won Pat Int’l Airport Auth.*, No. 10-00013, 2010 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 130692, at \*13, 2010 WL  
19 5148202, at \*5 (D. Guam Dec. 9, 2010) (citations omitted) (“[C]ourts are now looking to those  
20 elements to analyze a motion to dismiss—so as to decide, in the light of ‘judicial experience and  
21 common sense,’ whether the challenged complaint ‘contain[s] sufficient factual matter, accepted  
22 as true, to “state a claim to relief that is plausible on its face.””); *Carter v. Brennan*, No. 2:18-cv-  
23 00823 MCE AC (PS), 2018 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 172048, at \*6, 2018 WL 4810808, at \*2 (E.D. Cal.  
24 Oct. 4, 2018) (citations omitted) (“[T]he court must look to these elements [of a prima facie case  
25 of discrimination] to decide whether plaintiff’s complaint as pleaded contains sufficient factual  
26  
27  
28

1 matter, accepted as true, to state a plausible claim for relief.”), *report and recommendation*  
2 *adopted*, No. 2:18-CV-00823 MCE AC(PS), 2019 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 11066, 2019 WL 296948  
3 (E.D. Cal. Jan. 23, 2019).

4 To state an individualized claim for race-based disparate treatment under Title VII, a  
5 plaintiff must allege sufficient facts to show that: “(1) [plaintiff] is a member of a protected class;  
6 (2) [plaintiff] was qualified for [the] position; (3) [plaintiff] experienced an adverse employment  
7 action; and (4) similarly situated individuals outside [plaintiff’s] protected class were treated more  
8 favorably, or other circumstances surrounding the adverse employment action give rise to an  
9 inference of discrimination.” *Peterson v. Hewlett-Packard Co.*, 358 F.3d 599, 603 (9th Cir. 2004)  
10 (citations omitted); *see Campbell v. Haw. Dep’t of Educ.*, 892 F.3d 1005, 1012 (9th Cir. 2018)  
11 (noting same). To satisfy this fourth prong on “similarly situated,” the plaintiff “must demonstrate  
12 that he [or she] was similar to [the] proposed comparator ‘in all material respects.’” *Sheets v. City*  
13 *of Winslow*, 859 F. App’x 161, 162 (9th Cir. 2021) (quoting *Moran v. Selig*, 447 F.3d 748, 755  
14 (9th Cir. 2006)). “[I]ndividuals are similarly situated when they have similar jobs and display  
15 similar conduct.” *Vasquez v. County of Los Angeles*, 349 F.3d 634, 641 (9th Cir. 2003).

16  
17  
18 At the motion hearing, IPI confirmed that it does not contest the first three elements of the  
19 prima facie case of discrimination. (*See also* Mot. 12 n.2.) As with the prior motions, this motion  
20 to dismiss turns on the fourth element in determining whether the SAC alleges a plausible claim  
21 of discrimination.

22  
23 Plaintiffs cite to *Houle v. Walmart Inc.*, 447 F. Supp. 3d 261, 280 (M.D. Pa. 2020), for the  
24 contention that for a pay discrimination claim, complaints are “not required to identify any  
25 comparators who have received more favorable treatment than plaintiff.” (Opp’n 4.) Despite this  
26 non-binding out-of-circuit district court case, courts from other circuits, including the Ninth, have  
27  
28



1 required complaints to identify similarly situated comparators for pay discrimination claims. *See*  
2 *Redwind v. W. Union, LLC*, No. 3:18-CV-02094-SB, 2019 WL 3069864, at \*4 (D. Or. June 21,  
3 2019) (recommending dismissal of pay discrimination claim because the plaintiff did not allege  
4 comparators were similarly situated), *report and recommendation adopted*, No. 3:18-CV-2094-  
5 SB, 2019 WL 3069841 (D. Or. July 12, 2019); *Harrington v. Lesley Univ.*, 554 F. Supp. 3d 211,  
6 224 (D. Mass. 2021) (quoting *Smith v. Stratus Comput., Inc.*, 40 F.3d 11, 17 (1st Cir. 1994))  
7 (dismissing complaint because the plaintiff failed to allege facts to demonstrate male colleagues  
8 were similarly situated). Nevertheless, as outlined by the Ninth Circuit, to prove a *prima facie* case  
9 of discrimination, plaintiffs must establish either that “similarly situated individuals outside  
10 [plaintiff’s] protected class were treated more favorably, *or* other circumstances surrounding the  
11 adverse employment action give rise to an inference of discrimination.” *Peterson*, 358 F.3d at 603  
12 (emphasis added) (citations omitted).

13  
14  
15       Construing the pleadings in the light most favorable to and drawing all reasonable  
16 inferences in favor of Plaintiffs, the Court finds that the SAC plausibly states a claim that IPI  
17 discriminated against Plaintiffs and the proposed class members in paying them lower wages  
18 compared to their Italian and Taiwanese counterparts. Previously, this Court found that the FAC  
19 “d[id] not contain sufficient facts to plausibly allege that the Italian and Taiwanese are appropriate  
20 comparators.” (Mem. Decision Granting Mot. Dismiss FAC 11 (citations omitted).) While the  
21 FAC stated that Plaintiffs were construction carpenters, plumbers, and electricians, it lacked any  
22 facts regarding other construction carpenters, plumbers, and electricians. (*Id.* at 10.) Now,  
23 Plaintiffs clarify that “[t]he material, relevant unit of comparison is the group, not the individual,  
24 because within each group – construction workers, foremen, supervisors – the pay was the same  
25 for all individuals of the same nationality.” (Opp’n 5.) Contrary to IPI’s claim that the SAC lacks  
26  
27  
28

1 facts stating that “‘groups’ of construction workers, foremen and supervisors of the same national  
2 origin had the same wage rate” (Reply 5), the SAC asserts that “[w]ithin each ethnic national team,  
3 all the construction workers were paid at the same rate, all foremen were paid at the same rate, and  
4 all supervisors were paid at the same rate” (SAC ¶ 25.) As such, the Court uses the groupings of  
5 construction worker, foreman, and supervisor to determine whether the SAC plausibly alleges Title  
6 VII discrimination. *See generally Vasquez*, 349 F.3d at 641 (“Employees in supervisory positions  
7 are generally deemed not to be similarly situated to lower level employees.”). At the hearing on  
8 the motion to dismiss the SAC, Defendant clarified that it does not contest the propriety of using  
9 the group classifications, but asserts the SAC should nevertheless be dismissed for failure to allege  
10 sufficient comparators. (*See also* Reply 5-6.) The Court therefore turns to whether Plaintiffs have  
11 stated sufficiently plausible facts in their SAC to state a claim for Title VII discrimination based  
12 on the fourth prong and Plaintiffs’ hierarchal comparators, starting with the construction workers.  
13  
14

### 15 *I. Construction Workers*

16 Plaintiffs claim Title VII discrimination for the Turkish construction workers because there  
17 were pay disparities compared to other construction workers of different nationalities, despite the  
18 work being comparable or the same. Their SAC is supported by several declarations, including  
19 one from Hamo, a U.S. citizen that worked in general construction at IPI’s construction site. Hamo  
20 states that “[t]here was no difference that [he] could see in the work that Turkish construction  
21 workers doing welding, masonry, carpentry, and electrical work were doing, as opposed to work  
22 that welders, mason, carpenters, and electricians from other nations were doing.” (Hamo Decl. ¶  
23 11.) These statements sufficiently support the proposition that Taiwanese and Italian construction  
24 workers were similarly situated to the Turkish construction workers – they had similar jobs of  
25 construction workers and similar conduct in that they were “doing welding, masonry, carpentry,  
26 and electrical work.” This conclusion is further buttressed by other declarations. Bell, project  
27  
28

1 manager for a team of Italian construction workers, attests that while “[t]he nature and quality of  
2 work that the Turks did was comparable to the nature and quality of the work the Italians did . . .  
3 the Turks were paid approximately one-third the hourly rate as Italians.” (Bell Decl. ¶¶ 3, 9, 13.)  
4 Moreover, Bell states that “the Turks and Taiwanese were performing the same type of  
5 construction work, and the skill level, workmanship, and the nature and scope of the work cannot  
6 account for any disparity in pay rates between the Turks and the Taiwanese.” (*Id.* ¶ 16.) Although  
7 Bell does not specify what group he was describing when comparing the Turks, Taiwanese, and  
8 Italians, it is a reasonable inference to conclude that he is referencing the construction workers that  
9 he supervised. *See Tracht Gut, LLC*, 836 F.3d at 1150 (citation omitted) (“At the motion to dismiss  
10 phase, the trial court must . . . draw all reasonable inferences in favor of the plaintiff.”) Further,  
11 Genç concludes that “the work that Taiwanese welders and Italian welders, dry wall specialists,  
12 and carpenters [i.e. the Taiwanese and Italian construction workers] did . . . required no greater  
13 skill or training than the work that similar Turkish workers were doing. It was the same work that  
14 the Turks were doing. There was no difference.” (Genç Decl. ¶ 10, ECF 35-7.) Based on the  
15 foregoing, the Court concludes that the Turkish construction workers were similarly situated to the  
16 Italian and Taiwanese construction workers, which satisfies the fourth element of the *prima facie*  
17 case. As such, the SAC states a plausible claim that IPI discriminated against the Turkish  
18 construction workers.  
19  
20  
21

## 22 2. Supervisors and Foremen

23 Construing the SAC in the light most favorable to and drawing all reasonable inferences in  
24 favor of Plaintiffs, it is reasonable to conclude that IPI discriminated against the Turkish  
25 supervisors. As to supervisors, Turkish supervisor Barut states that all of his fellow supervisors,  
26 except one, were paid much more than he. (Barut Decl. 1.) While Barut details his own job duties,  
27  
28

1 (*id.*), he does not state whether Turkish and Taiwanese supervisors performed duties similar to his.  
2 However, based on the actual work performed, the Court finds there are sufficient similarities.  
3 Specifically, the SAC asserts that the Turkish, Italian, and Taiwanese teams were each assigned  
4 floors that “were based on the same plan and the same productions.” (SAC ¶¶ 51-52 (quoting Barut  
5 Decl. 1).) This statement supports the similarly situated allegation by providing the missing link  
6 that the Taiwanese and Italian supervisors were doing the same work as the Turkish supervisors  
7 such that they were similarly situated yet being paid differently. Alternatively, these facts as  
8 alleged at least give rise to an inference of discrimination, which thus satisfies the fourth element  
9 of the prima facie case. Therefore, the SAC plausibly alleges that IPI discriminated against the  
10 Turkish supervisors.  
11

12 In light of the discussion above, the Court concludes that the SAC plausibly alleges that  
13 IPI discriminated against the Turkish foremen, including the three named Plaintiffs. Genç attests  
14 that “IPI asked us to support the Italians in drywall system installation, ceiling carpentry, and  
15 welding on the 14<sup>th</sup> floor[.]” (Genç Decl. ¶ 5.) He further provides that “[t]he Italians also were  
16 sent to other floors for aluminum curtain wall installation, and we assisted them in that work.” (*Id.*  
17 ¶ 6.) It is reasonable to infer that Genç’s use of the term “we” includes Turkish construction  
18 workers that he oversaw as well as Turkish foremen. The SAC also reasserts that “IPI employed  
19 those Taiwanese and Italian workers to perform the same types of work that Plaintiffs and members  
20 of the class performed” and those “Taiwanese and Italian workers had the same or similar level of  
21 skills, qualifications, and experience as Plaintiffs and members of the class.” (SAC ¶¶ 17-18.)  
22 Although Plaintiffs use the vague term “workers,” it can apply to the context of the foremen. These  
23 drawn inferences along with the prior findings that IPI discriminated against the Turkish  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

1 construction workers and supervisors supports finding that the SAC raises an inference that IPI  
2 discriminated against the Turkish foremen.

3 **B. Each of the three named Plaintiffs have plausibly alleged individual claims of**  
4 **Title VII discrimination.**

5 The Court must still analyze the individual claims of discrimination plead by each named  
6 Plaintiff who are each foreman even though the SAC plausibly states a claim of discrimination  
7 against all Turkish foremen in this case. *See Renati v. Wal-Mart Stores, Inc.*, No. 19-cv-02525-  
8 CRB, 2019 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 185486, 2019 WL 5536206, at \*6 (N.D. Cal. Oct. 25, 2019) (citing  
9 *Hawn v. Exec. Jet Mgmt., Inc.*, 615 F.3d 1151, 1156 (9th Cir. 2010)) (“Individual plaintiffs must  
10 show that they themselves were discriminated against.”). “It is true that evidence of a pattern or  
11 practice of discrimination may, in a class action, be sufficient to prove a Title VII claim, ‘even  
12 absent proof of losses to specific individuals.’” *Id.* (quoting *Chin v. Port Auth. of N.Y. & N.J.*, 685  
13 F.3d 135, 147 (2d Cir. 2012)). However, “every circuit to consider the question has held that  
14 individual Title VII plaintiffs cannot prevail based only on pattern or practice evidence” because  
15 “extending the pattern-or-practice method of proof to individual cases would impermissibly  
16 ‘relieve the plaintiff of the need to establish each element of his or her claim.’” *Id.* (quoting *Chin*,  
17 685 F.3d at 149-50.)

18 Here, construing the pleadings in the light most favorable to Plaintiffs, the SAC sufficiently  
19 states a claim of discrimination against all three Plaintiffs as foremen. Plaintiffs assert that the  
20 Italian foremen earned \$50 an hour,<sup>2</sup> (Bell Decl. ¶ 11), yet they only earned \$10.50 an hour as  
21  
22  
23

---

24 <sup>2</sup> Conversely, in their EEOC charge forms, Plaintiffs state that “the Italians were being paid \$30 an hour, also for the  
25 same work that we were doing.” (ECF Nos. 35-8, 35-10, 35-12.) While the Court is “not . . . required to accept as true  
26 allegations that contradict exhibits attached to the Complaint[.]” *Daniels-Hall v. Nat’l Educ. Ass’n*, 629 F.3d 992, 998  
27 (9th Cir. 2010) (citation omitted), the Court is mindful that the statements in the EEOC charge forms were made before  
28 Bell’s statements were made. Further, Plaintiffs’ and Bell’s statements still support the allegation that IPI  
discriminated against the Turkish by paying their Italian counterparts more – Plaintiffs just provided a more  
conservative estimate.

1 foremen (ECF Nos. 35-8, 35-10, 35-12.) Additionally, they state that “the Taiwanese were being  
2 paid \$23 an hour, nearly three times what IPI was paying us, for the same work.” (*Id.*) It is a  
3 reasonable inference to conclude that Plaintiffs were comparing themselves, as Turkish foremen,  
4 to the Taiwanese foremen. Also, as described above, the SAC describes the similar conduct among  
5 the Turkish, Italian, and Taiwanese foremen. Therefore, the Court concludes that the SAC  
6 plausibly states that individual Plaintiffs Genç, Gökçe, and Köş were each discriminated against.  
7

8 **C. Any differences IPI alleges are immaterial.**

9 IPI argues that there are significant differences between the Turkish, Italian, and Taiwanese  
10 workers such that they cannot be similarly situated, such as the exclusivity of electrician and  
11 plumber positions to only the Turkish; the Turkish workers’ ability to earn overtime pay; and the  
12 Turkish workers’ representation through a third-party recruitment agency. (Mot. Dismiss 14-15.)  
13 At this early stage of litigation, the Court finds the SAC alleges sufficient facts to plausibly assert  
14 that IPI discriminated against the Turkish construction workers, foremen, and supervisors.  
15 Moreover, the distinctions that IPI highlights do not appear to be material.  
16

17 In affirming a grant of summary judgment in favor of defendant Major League Baseball  
18 (MLB), the Ninth Circuit found that the plaintiffs, Caucasian or Latino retired professional  
19 baseball players, “failed to demonstrate that they are similarly situated in all material respects to  
20 the former Negro League players they assert are receiving more favorable treatment” of receiving  
21 benefits under the Negro League Plans. *Moran*, 447 F.3d at 751, 755-56. The Ninth Circuit  
22 identified a material aspect when it noted that “in order to qualify for the benefits under the Negro  
23 League Plans, the players to whom the appellants seek to equate themselves must have played in  
24 the Negro Leagues—a qualification that the appellants indisputably lack.” *Id.* at 756.  
25  
26  
27  
28

1 Here, it is unclear how any of the distinctions IPI highlights between the Turkish workers  
2 and the Italian and Taiwanese workers are material. (Mot. Dismiss 14-15). The comparators here  
3 are among three groups: construction workers, supervisors, and foremen. The disparate treatment  
4 under Title VII is the inequitable base rate IPI applied among the national groups, not the  
5 opportunity for all the workers to earn the same amount of money per pay period. Plaintiffs clarify  
6 that even though “Taiwanese and Italian workers doing the same job as he worked fewer hours (no  
7 overtime) each week but were paid substantially more.” (SAC ¶ 49.) So even assuming that IPI  
8 paid the Turkish a lower wage because they were allowed to work overtime, this should not result  
9 in the Turkish being treated disparately because they still earned substantially less.  
10

11 At the motion hearing, IPI emphasized that the difference in skills and qualifications among  
12 the groups as outlined in the SAC demonstrates that the Turkish are not similarly situated to the  
13 Taiwanese and Italian. (*See also* Reply 7.) For example, IPI notes that the Plaintiffs allege only  
14 the Turks had electricians and plumbers. (Mot. 14 (citing SAC ¶ 34).) Plaintiffs counter that  
15 because IPI did not differentiate pay based on specialty, these differences are immaterial. At this  
16 stage, the Court finds that the differences in skills and qualifications are not material because  
17 Plaintiffs allege discrimination based upon each class of workers, regardless of specialization.  
18 Plaintiffs assert that “[w]ithin each ethnic national team, all the construction workers were paid at  
19 the same rate, all foremen were paid at the same rate, and all supervisors were paid at the same  
20 rate.” (SAC ¶ 25.) In support of this, Plaintiffs allege that the Italian construction workers were all  
21 paid \$25.00 per hour and the Italian foremen were paid \$50.00 an hour – “There was no distinction  
22 in pay based on specialties – carpenters, welders, plumbers, etc.” (*Id.* ¶ 28.)  
23  
24

25 Moreover, these holes that IPI is attempting to poke in Plaintiffs’ prima facie case appear  
26 to be legitimate, nondiscriminatory reasons for the alleged discrimination. *See Fernandez v. Wynn*  
27  
28

1 *Oil Co.*, 653 F.2d 1273, 1275 (9th Cir. 1981) (acknowledging superior qualifications as a  
2 legitimate and nondiscriminatory reason for adverse employment action). It is inappropriate for a  
3 court to consider “legitimate, nondiscriminatory reasons proffered by a defendant at the pleading  
4 stage” because “[d]oing so would improperly invoke the *McDonnell Douglas* burden-shifting  
5 framework, which ‘is a summary judgment “evidentiary standard, not a pleading requirement.”’”  
6 *Seyed Mohsen Sharifi Takieh v. Banner Health*, 515 F. Supp. 3d 1026, 1044-45 (D. Ariz. 2021)  
7 (quoting *Astre v. McQuaid*, 804 F. App’x 665, 667 n.3 (9th Cir. 2020)).

9 Ultimately, the SAC plausibly alleges that IPI discriminated against the Turkish  
10 construction workers, foremen, and supervisors.

11 **D. The statistics by the Department of Labor establish circumstantial and**  
12 **anecdotal evidence that Plaintiffs suffered Title VII discrimination.**

13 Plaintiffs’ SAC also plead new facts regarding DOL statistics. (SAC ¶¶ 20-24, 35.)  
14 Specifically, Plaintiffs list the wage range the DOL authorized for various construction worker  
15 positions such as plumbers and welders. (*Id.* ¶ 22.) Plaintiffs assert that because IPI paid Turkish  
16 employees minimum wage, they were paid below the range that the DOL had approved IPI to pay  
17 its H-2B employees. (SAC ¶¶ 20-23.) Next, Plaintiffs claim that “[t]he statistics on IPI H-2B  
18 approvals by USDOL (SAC ¶¶ 20–23) show that the basic wage rate for any of the approved  
19 categories never was larger than a factor of 2 (e.g., construction carpenter: \$15.48–\$28.95) and  
20 typically was closer to a factor of 1.5 (e.g., mason: \$14.92–\$22.00).” (Opp’n 7.) At the hearing,  
21 Plaintiffs’ counsel asserted that the DOL range of appropriate wages for workers accounts for  
22 differences in skills and qualifications. For example, a highly skilled and qualified mason should  
23 earn no more than 1.5 times more than a novice mason. So even assuming that IPI paid Italian  
24 construction workers more than the Turkish construction workers because the former were more  
25 qualified, the Italians should not be earning three times more. Rather, Plaintiffs assert that the pay  
26  
27  
28



1 difference was not due to a difference in qualifications, but because of discrimination. The Court  
2 finds that this additional information supports the finding of plausibility of discrimination as it is  
3 strong circumstantial and anecdotal evidence of how IPI paid the Turkish H-2B workers  
4 substantially less than H-2B workers recruited from Italy and Taiwan.

5  
6 **E. Facts alleging systemic discrimination establish circumstantial and anecdotal  
7 evidence that Plaintiffs suffered Title VII discrimination.**

8 “In a discriminatory treatment class action, plaintiffs have the burden of proving by a  
9 preponderance of the evidence that sex discrimination was defendant’s ‘standard operating  
10 procedure’ maintained through systematic intentional discrimination.” *Penk v. Or. State Bd. of*  
11 *Higher Educ.*, 816 F.2d 458, 463 (9th Cir. 1987) (citations omitted). “To establish the requisite  
12 discriminatory intent plaintiffs may offer statistical, nonstatistical, and anecdotal evidence.” *Id.*  
13 Here, Plaintiffs assert that “IPI engaged in a company-wide practice of employment  
14 discrimination, both intentional and systemic, on the basis of national origin, against Plaintiffs and  
15 a class of similarly situated Turkish employees/former employees[.]” (SAC ¶ 1.) Specifically,  
16 Plaintiffs allege that IPI paid the “Taiwanese and Italian workers . . . at a wage rate significantly  
17 higher—as much as three times higher—than Plaintiffs and members of the class.”<sup>3</sup> (*Id.* ¶ 19.)  
18 This assertion is further supported by the plausible claims of discrimination against the Turkish  
19 construction workers, foremen, and supervisors as discussed above. As such, the SAC plausibly  
20 asserts that it was IPI’s standard operating procedure maintained through systematic intentional  
21 discrimination to pay Plaintiffs and the proposed class members less than their Italian and  
22 Taiwanese counterparts.  
23  
24

25  
26  
27 <sup>3</sup> For the first time, in their opposition, Plaintiffs state that they used “the term ‘workers’ to mean construction  
28 workers.” (Opp’n 1 n.1.) However, there was not a similar explanation in the SAC, such that the Court does not  
conclude the term “workers” as used in the SAC to mean construction workers.

1 **IV. CONCLUSION**

2 Based on the foregoing, the Court DENIES IPI's motion to dismiss (ECF No. 38) the SAC  
3 with prejudice because Plaintiffs' SAC alleges sufficient facts to plausibly show that IPI  
4 discriminated against them and the proposed class of 107 Turkish H-2B workers.  
5

6 SO ORDERED this 20th day of June, 2023.

7  
8 

9 \_\_\_\_\_  
10 RAMONA V. MANGLONA  
11 Chief Judge  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28