

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF PUERTO RICO**

**SOLBEE MALAVÉ-VARGAS;
JORGE PÉREZ-BORROTO;
MARGARITA ARROYO-MOLINA;
NILSA PAGÁN-SERRANO;
ENID RUIZ-RODRÍGUEZ;
MARIELIS RODRÍGUEZ-LEÓN;
GABRIEL SÁNCHEZ-RÍOS;
JONATHAN DE SANTIAGO-MORENO;
CARLOS FERNÁNDEZ-FLORES;
BLANCA SERRANO-MALDONADO;
LEADETTE GONZÁLEZ-COLÓN;
HERIBERTO FIGUEROA-SANTANA
FLORENTÍN TIRADO-CARLO;
CHRISTIAN MORALES-LEÓN;
LUZ PÉREZ-BETANCOURT;
YESENIA MARÍA SUÁREZ;
ISABEL DE LA CRUZ-SÁNCHEZ;
ANGEL ACABÁ-VÁZQUEZ;
MIGUEL SANTIAGO-CALDERÓN;
THELMA DELGADO-PEDROGO;
NYDIA TOSAS-CORDERO;
ELEONOR RODRÍGUEZ-AVILÉS;
EDWIN TORRES-CRUZ;
JOEL SELJO-RIVERA;
WILLIAM TORRELLAS-DÍAZ;
ROBERTO VALENTÍN-SANTIAGO;
YAMAIRA ORTIZ-PEREA;
OMAYRA GARAY-GARCÍA;
ENID PILLOT-MARTÍNEZ;
LAURA RIVERA-RULLÁN;
ALEX RIVERA-PORTELA;
EMMANUEL FONTANILLA-ESPINAL
MIGUEL GONZÁLEZ-ROLÓN;
OMAR SANTIAGO-RODRÍGUEZ; and
CLAIMY RAMÍREZ-DÍAZ**

Plaintiffs,

v.

Civil Action No: 13-1895

COMPLAINT

JURY TRIAL DEMANDED

CIVIL RIGHTS

DAMAGES

DECLARATORY RELIEF

INJUNCTIVE RELIEF

JAIME PERELLÓ-BORRÁS, in his personal capacity and in his official capacity as SPEAKER OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES OF THE COMMONWEALTH OF PUERTO RICO; AILEEN FIGUEROA-VÁZQUEZ, in her personal capacity and in her official capacity as SECRETARY OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES OF THE COMMONWEALTH OF PUERTO RICO; XAVIER GONZÁLEZ-CALDERÓN, in his personal capacity and in his official capacity as ADMINISTRATOR OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES OF THE COMMONWEALTH OF PUERTO RICO; JOSÉ A. FUENTES-SERRANO, in his personal capacity and in his official capacity as HUMAN RESOURCES DIRECTOR OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES OF THE COMMONWEALTH OF PUERTO RICO; JANE DOE; and JOHN DOE,

Defendants.

COMPLAINT

TO THE HONORABLE COURT:

Plaintiffs, SOLBEE MALAVÉ-VARGAS; JORGE PÉREZ-BORROTO; MARGARITA ARROYO-MOLINA; NILSA PAGÁN-SERRANO; ENID RUIZ-RODRÍGUEZ; MARIELIS RODRÍGUEZ-LEÓN; GABRIEL SÁNCHEZ-RÍOS; JONATHAN DE SANTIAGO-MORENO; CARLOS FERNÁNDEZ-FLORES; BLANCA SERRANO-MALDONADO; LEADETTE GONZÁLEZ-COLÓN; HERIBERTO FIGUEROA-SANTANA; FLORENTÍN TIRADO-CARLO; CHRISTIAN MORALES-LEÓN; LUZ PÉREZ-BETANCOURT; YESENIA MARÍA SUÁREZ; ISABEL DE LA CRUZ-SÁNCHEZ; ANGEL ACABÁ-VÁZQUEZ; MIGUEL SANTIAGO-CALDERÓN; THELMA DELGADO-PEDROGO; NYDIA TOSAS-CORDERO; ELEONOR RODRÍGUEZ-AVILÉS; EDWIN TORRES-CRUZ; JOEL SEJO-RIVERA;

WILLIAM TORRELLAS-DÍAZ; ROBERTO VALENTÍN-SANTIAGO; YAMAIRA ORTIZ-PEREA; OMayRA GARAY-GARCÍA; ENID PILLOT-MARTÍNEZ; LAURA RIVERA-RULLÁN; ALEX RIVERA-PORTELA; EMMANUEL FONTANILLA-ESPINAL; MIGUEL GONZÁLEZ-ROLÓN; OMAR SANTIAGO-RODRÍGUEZ; and CLAIMY RAMÍREZ-DÍAZ (collectively, “Plaintiffs”), hereby file this Complaint for economic, compensatory and punitive damages, and for declaratory, injunctive and equitable relief, against Defendants JAIME PERELLÓ-BORRÁS, in his personal capacity and in his official capacity as SPEAKER OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES OF THE COMMONWEALTH OF PUERTO RICO; AILEEN FIGUEROA-VÁZQUEZ, in her personal capacity and in her official capacity as SECRETARY OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES OF THE COMMONWEALTH OF PUERTO RICO; XAVIER GONZÁLEZ-CALDERÓN, in his personal capacity and in his official capacity as ADMINISTRATOR OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES OF THE COMMONWEALTH OF PUERTO RICO; JOSÉ A. FUENTES-SERRANO, in his personal capacity and in his official capacity as HUMAN RESOURCES DIRECTOR OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES OF THE COMMONWEALTH OF PUERTO RICO; JANE DOE; and JOHN DOE.

INTRODUCTION

1. This is a civil action filed by thirty-five (35) former term employees of the House of Representatives of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico (“House” or “House of Representatives”) – affiliated to the New Progressive Party (“NPP”) – who seek redress for blatant, politically motivated adverse employment actions taken against them in violation of federal and local law.
2. Almost all Plaintiffs began working for the House of Representatives under NPP administrations. Plaintiffs held term appointments and such appointments were consistently

renewed – some for over eight (8) years. All the Plaintiffs worked in positions and carried out functions for which political affiliation is not an appropriate requirement, and none had ever received a negative evaluation as to their work performance.

3. The General Election of 2012 caused a shift in political power in the Executive and Legislative branches of government in Puerto Rico from the NPP to the Popular Democratic Party (“PDP”). In the House of Representatives, the PDP gained a majority of the seats, and Jaime Perelló-Borrás - a named defendant in this civil action - was chosen by the PDP legislative caucus shortly after the General Elections as the next Speaker of the House of Representatives.

4. In December of 2012, approximately a month after the General Elections of 2012, the upcoming Speaker of the House of Representatives, Defendant Jaime Perelló-Borrás of the PDP brazenly vowed to “clean house” and get rid of, as he put it, “...all of the son of the bitches NPP’ers in the Capitol.”

5. Defendant Perelló-Borrás wasted no time to make good on his promise. Together with co-Defendants, his first order of business once he assumed control of the administration was to systematically identify NPP affiliated employees and then orchestrate a massive purge of these employees from the House of Representatives. Plaintiffs – all of whom are affiliated with the NPP – fell victim to Defendants’ discriminatory scheme and their appointments were not renewed; they were not rehired and none was ever recalled back to work. All Plaintiffs were replaced shortly thereafter with PDP-affiliated individuals in their positions, who now perform the same duties and functions the Plaintiffs had done previously.

6. As it can be logically inferred from such fact-pattern, and as noted in more detail below, the adverse employment actions executed by Defendants were motivated by Plaintiffs’ political affiliation, participation and beliefs in favor of a political party other than the PDP, specifically

the NPP. Had it not been for Plaintiffs' political affiliation, participation and beliefs, all of them would still be employed by the House of Representatives.

7. Plaintiffs accordingly allege violations under the First Amendment of the United States Constitution, as well as under the laws and Constitution of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, in particular, Sections 1, 2, 4, 6 and 7 of Article II of the Puerto Rico Constitution and Articles 1802 and 1803 of the Civil Code, §5141-5142 of Title 31

JURISDICTION AND VENUE

8. This District Court has federal subject matter jurisdiction pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §§1331 because this is a civil action brought under the laws and the Constitution of the United States.

9. This Court also has supplemental jurisdiction over all claims arising under the laws and the Constitution of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §1367.

10. Venue is proper in the District of Puerto Rico pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §1391. All parties reside in Puerto Rico, and a substantial part of the acts, events and/or omissions giving rise to the Plaintiffs' claims occurred in Puerto Rico.

11. A jury trial is demanded.

THE PARTIES

Plaintiffs

12. Plaintiff **Solbee Malavé-Vargas** ("Malavé-Vargas") had worked in the House of Representatives for almost eight (8) years – since January 2005. Defendants refused to renew Malavé-Vargas' appointment and rehire her after they assumed control of the House of Representatives on January 2013 because she had exercised her First Amendment rights and had engaged in activity protected by the First Amendment. Malavé-Vargas' last appointment at the House of Representatives was as a Technician Supervisor in the Technology and Information

Office, where she performed routine functions that have no impact on public policy. Party affiliation is not an appropriate requirement for such position. Malavé-Vargas is a citizen of the United States, is affiliated to the NPP, and currently resides in Cidra, Puerto Rico.

13. Plaintiff **Jorge Pérez-Borroto** (“Pérez-Borroto”) had worked in the House of Representatives for almost four (4) years – since January 2009. Defendants refused to renew Pérez-Borroto’s appointment and rehire him after they assumed control of the House of Representatives on January 2013 because he had exercised his First Amendment rights and had engaged in activity protected by the First Amendment. Pérez-Borroto’s last appointment at the House of Representatives was as an Information Technician in the Technology and Information Office, where he performed routine functions that have no impact on public policy. Party affiliation is not an appropriate requirement for such position. Pérez-Borroto is a citizen of the United States, is affiliated to the NPP, and currently resides in Cabo Rojo, Puerto Rico.

14. Plaintiff **Margarita Arroyo-Molina** (“Arroyo-Molina”) had worked in the House of Representatives for over seven (7) years – since September 2005. Defendants refused to renew Arroyo-Molina’s appointment and rehire her after they assumed control of the House of Representatives on January 2013 because she had exercised her First Amendment rights and had engaged in activity protected by the First Amendment. Arroyo-Molina’s last appointment at the House of Representatives was as an Administrative Assistant performing duties as Coordinator of the Employee’s Help Program (PAE, for its Spanish acronym) in the Human Resources Office, where she performed routine, clerical functions that have no impact on public policy. Party affiliation is not an appropriate requirement for such position. Arroyo-Molina is a citizen of the United States, is affiliated to the NPP, and currently resides in Toa Baja, Puerto Rico.

15. Plaintiff **Nilsa Pagán-Serrano** (“Pagán-Serrano”) had worked in the House of Representatives for three and a half (3½) years – since June 2009. Defendants refused to renew Pagán-Serrano’s appointment and rehire her after they assumed control of the House of Representatives on January 2013 because she had exercised her First Amendment rights and had engaged in activity protected by the First Amendment. Pagán-Serrano’s last appointment at the House of Representatives was as an Aide in the Training Division of the Human Resources Office, where she performed routine and clerical functions that have no impact on public policy. Party affiliation is not an appropriate requirement for such position. Pagán-Serrano is a citizen of the United States, is affiliated to the NPP, and currently resides in San Juan, Puerto Rico.

16. Plaintiff **Enid Ruiz-Rodríguez** (“Ruiz-Rodríguez”) had worked in the House of Representatives for over three (3) years – since July 2009. Defendants refused to renew Ruiz-Rodríguez’ appointment and rehire her after they assumed control of the House of Representatives on January 2013 because she had exercised her First Amendment rights and had engaged in activity protected by the First Amendment. Ruiz-Rodríguez’ last appointment at the House of Representatives was as a Human Resources Technician in the Human Resources Office, where she performed routine and clerical functions that have no impact on public policy. Party affiliation is not an appropriate requirement for such position. Ruiz-Rodríguez is a citizen of the United States, is affiliated to the NPP, and currently resides in San Juan, Puerto Rico.

17. Plaintiff **Marielis Rodríguez-León** (“Rodríguez-León”) had worked in the House of Representatives for almost four (4) years – since February 2009. Defendants refused to renew Rodríguez-León’s appointment and rehire her after they assumed control of the House of Representatives on January 2013 because she had exercised her First Amendment rights and had engaged in activity protected by the First Amendment. Rodríguez-León’s last appointment at the

House of Representatives was as a Telephone Switchboard Operator in the Telephone Switchboard Office, where she performed routine and clerical functions that have no impact on public policy. Party affiliation is not an appropriate requirement for such position. Rodríguez-León is a citizen of the United States, is affiliated to the NPP, and currently resides in Toa Baja, Puerto Rico.

18. Plaintiff **Gabriel Sánchez-Ríos** (“Sánchez-Ríos”) had worked in the House of Representatives for almost four (4) years – since January 2009. Defendants refused to renew Sánchez-Ríos’ appointment and rehire him after they assumed control of the House of Representatives on January 2013 because he had exercised his First Amendment rights and had engaged in activity protected by the First Amendment. Sánchez-Ríos’ last appointment at the House of Representatives was as a Legislative Technician in the Daily Records Office (“*Diario de Sesiones*”), where he performed routine and clerical functions that have no impact on public policy. Party affiliation is not an appropriate requirement for such position. Sánchez-Ríos is a citizen of the United States, is affiliated to the NPP, and currently resides in San Juan, Puerto Rico.

19. Plaintiff **Jonathan De Santiago-Moreno** (“De Santiago-Moreno”) had worked in the House of Representatives for over three (3) years – since July 2009. Defendants refused to renew De Santiago-Moreno’s appointment and rehire him after they assumed control of the House of Representatives on January 2013 because he had exercised his First Amendment rights and had engaged in activity protected by the First Amendment. De Santiago-Moreno’s last appointment at the House of Representatives was as an Accounting Technician in the Finances and Budget Office, where he performed routine and clerical functions that have no impact on public policy. Party affiliation is not an appropriate requirement for such position. De Santiago-Moreno is a

citizen of the United States, is affiliated to the NPP, and currently resides in San Juan, Puerto Rico.

20. Plaintiff **Carlos Fernández-Flores** (“Fernández-Flores”) had worked in the House of Representatives for over five (5) years – since October 2007. Defendants refused to renew Fernández-Flores’ appointment and rehire him after they assumed control of the House of Representatives on January 2013 because he had exercised her First Amendment rights and had engaged in activity protected by the First Amendment. Fernández-Flores’ last appointment at the House of Representatives was as an Accounting Technician performing duties as Budget Technician in the Finances and Budget Office, where he performed routine and clerical functions that have no impact on public policy. Party affiliation is not an appropriate requirement for such position. Fernández-Flores is a citizen of the United States, is affiliated to the NPP, and currently resides in San Lorenzo, Puerto Rico.

21. Plaintiff **Blanca Serrano-Maldonado** (“Serrano-Maldonado”) had worked in the House of Representatives for over four (4) years – since April 2008. Defendants refused to renew Serrano-Maldonado’s appointment and rehire her after they assumed control of the House of Representatives on January 2013 because she had exercised her First Amendment rights and had engaged in activity protected by the First Amendment. Serrano-Maldonado’s last appointment at the House of Representatives was as an Accounts Payable Technician (“*Técnico de Cuentas a Pagar*”) in the Finances and Budget Office, where she performed routine and clerical functions that have no impact on public policy. Party affiliation is not an appropriate requirement for such position. Serrano-Maldonado is a citizen of the United States, is affiliated to the NPP, and currently resides in Carolina, Puerto Rico.

22. Plaintiff **Leadette González-Colón** (“González-Colón”) had worked in the House of Representatives for over three (3) years – since July 2009. Defendants refused to renew González-Colón’s appointment and rehire her after they assumed control of the House of Representatives on January 2013 because she had exercised her First Amendment rights and had engaged in activity protected by the First Amendment. González-Colón’s last appointment at the House of Representatives was as a Deputy Director in the Aide to the Citizen Office (“*Oficina de Ayuda al Ciudadano*”), where she performed routine and clerical functions that have no impact on public policy. Party affiliation is not an appropriate requirement for such position. González-Colón is a citizen of the United States, is affiliated to the NPP, and currently resides in Cabo Rojo, Puerto Rico.

23. Plaintiff **Heriberto Figueroa-Santana** (“Figueroa-Santana”) had worked in the House of Representatives for almost three (3) years – since March 2010. Defendants refused to renew Figueroa-Santana’s appointment and rehire him after they assumed control of the House of Representatives on January 2013 because he had exercised his First Amendment rights and had engaged in activity protected by the First Amendment. Figueroa-Santana’s last appointment at the House of Representatives was as a Driver in the Press Office, where he performed routine and clerical functions that have no impact on public policy. Party affiliation is not an appropriate requirement for such position. Figueroa-Santana is a citizen of the United States, is affiliated to the NPP, and currently resides in Comerío, Puerto Rico.

24. Plaintiff **Florentín Tirado-Carlo** (“Tirado-Carlo”) had worked in the House of Representatives for almost over three (3) years – since May 2009. Defendants refused to renew Tirado-Carlo’s appointment and rehire him after they assumed control of the House of Representatives on January 2013 because he had exercised his First Amendment rights and had

engaged in activity protected by the First Amendment. Tirado-Carlo's last appointment at the House of Representatives was as an Carpenter's Aid ("*Ayudante de Ebanistería*") in the Property Office, where he performed routine and clerical functions that have no impact on public policy. Party affiliation is not an appropriate requirement for such position. Tirado-Carlo is a citizen of the United States, is affiliated to the NPP, and currently resides in Río Grande, Puerto Rico.

25. Plaintiff **Christian Morales-León** ("Morales-León") had worked in the House of Representatives for almost one (1) year – since April 2012. Defendants refused to renew Morales-León's appointment and rehire him after they assumed control of the House of Representatives on January 2013 because he had exercised his First Amendment rights and had engaged in activity protected by the First Amendment. Morales-León's last appointment at the House of Representatives was as a Warehouse Keeper in the Property Office where he performed routine and clerical functions that have no impact on public policy. Party affiliation is not an appropriate requirement for such position. Morales-León is a citizen of the United States, is affiliated to the NPP, and currently resides in Maunabo, Puerto Rico.

26. Plaintiff **Luz Pérez-Betancourt** ("Pérez-Betancourt") had worked in the House of Representatives for over two (2) years – since August 2010. Defendants refused to renew Pérez-Betancourt's appointment and rehire her after they assumed control of the House of Representatives on January 2013 because she had exercised her First Amendment rights and had engaged in activity protected by the First Amendment. Pérez-Betancourt's last appointment at the House of Representatives was as a Protocol Officer in the Protocol Office, where she performed clerical and routine functions that have no impact on public policy. Party affiliation is not an appropriate requirement for such position. Pérez-Betancourt is a citizen of the United States, is affiliated to the NPP, and currently resides in Trujillo Alto, Puerto Rico.

27. Plaintiff **Yesenia María Suárez** (“Suárez”) had worked in the House of Representatives for over three (3) years – since May 2009. Defendants refused to renew Suárez’ appointment and rehire her after they assumed control of the House of Representatives on January 2013 because she had exercised her First Amendment rights and had engaged in activity protected by the First Amendment. Suárez’ last appointment at the House of Representatives was as a Receptionist in the Protocol Office, where she performed clerical and routine functions that have no impact on public policy. Party affiliation is not an appropriate requirement for such position. Suárez is a citizen of the United States, is affiliated to the NPP, and currently resides in Toa Baja, Puerto Rico.

28. Plaintiff **Isabel De La Cruz-Sánchez** (“De La Cruz-Sánchez”) had worked in the House of Representatives for almost two (2) years – since March 2011. Defendants refused to renew De La Cruz-Sánchez’ appointment and rehire her after they assumed control of the House of Representatives on January 2013 because she had exercised her First Amendment rights and had engaged in activity protected by the First Amendment. De La Cruz-Sánchez’ last appointment at the House of Representatives was as a Maintenance Employee, ascribed to the Sergeant of Arms Office, where she performed clerical and routine functions that have no impact on public policy. Party affiliation is not an appropriate requirement for such position. De La Cruz-Sánchez is a citizen of the United States, is affiliated to the NPP, and currently resides in San Juan, Puerto Rico.

29. Plaintiff **Ángel Acabá-Vázquez** (“Acabá-Vázquez”) had worked in the House of Representatives for almost eight (8) years – since January 2005. Defendants refused to renew Acabá-Vázquez’ appointment and rehire him after they assumed control of the House of Representatives on January 2013 because he had exercised his First Amendment rights and had

engaged in activity protected by the First Amendment. Acabá-Vázquez' last appointment at the House of Representatives was as an Internal Security Officer, ascribed to the Sergeant of Arms Office, where he performed clerical and routine functions that have no impact on public policy. Party affiliation is not an appropriate requirement for such position. Acabá-Vázquez is a citizen of the United States, is affiliated to the NPP, and currently resides in Hatillo, Puerto Rico.

30. Plaintiff **Miguel Santiago-Calderón** ("Santiago-Calderón") had worked in the House of Representatives for over three (3) years – since October 2009. Defendants refused to renew Santiago-Calderón's appointment and rehire him after they assumed control of the House of Representatives on January 2013 because he had exercised his First Amendment rights and had engaged in activity protected by the First Amendment. Santiago-Calderón's last appointment at the House of Representatives was as an Usher, ascribed to the Sergeant of Arms Office, where he performed clerical and routine functions that have no impact on public policy. Party affiliation is not an appropriate requirement for such position. Santiago-Calderón is a citizen of the United States, is affiliated to the NPP, and currently resides in San Juan, Puerto Rico.

31. Plaintiff **Thelma Delgado-Pedrogo** ("Delgado-Pedrogo") had worked in the House of Representatives for almost four (4) years – since January 2009. Defendants refused to renew Delgado-Pedrogo's appointment and rehire her after they assumed control of the House of Representatives on January 2013 because she had exercised her First Amendment rights and had engaged in activity protected by the First Amendment. Delgado-Pedrogo's last appointment at the House of Representatives was as a Secretary in the Transportation Office, where she performed clerical and routine functions that have no impact on public policy. Party affiliation is not an appropriate requirement for such position. Delgado-Pedrogo is a citizen of the United States, is affiliated to the NPP, and currently resides in Bayamón, Puerto Rico.

32. Plaintiff **Nydia Tosas-Cordero** (“Tosas-Cordero”) had worked in the House of Representatives for over two (2) years – since November 2010. Defendants refused to renew Tosas-Cordero’s appointment and rehire her after they assumed control of the House of Representatives on January 2013 because she had exercised her First Amendment rights and had engaged in activity protected by the First Amendment. Tosas-Cordero’s last appointment at the House of Representatives was as a Photographer in the Press Office, where she performed clerical and routine functions that have no impact on public policy. Party affiliation is not an appropriate requirement for such position. Tosas-Cordero is a citizen of the United States, is affiliated to the NPP, and currently resides in Caguas, Puerto Rico.

33. Plaintiff **Eleonor Rodríguez-Avilés** (“Rodríguez-Avilés”) had worked in the House of Representatives for almost seven (7) years – since January 2006. Defendants refused to renew Rodríguez-Avilés’ appointment and rehire her after they assumed control of the House of Representatives on January 2013 because she had exercised her First Amendment rights and had engaged in activity protected by the First Amendment. Rodríguez-Avilés’s last appointment at the House of Representatives was as a Press Officer in the Press Office, where she performed clerical and routine functions that have no impact on public policy. Party affiliation is not an appropriate requirement for such position. Rodríguez-Avilés is a citizen of the United States, is affiliated to the NPP, and currently resides in Bayamón, Puerto Rico.

34. Plaintiff **Edwin Torres-Cruz** (“Torres-Cruz”) had worked in the House of Representatives for over seven (7) years – since October 2005. Defendants refused to renew Torres-Cruz’ appointment and rehire him after they assumed control of the House of Representatives on January 2013 because he had exercised his First Amendment rights and had engaged in activity protected by the First Amendment. Torres-Cruz’s last appointment at the

House of Representatives was as a Computer Technician in the Technology and Information Office, where he performed clerical and routine functions that have no impact on public policy. Party affiliation is not an appropriate requirement for such position. Torres-Cruz is a citizen of the United States, is affiliated to the NPP, and currently resides in Patillas, Puerto Rico.

35. Plaintiff **Joel Seijo-Rivera** (“Seijo-Rivera”) had worked in the House of Representatives for almost three (3) years – since February 2010. Defendants refused to renew Seijo-Rivera’s appointment and rehire him after they assumed control of the House of Representatives on January 2013 because he had exercised his First Amendment rights and had engaged in activity protected by the First Amendment. Seijo-Rivera’s last appointment at the House of Representatives was as a Legislative Technician in the Daily Records Office (“*Diario de Sesiones*”), where he performed clerical and routine functions that have no impact on public policy. Party affiliation is not an appropriate requirement for such position. Seijo-Rivera is a citizen of the United States, is affiliated to the NPP, and currently resides in Morovis, Puerto Rico.

36. Plaintiff **William Torrellas-Díaz** (“Torrellas-Díaz”) had worked in the House of Representatives for over seven (7) years – since September 2005. Defendants refused to renew Torrellas-Díaz’s appointment and rehire him after they assumed control of the House of Representatives on January 2013 because he had exercised his First Amendment rights and had engaged in activity protected by the First Amendment. Torrellas-Díaz’s last appointment at the House of Representatives was as an Accounting Technician in the Finance and Budget Office, where he performed clerical and routine functions that have no impact on public policy. Party affiliation is not an appropriate requirement for such position. Torrellas-Díaz is a citizen of the United States, is affiliated to the NPP, and currently resides in Naguabo, Puerto Rico.

37. Plaintiff **Roberto Valentín-Santiago** (“Valentín-Santiago”) had worked in the House of Representatives for over three (3) years – since October 2009. Defendants refused to renew Valentín-Santiago’s appointment and rehire him after they assumed control of the House of Representatives on January 2013 because he had exercised his First Amendment rights and had engaged in activity protected by the First Amendment. Valentín-Santiago’s last appointment at the House of Representatives was as a Printing Technician in the Printing Office (“*Imprenta*”) ascribed to the Administration Office, where he performed clerical and routine functions that have no impact on public policy. Party affiliation is not an appropriate requirement for such position. Valentín-Santiago is a citizen of the United States, is affiliated to the NPP, and currently resides in San Juan, Puerto Rico.

38. Plaintiff **Yamaira Ortiz-Perea** (“Ortiz-Perea”) had worked in the House of Representatives for over six (6) years – since June 2006. Defendants refused to renew Ortiz-Perea’s appointment and rehire her after they assumed control of the House of Representatives on January 2013 because she had exercised her First Amendment rights and had engaged in activity protected by the First Amendment. Ortiz-Perea’s last appointment at the House of Representatives was as an Administrative Assistant in the Center for Document Impression (“*Centro de Impresión de Documentos*”), where she performed clerical and routine functions that have no impact on public policy. Party affiliation is not an appropriate requirement for such position. Ortiz-Perea is a citizen of the United States, is affiliated to the NPP, and currently resides in Bayamón, Puerto Rico.

39. Plaintiff **Omayra Garay-García** (“Garay-García”) had worked in the House of Representatives for over two (2) years – since August 2010. Defendants refused to renew Garay-García’s appointment and rehire her after they assumed control of the House of Representatives

on January 2013 because she had exercised her First Amendment rights and had engaged in activity protected by the First Amendment. Garay-García's last appointment at the House of Representatives was as an Adjudication Technician in the Purchase and Services Office, where she performed clerical and routine functions that have no impact on public policy. Party affiliation is not an appropriate requirement for such position. Garay-García is a citizen of the United States, is affiliated to the NPP, and currently resides in San Juan, Puerto Rico.

40. Plaintiff **Enid Pillot-Martínez** ("Pillot-Martínez") had worked in the House of Representatives for over three (3) years – since June 2009. Defendants refused to renew Pillot-Martínez' appointment and rehire her after they assumed control of the House of Representatives on January 2013 because she had exercised her First Amendment rights and had engaged in activity protected by the First Amendment. Pillot-Martínez' last appointment at the House of Representatives was as a Secretary/Receptionist in the Contracts Office, where she performed clerical and routine functions that have no impact on public policy. Party affiliation is not an appropriate requirement for such position. Pillot-Martínez is a citizen of the United States, is affiliated to the NPP, and currently resides in San Juan, Puerto Rico.

41. Plaintiff **Laura Rivera-Rullán** ("Rivera-Rullán") had worked in the House of Representatives for four (4) years – since January 2009. Defendants refused to renew Rivera-Rullán's appointment and rehire her after they assumed control of the House of Representatives on January 2013 because she had exercised her First Amendment rights and had engaged in activity protected by the First Amendment. Rivera-Rullán's last appointment at the House of Representatives was as a Contract Technician in the Contracts Office, where she performed clerical and routine functions that have no impact on public policy. Party affiliation is not an

appropriate requirement for such position. Rivera-Rullán is a citizen of the United States, is affiliated to the NPP, and currently resides in Caguas, Puerto Rico.

42. Plaintiff **Alex Rivera-Portela** (“Rivera-Portela”) had worked in the House of Representatives for over three (3) years – since August 2009. Defendants refused to renew Rivera-Portela’s appointment and rehire him after they assumed control of the House of Representatives on January 2013 because he had exercised his First Amendment rights and had engaged in activity protected by the First Amendment. Rivera-Portela’s last appointment at the House of Representatives was as a Warehouse Keeper in the Property Office, where he performed clerical and routine functions that have no impact on public policy. Party affiliation is not an appropriate requirement for such position. Rivera-Portela is a citizen of the United States, is affiliated to the NPP, and currently resides in San Juan, Puerto Rico.

43. Plaintiff **Emmanuel Fontanilla-Espinal** (“Fontanilla-Espinal”) had worked in the House of Representatives for seven (7) years – since January 2006. Defendants refused to renew Fontanilla-Espinal’s appointment and rehire him after they assumed control of the House of Representatives on January 2013 because he had exercised his First Amendment rights and had engaged in activity protected by the First Amendment. Fontanilla-Espinal’s last appointment at the House of Representatives was as an Usher ascribed to the Sergeant of Arms Office, where he performed clerical and routine functions that have no impact on public policy. Party affiliation is not an appropriate requirement for such position. Fontanilla-Espinal is a citizen of the United States, is affiliated to the NPP, and currently resides in Guaynabo, Puerto Rico.

44. Plaintiff **Miguel González-Rolón** (“González-Rolón”) had worked in the House of Representatives for almost three (3) years – since January 2010. Defendants refused to renew González-Rolón’s appointment and rehire him after they assumed control of the House of

Representatives on January 2013 because he had exercised his First Amendment rights and had engaged in activity protected by the First Amendment. González-Rolón's last appointment at the House of Representatives was as a Sous Chef in the Coffee Parlor ("**Salón Café**") – ascribed to the Sergeant of Arms Office – where he performed clerical and routine functions that have no impact on public policy. Party affiliation is not an appropriate requirement for such position. González-Rolón is a citizen of the United States, is affiliated to the NPP, and currently resides in San Juan, Puerto Rico.

45. Plaintiff **Omar Santiago-Rodríguez**; ("Santiago-Rodríguez") had worked in the House of Representatives for over seven (7) years – since September 2005. Defendants refused to renew Santiago-Rodríguez's appointment and rehire him after they assumed control of the House of Representatives on January 2013 because he had exercised his First Amendment rights and had engaged in activity protected by the First Amendment. Santiago-Rodríguez's last appointment at the House of Representatives was as a Vehicle Washer in the Transportation Office, where he performed clerical and routine functions that have no impact on public policy. Party affiliation is not an appropriate requirement for such position. Santiago-Rodríguez is a citizen of the United States, is affiliated to the NPP, and currently resides in San Lorenzo, Puerto Rico.

46. Plaintiff **Claimy Ramírez-Díaz** ("Ramírez-Díaz") had worked in the House of Representatives for over four (4) years – since about 2008. Defendants refused to renew Ramírez-Díaz' appointment and rehire her after they assumed control of the House of Representatives on January 2013 because she had exercised her First Amendment rights and had engaged in activity protected by the First Amendment. Ramírez-Díaz' last appointment at the House of Representatives was as a Process Officer ("*Oficial de Trámite*") in the Center for Document Impression ("*Centro de Impresión de Documentos*"), where she performed clerical

and routine functions that have no impact on public policy. Party affiliation is not an appropriate requirement for such position. Ramírez-Díaz is a citizen of the United States, is affiliated to the NPP, and currently resides in San Juan, Puerto Rico.

Defendants

47. Defendant **Jaime Perelló-Borrás** (“Perelló-Borrás”) is the newly elected Speaker of the House of Representatives.

- a. As a result of the November 6, 2012 General Election, the PDP gained a majority of the seats in the House of Representatives.
- b. Immediately after the election, Perelló-Borrás became the frontrunner for the position of Speaker of the House of Representative, and was the only Representative nominated to occupy the position. On or about November 14, 2012, Governor Elect Alejandro García-Padilla announced that the PDP caucus in the House of Representatives elected Perelló-Borrás to become the next Speaker of the House.
- c. Perelló-Borrás was a Representative for the PDP from January 2, 2009 until December 31, 2012. As a result of the November 6, 2012 General Election, he was re-elected to the House of Representatives under the PDP insignia.
- d. Perelló-Borrás was more recently sworn in as a Representative on January 2, 2013.
- e. On January 14, 2013, Perelló-Borrás formally became the Speaker of the House.
- f. As Speaker of the House of Representatives, Perelló-Borrás is the nominating authority of the House of Representatives and he participated in, directed, executed, authorized and/or condoned the adverse employment actions giving rise to this Complaint.

- g. At all times relevant and material to this action, Perelló-Borrás has been a well-known member of the PDP that has occupied various positions under PDP administrations, including, among others: Special Aide to former PDP Mayor of Carolina, José Aponte de la Torres from 2001 to 2007; adviser in Municipal Affairs to former PDP Governor Aníbal Acevedo-Vilá from 2007 to 2008, and Representative from 2009 to 2012 and reelected for the 2013-2016 term.
- h. At all times relevant and material hereto, Perelló-Borrás acted under color of state law.
- i. Perelló-Borrás is sued in this action for declaratory, injunctive and monetary relief in both his personal capacity and in his official capacity as Speaker of the House of Representatives.

48. Defendant **Aileen Figueroa-Vázquez** (“Figueroa-Vázquez”) is the Secretary of the House of Representatives.

- a. Figueroa-Vázquez was appointed to such position by Perelló-Borrás.
- b. Figueroa-Vázquez enjoys the full trust of and is loyal to Perelló-Borrás and the PDP.
- c. Figueroa-Vázquez is a well-known and loyal member of the PDP.
- d. Figueroa-Vázquez used to work as an advisor for former PDP Representative Héctor Ferrer.
- e. As Secretary of the House of Representatives, Figueroa-Vázquez participated in, directed, executed, authorized and/or condoned the adverse employment actions giving rise to this Complaint.

- f. Figueroa-Vázquez is sued in this action for declaratory, injunctive and monetary relief in both her individual capacity and in her official capacity as Secretary of the House of Representatives.
 - g. At all times relevant and material hereto, Figueroa-Vázquez acted under color of state law.
49. Defendant **Xavier González-Calderón** (“González-Calderón”) is the Administrator of the House of Representatives
- a. González-Calderón was appointed to such position by Perelló-Borrás.
 - b. González-Calderón was also appointed Perelló-Borrás as the President of the incoming transition committee in the House of Representatives.
 - c. González-Calderón enjoys the full trust of and is loyal to Perelló-Borrás and the PDP.
 - d. González-Calderón is a well-known member of the PDP and held several high-ranking trust positions under the PDP administration of former Governor Sila M. Calderón-Serra, such as Auxiliary Secretary of Planning and Special Assistant of Federal Affairs for the Workforce Investment Board and Executive Director of the Human Resources and Occupational Development Council.
 - e. As Administrator of the House of Representatives, González-Calderón participated in, directed, executed, authorized and/or condoned the adverse employment actions giving rise to this Complaint.
 - f. González-Calderón is sued in this action for declaratory, injunctive and monetary relief in both his individual capacity and in his official capacity as Administrator of the House of Representatives

g. At all times relevant and material hereto, González-Calderón acted under color of state law.

50. Defendant **José A. Fuentes-Serrano** (“Fuentes-Serrano”) is the Human Resources Director of the Houses of Representatives.

- a. Fuentes-Serrano was appointed to such position by Perelló-Borrás.
- b. Fuentes-Serrano enjoys the full trust of and is loyal to Perelló-Borrás and the PDP.
- c. Fuentes-Serrano is a well-known and loyal member of the PDP.
- d. Fuentes-Serrano worked in a trust position at La Fortaleza under the PDP administration of former Governor Aníbal Acevedo-Vilá.
- e. As Human Resources Director of the Houses of Representatives, Fuentes-Serrano participated in, directed, executed, authorized and/or condoned the adverse employment actions giving rise to this Complaint.
- f. Fuentes-Serrano is sued in this action for declaratory, injunctive and monetary relief in both his individual capacity and in his official capacity as Human Resources Director of the House of Representatives.
- g. At all times relevant and material hereto, Fuentes-Serrano acted under color of state law.

51. Defendant **Jane Doe** is an individual defendant who works at the House of Representatives; whose name, identity and other personal circumstances are unknown at present. Defendant Jane Doe, however, directly and/or indirectly participated in, authorized or condoned and/or set in motion a series of events in connection with the non-renewal of Plaintiffs’ appointments because of Plaintiffs’ political affiliations participation, and beliefs. At all times relevant and material hereto, Defendant Jane Doe acted under color of state law.

52. Defendant **John Doe** is an individual defendant who works at the House of Representatives; whose name, identity and other personal circumstances are unknown at present. Defendant John Doe, however, directly and/or indirectly participated in, authorized or condoned and/or set in motion a series of events in connection with the non-renewal of Plaintiffs' appointments because of Plaintiffs' political affiliations participation, and beliefs. At all times relevant and material hereto, Defendant John Doe acted under color of state law.

FACTUAL ALLEGATIONS¹

GENERAL ALLEGATIONS AS TO ALL PLAINTIFFS

The House of Representatives, Before And After The November 6, 2012 General Election

53. This case involves blatant acts of political discrimination in the aftermath of the November 2012 election by the current Speaker of the House of Representatives, Jaime Perelló-Borrás of the PDP; Co- Defendants Figueroa-Vázquez, González-Calderón and Fuentes-Serrano, and upon information and belief, with other defendants whose names are not yet known, against thirty-six (36) former employees of the House of Representatives affiliated with the NPP.

54. The seats at the House of Representatives of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico are occupied by politicians that are primarily from two, competing political parties; the NPP and the PDP. Accordingly, the work environment is generally always politically charged and highly partisan, particularly in the weeks leading up to General Elections and in the months that follow such elections.

¹ Unless individually specified, all averments made throughout this complaint referring to "Plaintiffs" or "Defendants," whether in plural or singular, shall be read to include each and every named Plaintiff or Defendant, respectively.

55. It is also a fairly small work place where employees constantly interact on a daily basis, and where politics is commonly discussed. As such, the political affiliations of employees are well-known. All Plaintiffs worked in small work areas within the House of Representatives.

56. When making appointments, each administration of the House of Representatives typically hires employees affiliated with and loyal to the political party that controls the majority of the seats in the House, making political affiliations known to all.

57. The NPP held the majority of seats and thus controlled the administration of the House of Representatives from January 2nd, 2005 until December 31st, 2012. The NPP also controlled the Executive Branch of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico from January of 2009 until January of 2012.

58. All the Plaintiffs held term appointments, and such appointments were continuously renewed. That is, until Defendants arrived and refused to renew Plaintiff's appointments soon after they assumed control of the administration of the House of Representatives.

59. None of the Plaintiffs had ever received a negative evaluation of their work performance at the House of Representatives.

60. At all times relevant and material hereto, Plaintiffs were all public employees whose positions did not involve crafting, developing, or implementing public policy. Plaintiffs' positions were neither public-policy-making positions, nor positions that required the Plaintiffs to perform public-policy functions.

61. None of the Plaintiffs had close propinquity to policy-making employees or had access to politically sensitive information or confidential information related to public policy matters or the legislative process in the performance of their functions.

62. As such, political affiliation was not an appropriate requirement for Plaintiffs' positions.

63. Almost all of the Plaintiffs began working for the House of Representatives under NPP administrations.

64. Plaintiffs have been affiliated to the NPP at all times relevant and material to this action – a fact known by all Defendants.

65. Most Plaintiffs served as electoral polling officers for the NPP in general elections and/or were close collaborators and assistants in the political campaign of former Speaker of the House of Representatives, Jenniffer González-Colón of the NPP and of other NPP politicians – a fact known by all Defendants.

66. All of the Defendants knew, assumed, and/or perceived that all of the Plaintiffs had voted for the NPP and for NPP candidates in the General Election of 2012.

67. It was of common knowledge in the House of Representatives (including by co-Defendants and their political-trust employees) that all Plaintiffs avidly supported the NPP during the 2012 elections and that Plaintiffs were active during the NPP's electoral campaign.

68. At all times relevant and material hereto, House of Representative employees who do not associate with the PDP or who do not want to engage in politics were perceived, including by Defendants, as being avid supporters of a political party other than the PDP, particularly the NPP.

69. As in virtually all elections, the work environment in the House of Representatives was politically charged during the months prior to the General Election of 2012. Individuals – including Plaintiffs – openly expressed their support for their respective candidates and their participation in political activities, events and campaigns.

70. NPP affiliated individuals – including Plaintiffs - would also openly defend their political preferences, candidates and parties during discussions with individuals affiliated with

opposing political parties, including those loyal to and of the political trust of Defendants and the PDP.

71. Co-Defendants, employees of Defendants' political trust, and PDP-affiliated individuals ascended to or appointed to supervisory positions and employees of their political trust were active participants during these debates and/or personally witnessed Plaintiffs debate in favor of the NPP. As a result, the political affiliations of such individuals – including Plaintiffs – were openly known, including by Defendants.

72. In the days leading up to the General Election of 2012, employees wore clothing and/or accessories with their respective party colors. In the months after the election, including the months of December 2012 and January 2013, PDP-affiliated employees proudly and frequently wore the PDP's red and white colors to signal their loyalty to the PDP.

73. When Plaintiffs worked on NPP political campaigns, they wore uniforms that were blue and white and had logos with the names of NPP candidates.

74. Perelló-Borrás and the other co-Defendants routinely saw Plaintiffs wearing campaign uniforms in or around the House of Representatives after work-hours or during weekends.

75. On November 6, 2012, a contentious General Election² was held in Puerto Rico.

76. As a result of that General Election, PDP gubernatorial candidate Alejandro Garcia-Padilla defeated the incumbent Governor at the time, Luis G. Fortuño-Burset of the NPP, who was running for reelection. The PDP also won the majority of the seats in the Senate and in the House of Representatives; vesting the PDP with control of both legislative bodies and the right to select their respective presidents from amongst the PDP delegations.

² The November 6, 2012, "General Election" involved elections for all state-wide offices (the Governor, the Resident Commissioner, 11 Senators at large, 16 Senators by district, 11 Representatives at large, 40 Representatives by district), all municipal offices (78 Mayors and 78 Municipal Legislative Assemblies of between 9 and 33 members each) and a plebiscite whereby the people selected amongst acceptable status options.

77. Thus the PDP is political party in power at this time, with full control of the Executive and Legislative Branches of government.

78. Within days after the General Election of 2012, the PDP legislative caucus selected Defendant Perelló-Borrás as the next Speaker of the House of Representatives of Puerto Rico.

79. Co-Defendants, and in particular Perelló-Borrás, have a long history with the PDP, and have held numerous high-ranking positions under PDP administrations and within the party itself.

80. Since 2000, Perelló-Borrás occupied positions associated with PDP leaders, such as advisor to the PDP Mayor of Carolina and Advisor to former PDP Governor Aníbal Acevedo-Vilá.

81. Perelló-Borrás was very much familiarized with the operations of the House of Representatives and the personnel administration in said legislative body. In 2009, he was elected as Representative at Large under the PDP insignia, acting as minority leader in several legislative commissions.

82. On or about November 16, 2012, a Transition Committee was established to provide for the orderly changeover of the administration of the House of Representatives from the NPP to the PDP. The incoming Transition Committee was composed of approximately eleven (11) individuals, all of which were affiliated with the PDP and loyal to Defendant Perelló-Borrás. These individuals had access to all House of Representatives records, including personnel lists and employee information.

83. The incoming Transition Committee was specifically given access to a list of all House of Representative employees. The list had the dates that each employee began working for the House of Representatives.

84. PDP-affiliated members of the incoming Transition Committee received a list of all House of Representative employees that had the date each employee was hired. This list was shared with and reviewed by all Defendants. Perelló-Borrás and other co-Defendants were also given access to this information.

85. Perelló-Borrás and the other co-defendants were active participants during the transition process, with Perelló-Borrás at all times having oversight and the final say over the actions of the representatives of the incoming PDP administration.

86. Co-Defendants also compiled a list of employees whom they understood not to be affiliated with the PDP.

87. Upon information and belief, co-Defendants verified (and had authorized, condoned, or provided their agents and employees of their political trust) with the information gathered in the aforementioned lists for the purpose of engaging in political discrimination and retaliation against individuals such as Plaintiffs affiliated to a political party other than the PDP.

88. Co-Defendants, and in particular Perelló-Borrás, have unrestricted access to PDP information, personnel, resources, and documents within the possession custody and/or control of the PDP and/or its officers, employees, personnel and/or agents. In particular, they have access to electoral lists, donation records, volunteer lists, and other information showing PDP-affiliated voters and loyal PDP supporters.

89. Employees of the House of Representative that are affiliated to the PDP, including newly appointed PDP-affiliated Supervisors, co-Defendants themselves, and employees loyal to co-Defendants and the PDP, constantly made reference to a list of employees to be terminated on the basis of their political beliefs and affiliation during times relevant and material hereto, and specifically stated that Perelló-Borrás and the other co-Defendants were creating a list of all

employees affiliated to political parties other than the PDP, in particular NPP-affiliated employees or those who were perceived by the Defendants as being affiliated to or having voted for the NPP.

90. Plaintiffs and/or individuals known to them saw supervisors and other PDP-affiliated House of Representative employees (some eventually promoted to high-level trust positions) with the list of NPP-affiliated employees.

91. Furthermore, upon information and belief, Defendants personally reviewed the House of Representative's personnel records, and compared these to PDP documents that identified PDP-affiliated electors. Upon information and belief, Defendants also directed, instructed or authorized others (whether directly or tacitly) to do this on their behalf, or otherwise gather information related to the political affiliations of all House of Representative employees, and to provide Defendants with this information, for the purpose of discriminating and or retaliating against them for being affiliated to a political party other than the PDP.

92. Individuals loyal to Perelló-Borrás – including individuals that ultimately substituted the Plaintiffs in their positions – were seen throughout the House of Representatives during the months of November and December of 2012.

93. In fact, one of the Plaintiffs was instructed as early as December 2012 to begin scheduling drug screening sessions for the prospective new employees to be appointed.

94. During times relevant and material hereto, co-Defendants visited the different departments and offices in the House of Representatives, including Plaintiffs' work-areas. Upon information and belief, this was done to identify individuals affiliated or perceived by Defendants as being affiliated to political parties other than the PDP and/or to verify where to accommodate future appointees loyal to Perelló-Borrás.

95. On some occasions, moreover, Defendants and/or their trust – or other PDP-affiliated employees acting pursuant to Defendants’ instructions and/or authorization – asked Plaintiffs when and how they began working in the House of Representatives.

96. As soon as the PDP won the election, Defendants, their political-trust employees and House of Representative employees in general – acting pursuant to the instructions and authorization of Defendants – initiated a campaign to verify and/or gather information tending to show the political affiliation of those employees of the House of Representative that were not affiliated to the PDP, including Plaintiffs, for the purpose of discriminating and retaliating against them for having opposing political views and beliefs.

97. This was fairly easy to do, as Plaintiffs had participated in the entourages of NPP-affiliated candidates and would usually be seen in TV, heard on the radio, and seen in newspapers. Some Plaintiffs even appeared in photos posted in the Facebook pages of NPP candidates and posted photos in their own non-private Facebook accounts, You Tube and other social media sites that anybody can easily access.

98. Upon information and belief, Defendants and their trust employees (acting pursuant to Defendants instructions) verified various news sources and Facebook accounts to determine political affiliations with the purpose of discriminating and/or retaliating against employees of the House of Representative such as Plaintiffs affiliated to a political party other than the PDP.

99. For example, one of the Plaintiffs in this case talked to the Director of the Office of the Vice-President of the House of Representatives to see if there was something she or the Vice-President could do to help the Plaintiff keep her job. The Director told her that there was nothing she could do because the Defendants had photos and videos of the NPP-affiliated employees participating in the political campaign in favor of the NPP or NPP candidates.

100. Another Plaintiff in this case went to talk to PDP-Representative Brenda López-De Arrarás to see if there was anything she could do to help the Plaintiff keep her job. The Representative told the Plaintiff that Perelló-Borrás had photos and videos of the people that worked in favor of the NPP during the political campaign and that there was nothing she could do.

101. Immediately after the November 2012 General Elections, PDP-affiliated employees – including Defendants and employees of their political trust – began a harassment campaign against individuals affiliated with or perceived to be affiliated with political parties other than the PDP. Such conduct resulted in a chilling effect and has compromised Plaintiffs’ First Amendment rights and their desire to engage in activities protected by the First Amendment.

102. On one specific incident relevant and material to this action, Defendant Perelló-Borrás was walking around the Capitol Building. He is suddenly told something and stops; while looking at a well-known NPP-affiliated employee suddenly states something to the effect that “they should pick up and leave ... I am the one in charge here ... not a single NPP is going to stay ... I am going to clean the house.”

103. On numerous occasions PDP-affiliated individuals – including co-Defendants, their agents and employees of their political trust – were heard making comments in the House of Representatives, and in the Legislature in general, to the effect that the days of employees affiliated to political parties other than the PDP – in particular individuals affiliated to the NPP, including Plaintiffs – were numbered. Statements to the effect that the new administration needed Plaintiffs’ positions to accommodate “their people” or “persons whom they could trust” would usually follow these comments.

104. On another incident an individual affiliated to the NPP that was terminated from a position in the House approached Perelló-Borrás and tells him that she had just been terminated, that she had worked there for 14 years and is a single mother of two children. Defendant Perelló-Borrás responded “how much? Fourteen? We have not gotten rid of anybody with more than ten years.” He then asks for her information and, while pretending to write it down, told her he was going to help her. Perelló-Borrás, however, failed to help her; nothing happened.

105. In a separate incident, one of the Plaintiffs in this case saw Perelló-Borrás – who at the moment was with González-Calderón – and approached him to tell him that she was fired from the House of Representatives. He asked the Plaintiff for her contact information and asked González-Calderón to take note. Immediately, Perelló-Borrás asked the Plaintiff when she started working at the House of Representatives. When the Plaintiff answered she started working on July 2009, Perelló-Borrás said “Oh!” realizing that she started under an NPP administration.

106. The already highly charged political atmosphere in Plaintiffs’ different work areas became increasingly hostile in the weeks following the swearing in of the new House of Representative administration, and Perelló-Borrás as Speaker of the House of Representatives.

107. In fact, on the date of the swearing-in of the newly elected PDP-affiliated Governor of Puerto Rico, which took place in the Capitol Building, PDP-affiliated employees proudly wore and displayed the colors of the PDP.

108. All Defendants and other employees affiliated with the PDP saw Plaintiffs not wearing PDP colors. Defendants and other House of Representative employees of the PDP associated those who did not wear the colors of the PDP with a political party other than the PDP. Eventually, such employees became targets of political discrimination and retaliation.

109. After the General Election of 2012, PDP-affiliated employees were celebrating and obviously happy and cheerful, while NPP-affiliated employees were not. Individuals who were not celebrating the victory of the PDP in the General Election or who were not happy and cheerful, such as Plaintiffs, were perceived by PDP affiliated employees, including by all Defendants, as being affiliated with a party different than the PDP; including by all Defendants who continuously roamed throughout the House of Representative, including Plaintiffs' work areas, and saw that Plaintiffs were not celebrating, but were rather discouraged and frustrated.

110. After the elections, the employees known to be PDP supporters were celebrating the PDP victory in the work areas. It went to the extreme that, on or about December 31, 2012, when the first group of plaintiffs' appointments was to expire, some PDP employees brought hors d'oeuvres and were openly celebrating Plaintiff's exit from the House of Representatives.

111. In another incident, some weeks after the elections, two (2) employees came to work wearing jackets with the campaign logo for co-Defendant Perelló-Borrás. They were not reprimanded for such conduct even though it is against the law and regulations to wear political propaganda in work areas.

112. In furtherance of the politically discriminatory scheme and consistent with their desire to discriminate and retaliate against the Plaintiffs and other employees affiliated with the NPP, Defendants stood idly by and took no action to stop such comments or discipline the PDP affiliated employees and/or supervisors who undertook politically motivated actions, harassment and mistreatment against the Plaintiffs despite being well aware of such conduct. Rather, Defendants allowed them to continue, promoted these, condoned them and/or authorized them with the purpose of discriminating and/or retaliating against employees such as Plaintiffs

because of their political affiliation, participation and beliefs with regards to a political party other than the PDP.

113. In fact, co-Defendant Perelló-Borrás spent thousands of taxpayer funds remodeling his Presidential Office with red and white furniture, even purchasing and decorating a red and white Christmas tree.

114. On one specific occasion in or about mid-December, 2012, an individual known to Plaintiffs was in the hall near the Human Resources Office of the Office of the Superintendent of the Capitol Building, and saw Perelló-Borrás, talking to a group of people. By then, it was well known that in a few weeks Perelló-Borrás would be the next Speaker of the House.

115. The individual could hear Perelló-Borrás openly state to the persons he was with that “I am not going to rest until I get rid of all the son of the bitches NPP’ers in the Capitol” (“*no voy a descansar hasta que bote a todos los hijos de puta PNP’s del Capitolio*”).

116. But this is not the only incident that shows Perelló-Borrás’s direct and indirect participation, involvement, intent, motivation and animus in politically motivated adverse employment actions.

117. It was well-known that Perelló-Borrás openly stated on various occasions during times and in places relevant and material to this action that: the budget of the House was “now for us”; he was going to “clean house”; no NPP was going to remain working there and he was going to “get rid of all of the NPP’ers”. Perelló-Borrás made these statements and other variances of the same on numerous occasions relevant and material to this action.

118. On numerous occasions during times relevant and material hereto, the Defendants also made disparaging political remarks against NPP affiliated individuals and the prior NPP administration.

119. In one occasion, the Deputy Director of the Property Office – whose last name is Bibiloni – told one of the Plaintiffs in this case that he was going to be fired because he was “burned” – meaning identified – with the NPP.

120. In fact, the Director of the Property Office, Roberto Santiago, told that same Plaintiff that he was an excellent employee but he could do nothing about his termination because the Plaintiff was a “trust” employee of the NPP administration.

121. On a separate incident, Bibiloni told another Plaintiff in this case that she was protected by former Speaker Jenniffer González, but that she was going out nonetheless.

122. Other Deputy Director, this time from Human Resources, told one of the Plaintiffs when the Plaintiff went to that office to request her termination letter that now they were going to know what the people that were fired under Law 7³ went through.

123. During the 2012 campaign, Perelló-Borrás and the PDP Candidate for Representative in the Naguabo area were visiting the ward and stopped in the house of one of the Plaintiffs in this action. The Plaintiff went out to greet the candidate of the area, because they knew each other. The photographer from the Perelló-Borrás tried to take a picture of the three, but the Plaintiff rejected the photo and told Perelló-Borrás that he was an NPP employee of the House of Representatives. Perelló-Borrás told the Plaintiff to think about it, because “that picture could save his job”. The Plaintiff reiterated his refusal to be photographed with Perelló-Borrás.

124. Defendants decided to further punish the Plaintiffs’ because of their exercise of their First Amendment rights and their engagement in First Amendment protected activity. Defendants proceeded to systematically purge the House of Representatives of NPP affiliated employees and fired, terminated, and/or determined not to renew Plaintiffs term appointments,

³ Making reference to Law 9 of 2009, approved during the Furtuño-Burset term as Governor, entitled “Special Law Declaring a State of Fiscal Emergency and Establishing a Comprehensive Fiscal Stabilization Plan to Salvage the Credit of Puerto Rico”

or to hire, rehire or recall them upon the expiration of their appointments and their request to be rehired, simply because of Plaintiffs' political affiliation, participation, activism and beliefs on behalf of a political party other than the PDP and their political involvement on behalf of candidates not affiliated with the PDP.

Politically Motivated Personnel Transactions in the House of Representatives

125. In accordance with the Constitution of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, the newly elected members of the House of Representatives were sworn-in on January 2, 2013.

126. Pursuant to Section 3.4 of the Regulation of the Puerto Rico House of Representatives, the Secretary of said Legislative body – Mr. Carlos Fajardo-Verdejo – assumed the position of Speaker of the House of Representatives on an interim basis (until Perelló-Borrás' formal swear-in on the first day of the legislative session). However, Perelló-Borrás exercised full authority over all House of Representatives administrative matters, including hiring and firing of employees, at all times relevant and material herein, either directly or through his transition committee.

127. Plaintiffs' appointments were discussed during the Transition Committee hearings. Members of the incoming committee asked when the appointments would expire, while members of the outgoing committee requested the incoming members to identify the persons they wanted to stay in order to start the reappointment process. Mr. William Díaz-Natal, who was a member of the incoming committee and later became co-Defendant Perelló-Borrás' Chief of Staff, stated that "this is an issue we will take to the Speaker and once we have his instructions we will communicate with [the outgoing committee]".

128. Accordingly, on December 27, 2012, co-defendant González-Calderón – acting as a representative of Perelló-Borrás' Transition Committee – sent a letter to Mr. Oriol Campos-

Hernández – then Administrator of the House of Representatives – instructing him as to the House of Representative employees whose appointments would be renewed for thirty (30) additional days, effective from January 1, 2013 to January 31, 2013. The letter also instructed Mr. Campos-Hernández to notify the employees included in such lists of the extension of their appointments.

129. On December 28, 2012, Mr. Campos-Hernández wrote a response letter to co-Defendant González-Calderón asking who would be signing the extensions and the new appointments.

130. On December 31, 2012, co-Defendant González-Calderón answered Mr. Campos-Hernández's letter stating that he – Mr. Campos-Hernández – would be the one signing the extensions of the appointments for thirty (30) additional days.

131. Following the instructions given by co-Defendant González-Calderón, Mr. Campos-Hernández signed letters to all the employees, whose names were included in the lists provided by the latter, extending their appointments until January 31, 2013.

132. For those employees whose appointments were not to be extended, as instructed by co-Defendant González-Calderón to Mr. Campos-Hernández, their respective appointments expired on December 31, 2012 and were not renewed after January 2, 2013. This is the case of Plaintiffs Malavé-Vargas, Pérez-Borroto, Arroyo-Molina, Pagán Serrano, Ruiz-Rodríguez, Rodríguez-León, Sánchez-Ríos, De Santiago-Moreno, Fernández-Flores, Serrano-Maldonado, Figueroa-Santana, Tirado-Claudio, Morales-León, Pérez-Betancourt, Suárez, González-Rolón, De La Cruz-Sánchez, Acabá-Vázquez, Santiago-Calderón, and Delgado-Pedrogo.

133. There were two employees that originally did not receive letter extending their appointments, to wit Plaintiffs Tossas-Cordero and Rodríguez-Avilés. At the time, their supervisor requested a brief extension of their appointments because she needed their services.

They received an extension until January 15, 2013, but their appointments were not extended further.

134. As early as January 2, 2013, co-Defendant González-Calderón requested Carlos Fajardo-Verdejo to delegate unto him the authorization to sign each and every appointment performed in the House of Representatives from that date on. After confirming that those were the instructions of co-Defendant Perelló-Borrás, Mr. Fajardo-Verdejo signed a letter authorizing the delegation.

135. Co-Defendant González-Calderón made immediate use of the delegation he received approving close to fifty (50) new appointments between January 2, 2013 and January 14, 2013.

136. Perelló-Borrás and the new PDP representatives were sworn in on January 2, 2013, and Perelló-Borrás assumed the Speakership of the House of Representatives on January 14, 2013. Perelló-Borrás was also a duly elected representative before said date, and all other co-defendants worked in the House of Representatives and/or represented codefendant Perelló-Borrás in his Transition Committee.

137. On January 31, 2013, many of the employees whose appointments were extended on December 31, 2012, were notified through letters signed by co-defendant González-Calderón that their appointments ended and were not going to be renewed. Such is the case of Plaintiffs Torres-Cruz, Seijo-Rivera, Torrellas-Díaz, Torres-Morales, Valentín Santiago, Ortiz-Perea, Garay-García, Pillot-Martínez, Rivera-Rullán, Rivera-Portela, Fontanilla-Espinal, González-Colón, and Santiago-Rodríguez.

138. There was a Plaintiff – Ramírez-Díaz – that was receiving treatment while resting in the Workers Compensation Fund by January 31, 2013. She returned to work on February 5, 2013. As soon as she returned to work, she received her termination letter, effective the same day.

139. Several supervisors handed out termination letters, informing NPP-affiliated individuals that their contracts were not going to be renewed. These supervisors specifically implicated Defendant Perelló-Borrás by indicating that this was Perelló-Borrás' wishes, and that he needed Plaintiff's positions to accommodate those who had helped him and the PDP during the political campaign.

140. When plaintiff's supervisors gave them their termination letters and informed them that their appointments were not going to be renewed, some of them expressed that they were not consulted when such determination was taken and/or that plaintiff's work performance was not the reason for their termination.

141. In fact, several of the supervisors stated that the determination was taken by the "new administration" and that "it was not in their hands".

142. Despite the fact that Plaintiffs appointments were not renewed under instructions and/or by way of a letter signed by co-defendant González-Calderón, acting either as representative of Perelló-Borrás' Transition Committee or as Administrator of the House of Representatives, Perelló-Borrás is the nominating authority in the House of Representatives and approves, condones or disapproves—if not directly executes—all personnel decisions, including the decision to terminate Plaintiffs for political reasons. Put differently, co-Defendant González-Calderón acted as such because Perelló-Borrás so required or authorized it; Perelló-Borrás had ordered the mass firings of NPP affiliated individuals such as Plaintiffs and/or he had set in motion a series of events which he knew would culminate in mass firings.

143. Perelló-Borrás and the other co-Defendants either personally participated in the underlying terminations, or directed other co-Defendants and other House of Representatives employees to terminate as many NPP employees as possible. That is, Perelló-Borrás – and other

co-Defendants – personally directed, condoned and/or approved Plaintiffs’ terminations simply because of their political affiliations and/or set forth a series of events with the full knowledge and intent that these would result in political discrimination.

144. Defendants participated in the politically motivated non-renewals by, *inter alia*, directing, planning, ordering, executing, authorizing, condoning, encouraging, promoting and/or executing the non-renewals, failures to hire, rehire or recall, and harassment, and by otherwise participating in acts leading to such adverse employment actions.

145. The only reason for Plaintiffs’ terminations was their political affiliations. As evinced by their words and actions, Perelló-Borrás and other co-Defendants were determined to clear the House of Representatives of NPP-affiliated employees for various reasons: to substitute them with PDP workers, for associating them with the NPP after a contentious election, and/or in retaliation for the exercise of their right to vote for and being loyal to an opposing political party.

146. The discriminatory scheme devised by the Defendants continued to unfold when shortly after Defendants terminated and/or failed to renew Plaintiffs term appointments, or rehire or recall them, Defendants replaced or substituted Plaintiffs in their positions, duties and functions with loyal PDP-affiliated individuals, many of whom had actively participated during the 2012 electoral campaign in favor of the PDP. Upon information and belief, none of these individuals worked in the House of Representatives by December of 2012. This evinces that Plaintiffs’ duties were needed for the proper operation of the House of Representatives’ affairs, that Defendants were aware of Plaintiff’s political affiliations, and that the reason behind Plaintiffs’ terminations was political discrimination.

147. These individuals substituted Plaintiffs in their positions, duties and functions shortly after Defendants terminated Plaintiffs and/or refused to renew Plaintiffs' appointments or hire, rehire or recall Plaintiffs.

148. The employees hired to substitute Plaintiffs were notable for their affiliation with the PDP, consisting of people who had served as electoral polling officers for the PDP and/or who were PDP militants.

149. Before he was appointed as Administrator of the House of Representatives, co-Defendant Fuentes-Serrano was interviewing new personnel for all sorts of administrative positions. Upon and information and belief, Co-Defendant Fuentes-Serrano interviewed individuals affiliated with the PDP who would eventually fill Plaintiff's former positions.

150. No credible economic or cost savings rationale can be offered by Defendants for firing the Plaintiffs nor can any valid reorganizational claim be asserted because the Plaintiffs were substituted almost immediately and systematically with new, PDP-affiliated employees who then proceeded to perform the same duties and functions that Plaintiffs had competently handled before.

151. The discriminatory and retaliatory actions mentioned above – i.e. the termination and/or non-renewal of Plaintiffs' employment with the House of Representatives and/or the failures to hire, rehire and recall Plaintiffs – was because of the Plaintiffs' political affiliation, their exercise of First Amendment rights, and their engagement in activities protected by the First Amendment – including the right to vote, the right to speak out on and participate in political and public policy matters and/or in political campaigns on behalf of individual candidates who share their political beliefs or affiliations, and the right of political association.

152. Defendants not only acted individually to deprive Plaintiffs of their Federal Constitutional rights, but they also acted in a joint and conspiratorial manner. Each Defendant also acted in furtherance of the pattern, practice and plan to terminate individuals affiliated or perceived as being affiliated with the NPP, and to substitute them with PDP-affiliated individuals, including Plaintiffs.

153. Defendants were directly involved in the refusal to renew Plaintiffs' appointments, including by being the effective decision maker, executor, or a willful participant absent whom the adverse employment actions giving rise to this Complaint would not have occurred. All Defendants executed their actions while motivated by the Plaintiffs' adverse political beliefs and because of their understanding the Plaintiffs were of competing political persuasions.

154. The above facts show that the Defendants', malicious, discriminatory, and retaliatory adverse employment actions mentioned above were carried out with malice, and with reckless disregard to Plaintiffs' constitutional rights and shock the conscience.

155. In carrying out their actions the Defendants intentionally disregarded longstanding and consistent case law from virtually every court in the United States, which repeatedly and consistently proscribe politically-motivated adverse employment actions against government employees who hold positions for which political affiliation is not an appropriate requirement, such as those the Plaintiffs held.

156. The discriminatory and retaliatory political motive behind the adverse employment actions at issue may be also discerned by Defendants' hiring and firing practices.

157. With their actions, Defendants deprived these Plaintiffs – who were affiliated with or who were perceived by the Defendants as being affiliated with the NPP - of a substantial portion of the funds with which they sustained themselves and/or their families, simply because they

avored and supported (or were perceived as favoring and supporting) a political party and candidates of a political party which were in opposition to the PDP and PDP candidates for office.

SPECIFIC ALLEGATIONS AS TO ALL PLAINTIFFS⁴

Plaintiff Solbee Malavé-Vargas

158. Plaintiff Solbee Malavé-Vargas ("Malavé-Vargas") is of legal age, a resident of Puerto Rico and a citizen of the United States of America.

159. Malavé-Vargas began working for the House of Representatives in January 2005. Her last appointment at the House of Representatives was as an Information Technician Supervisor.

160. Party affiliation is not an appropriate requirement for Malavé-Vargas' position. At all times relevant and material hereto Malavé-Vargas was a public employee whose position was not a public-policy-making position, or one that required her to perform public-policy functions. Malavé-Vargas did not have access to politically sensitive information or confidential information related to public policy matters.

161. Malavé-Vargas engaged in functions of a routine nature that required manual competence and efficient performance, not political affiliation.

162. Malavé-Vargas' principal duties were to coordinate, assign duties, supervise and evaluate the personnel working at the technical support division; to assure compliance with a maintenance program for the computers and related equipment to keep the working properly; to supervise the installation, configuration and maintenance of the products used to provide information and communication services; to analyze and construe codes, messages and alarms to detect failures and problems in the computers and equipment; to review the computer and equipment inventory

⁴ To avoid repetition, all previous allegations referring to Plaintiffs, unless individually specified, are incorporated as if set forth in full herein to apply to each Plaintiff.

in light of changes made, everyday administrative duties like keeping track of the attendance, filing, drafting letters and reports, etc.

163. For the reasons set forth in this Complaint, all Defendants were aware that Malavé-Vargas is an active member of the NPP. It was of common knowledge in the workplace of the House of Representatives (and by Defendants themselves) that Malavé-Vargas avidly supported the NPP during the 2012 elections.

164. Moreover, Defendants also knew or assumed that Malavé-Vargas had voted for the NPP and candidates of the NPP for the House of Representatives in the 2012 General Elections.

165. Malavé-Vargas actively participated in NPP activities and with NPP candidates.

166. Malavé-Vargas worked as electoral polling officer and was a member of the advance team for former Speaker Jenniffer González and in 2004 of former Governor Pedro Rosselló.

167. Like some co-workers and the other Plaintiffs, Malavé-Vargas was seen in photos and videos doing her political work during the 2012 electoral campaign in several media including non-private Facebook accounts.

168. Defendants knew all these facts, as well as others provided throughout this Complaint in connection with the political affiliation, involvement and activism of Malavé-Vargas.

169. Defendants dismissed⁵ Malavé-Vargas from her job without evaluating her job performance and efficiency.

170. At no time prior to her dismissal did the Defendants discipline Malavé-Vargas or issue a reprimand related to the performance of her duties.

171. Defendants hired someone to substitute for Malavé-Vargas after her dismissal. That person is a member and/or supporter of the PDP.

⁵ The term dismissal, as used herein, shall be read to include termination, non-renewal of appointment, and failure to hire, rehire or recall.

172. The reason for Malavé-Vargas' dismissal was because the Defendants knew that she belonged to – or otherwise perceived her to be a member of and/or affiliated to – a political party other than the PDP, specifically the NPP.

173. As a result of this dismissal, Defendants have deprived Malavé-Vargas of the income and benefits by which she sustained herself and her family; have subjected her to personal pain and suffering; and have punished her for the exercise of her civil rights by terminating her employment – all because she is not a member of or affiliated to the PDP, and is perceived by Defendants as not having voted for the PDP or its candidates.

Plaintiff Jorge Pérez-Borroto

174. Plaintiff Jorge Pérez-Borroto ("Pérez-Borroto") is of legal age, a resident of Puerto Rico and a citizen of the United States of America.

175. Feliz-Pons started working for the House of Representatives in January 2009. His last appointment at the House of Representatives was as an Information Technician.

176. Party affiliation is not an appropriate requirement for Pérez-Borroto's position. At all times relevant and material hereto Pérez-Borroto was a public employee whose position was not a public-policy-making position, or one that required him to perform public-policy functions. Pérez-Borroto did not have access to politically sensitive information or confidential information related to public policy matters.

177. Pérez-Borroto engaged in functions of a routine nature that required manual competence and efficient performance, not political affiliation.

178. Pérez-Borroto's principal duties were to provide technical support, to install hardware, software and peripherals, to solve issues the users may have with their computers, etc.

179. For the reasons set forth in this Complaint, all Defendants were aware that Pérez-Borroto is an active member of the NPP. It was of common knowledge in the workplace of the House of Representatives (and by Defendants themselves) that Pérez-Borroto avidly supported the NPP during the 2012 elections.

180. Moreover, Defendants also knew or assumed that Pérez-Borroto had voted for the NPP and candidates of the NPP for the House of Representatives in the 2012 General Elections.

181. Pérez-Borroto actively participated in NPP activities and with NPP candidates.

182. Pérez-Borroto was a member of the advance team for former Speaker Jenniffer González and drove one of her campaign vehicles.

183. In the past, Pérez-Borroto also worked as polling officer representing the NPP.

184. Like some co-workers and the other Plaintiffs, Pérez-Borroto was seen in photos and videos doing his political work during the 2012 electoral campaign in several media including non-private Facebook accounts.

185. Defendants knew all these facts, as well as others provided throughout this Complaint in connection with the political affiliation, involvement and activism of Pérez-Borroto.

186. Defendants dismissed Pérez-Borroto from his job without evaluating him as to his job performance and efficiency.

187. At no time prior to his dismissal did the Defendants discipline Pérez-Borroto or issue a reprimand related to the performance of his duties.

188. Defendants hired someone to substitute for Pérez-Borroto after his dismissal. That person is a member and/or supporter of the PDP.

189. The reason that Pérez-Borroto was dismissed was because the Defendants knew that he belonged to – or otherwise perceived him to be a member of and/or affiliated to – a political party other than the PDP, specifically the NPP.

190. As a result of this dismissal, Defendants have deprived Pérez-Borroto of the income and benefits by which he sustained himself and his family; have subjected him to personal pain and suffering; and have punished him for the exercise of his civil rights by terminating his employment – all because he is not a member of or affiliated to the PDP, and is perceived by Defendants as not having voted for the PDP or its candidates.

Plaintiff Margarita Arroyo-Molina

191. Plaintiff Margarita Arroyo-Molina ("Arroyo-Molina") is of legal age, a resident of Puerto Rico and a citizen of the United States of America.

192. Arroyo-Molina started working for the House of Representatives in September 2005. Her last appointment at the House of Representatives was as an Administrative Assistant performing duties as Employee Help Program (PAE, for its Spanish acronym) Coordinator.

193. Party affiliation is not an appropriate requirement for Arroyo-Molina's position. At all times relevant and material hereto Arroyo-Molina was a public employee whose position was not a public-policy-making position, or one that required him to perform public-policy functions. Arroyo-Molina did not have access to politically sensitive information or confidential information related to public policy matters.

194. Arroyo-Molina engaged in functions of a routine nature that required manual competence and efficient performance, not political affiliation.

195. Arroyo-Molina's principal duties were to prepare referrals, reports and documents regarding the drug screening test performed to employees of the House of Representatives, as

well as review the invoices submitted by the suppliers regarding that service; to coordinate services for people with disabilities, etc.

196. For the reasons set forth in this Complaint, all Defendants were aware that Arroyo-Molina is an active member of the NPP. It was of common knowledge in the workplace of the House of Representatives (and by Defendants themselves) that Arroyo-Molina avidly supported the NPP during the 2012 elections.

197. Moreover, Defendants also knew or assumed that Arroyo-Molina had voted for the NPP and candidates of the NPP for the House of Representatives in the 2012 General Elections.

198. Arroyo-Molina actively participated in NPP activities and with NPP candidates.

199. Arroyo-Molina was a member of the Advance Team for former Speaker of the House of Representatives, Jenniffer González-Colón, including driving the campaign vehicle.

200. Arroyo-Molina also worked as polling officer and contributed financially to the political campaign of NPP candidates.

201. Like some co-workers and the other Plaintiffs, Arroyo-Molina was seen in photos and videos doing her political work during the 2012 electoral campaign in several media including non-private Facebook accounts.

202. Defendants knew all these facts, as well as others provided throughout this Complaint in connection with the political affiliation, involvement and activism of Arroyo-Molina.

203. Defendants dismissed Arroyo-Molina from his job without evaluating her as to her job performance and efficiency.

204. At no time prior to her dismissal did the Defendants discipline Arroyo-Molina or issue a reprimand related to the performance of her duties.

205. Defendants hired someone to substitute for Arroyo-Molina after her dismissal. That person is a member and/or supporter of the PDP.

206. The reason that Arroyo-Molina was dismissed was because the Defendants knew that she belonged to – or otherwise perceived her to be a member of and/or affiliated to – a political party other than the PDP, specifically the NPP.

207. As a result of this dismissal, Defendants have deprived Arroyo-Molina of the income and benefits by which she sustained herself and her family; have subjected her to personal pain and suffering; and have punished her for the exercise of her civil rights by terminating her employment – all because she is not a member of or affiliated to the PDP, and is perceived by Defendants as not having voted for the PDP or its candidates.

Plaintiff Nilsa Pagán-Serrano

208. Plaintiff Nilsa Pagán-Serrano ("Pagán-Serrano") is of legal age, a resident of Puerto Rico and a citizen of the United States of America.

209. Pagán-Serrano started working for the House of Representatives in June 2009. Her last appointment at the House of Representatives was as an Aide at the Training Division.

210. Party affiliation is not an appropriate requirement for Pagán-Serrano's position. At all times relevant and material hereto Pagán-Serrano was a public employee whose position was not a public-policy-making position, or one that required her to perform public-policy functions. Pagán-Serrano did not have access to politically sensitive information or confidential information related to public policy matters.

211. Pagán-Serrano engaged in functions of a routine nature that required manual competence and efficient performance, not political affiliation.

212. Resto-Colón's principal duties were to answer the phone, send communications regarding training sessions, file, review documents, etc.

213. For the reasons set forth in this Complaint, all Defendants were aware that Pagán-Serrano is an active member of the NPP. It was of common knowledge in the workplace of the House of Representatives (and by Defendants themselves) that Pagán-Serrano avidly supported the NPP during the 2012 elections.

214. Moreover, Defendants also knew or assumed that Pagán-Serrano had voted for the NPP and candidates of the NPP for the House of Representatives in the 2012 General Elections.

215. Pagán-Serrano actively participated in NPP activities and with NPP candidates.

216. Defendants knew all these facts, as well as others provided throughout this Complaint in connection with the political affiliation, involvement and activism of Pagán-Serrano.

217. Defendants dismissed Pagán-Serrano from her job without evaluating her job performance and efficiency.

218. At no time prior to her dismissal did the Defendants discipline Pagán-Serrano or issue a reprimand related to the performance of her duties.

219. Defendants hired someone to substitute for Pagán-Serrano after her dismissal. That person is a member and/or supporter of the PDP.

220. The reason that Pagán-Serrano was dismissed was because the Defendants knew that she belonged to – or otherwise perceived her to be a member of and/or affiliated to – a political party other than the PDP, specifically the NPP.

221. As a result of this dismissal, Defendants have deprived Pagán-Serrano of the income and benefits by which she sustained herself and her family; have subjected her to personal pain and suffering; and have punished her for the exercise of her civil rights by terminating her

employment – all because she is not a member of or affiliated to the PDP, and is perceived by Defendants as not having voted for the PDP or its candidates.

Plaintiff Enid Ruiz-Rodríguez

222. Plaintiff Enid Ruiz-Rodríguez ("Ruiz-Rodríguez") is of legal age, a resident of Puerto Rico and a citizen of the United States of America.

223. Ruiz-Rodríguez started working for the House of Representatives in July 2009. Her last appointment at the House of Representatives was as a Human Resources Technician.

224. Party affiliation is not an appropriate requirement for Ruiz-Rodríguez' position. At all times relevant and material hereto Ruiz-Rodríguez was a public employee whose position was not a public-policy-making position, or one that required her to perform public-policy functions. Ruiz-Rodríguez did not have access to politically sensitive information or confidential information related to public policy matters.

225. Ruiz-Rodríguez engaged in functions of a routine nature that required manual competence and efficient performance, not political affiliation.

226. Ruiz-Rodríguez' principal duties were to prepare and coordinate the annual training program for the employees; to organize the workshops and trainings provided by the Training Division; to coordinate the external resources and review the needs for each training; to review the hours included in the certifications of professional development for each employee; to make sure that all trainings and workshops comply with the applicable laws and regulations; etc.

227. For the reasons set forth in this Complaint, all Defendants were aware that Ruiz-Rodríguez is an active member of the NPP. It was of common knowledge in the workplace of the House of Representatives (and by Defendants themselves) that Ruiz-Rodríguez avidly supported the NPP during the 2012 elections.

228. Moreover, Defendants also knew or assumed that Ruiz-Rodríguez had voted for the NPP and candidates of the NPP for the House of Representatives in the 2012 General Elections.

229. Ruiz-Rodríguez actively participated in NPP activities and with NPP candidates.

230. Ruiz-Rodríguez was a member of the Advance Team for Former Speaker Jenniffer González.

231. Ruiz-Rodríguez also attended activities sponsored by the NPP Women Organization.

232. Like some co-workers and the other Plaintiffs, Ruiz-Rodríguez was seen in photos and videos doing her political work during the 2012 electoral campaign in several media including non-private Facebook accounts.

233. Defendants knew all these facts, as well as others provided throughout this Complaint in connection with the political affiliation, involvement and activism of Ruiz-Rodríguez.

234. Defendants dismissed Ruiz-Rodríguez from her job without evaluating her job performance and efficiency.

235. Defendants hired someone to substitute for Ruiz-Rodríguez after her dismissal. That person is a member and/or supporter of the PDP.

236. The reason that Ruiz-Rodríguez was dismissed was because the Defendants knew that she belonged to – or otherwise perceived her to be a member of and/or affiliated to – a political party other than the PDP, specifically the NPP.

237. As a result of this dismissal, Defendants have deprived Ruiz-Rodríguez of the income and benefits by which she sustained herself and her family; have subjected her to personal pain and suffering; and have punished her for the exercise of her civil rights by terminating her employment – all because she is not a member of or affiliated to the PDP, and is perceived by Defendants as not having voted for the PDP or its candidates.

Plaintiff Marielis Rodríguez-León

238. Plaintiff Marielis Rodríguez-León ("Rodríguez-León") is of legal age, a resident of Puerto Rico and a citizen of the United States of America.

239. Rodríguez-León started working for the House of Representatives in February 2009. Her last appointment at the House of Representatives was as a Telephone Switchboard Operator.

240. Party affiliation is not an appropriate requirement for Rodríguez-León' position. At all times relevant and material hereto Rodríguez-León was a public employee whose position was not a public-policy-making position, or one that required him to perform public-policy functions. Rodríguez-León did not have access to politically sensitive information or confidential information related to public policy matters.

241. Rodríguez-León engaged in functions of a routine nature that required manual competence and efficient performance, not political affiliation.

242. Rodríguez-León' principal duties were to operate the telephone switchboard, and answer calls received through the House of Representatives main phone number and transfer these calls to the appropriate office.

243. For the reasons set forth in this Complaint, all Defendants were aware that Rodríguez-León is an active member of the NPP. It was of common knowledge in the workplace of the House of Representatives (and by Defendants themselves) that Rodríguez-León avidly supported the NPP during the 2012 elections.

244. Moreover, Defendants also knew or assumed that Rodríguez-León had voted for the NPP and candidates of the NPP for the House of Representatives in the 2012 General Elections.

245. Rodríguez-León actively participated in NPP activities and with NPP candidates.

246. Rodríguez-León was a member of the advance team for former Speaker Jennifer González. She also worked as polling officer representing the NPP.

247. Like some co-workers and the other Plaintiffs, Rodríguez-León was seen in photos and videos doing her political work during the 2012 electoral campaign in several media including non-private Facebook accounts.

248. Defendants knew all these facts, as well as others provided throughout this Complaint in connection with the political affiliation, involvement and activism of Rodríguez-León.

249. Defendants dismissed Rodríguez-León from her job without evaluating her as to her job performance and efficiency.

250. At no time prior to her dismissal did the Defendants discipline Rodríguez-León or issue a reprimand related to the performance of her duties.

251. Defendants hired someone to substitute for Rodríguez-León after her dismissal. That person is a member and/or supporter of the PDP.

252. The reason that Rodríguez-León was dismissed was because the Defendants knew that she belonged to – or otherwise perceived him to be a member of and/or affiliated to – a political party other than the PDP, specifically the NPP.

253. As a result of this dismissal, Defendants have deprived Rodríguez-León of the income and benefits by which she sustained herself and her family; have subjected her to personal pain and suffering; and have punished her for the exercise of her civil rights by terminating her employment – all because she is not a member of or affiliated to the PDP, and is perceived by Defendants as not having voted for the PDP or its candidates.

Plaintiff Gabriel Sánchez-Ríos

254. Plaintiff Gabriel Sánchez-Ríos ("Sánchez-Ríos") is of legal age, a resident of Puerto Rico and a citizen of the United States of America.

255. Sánchez-Ríos started working for the House of Representatives in January 2009. His last appointment at the House of Representatives was as a Legislative Technician.

256. Party affiliation is not an appropriate requirement for Sánchez-Ríos' position. At all times relevant and material hereto Sánchez-Ríos was a public employee whose position was not a public-policy-making position, or one that required her to perform public-policy functions. Sánchez-Ríos did not have access to politically sensitive information or confidential information related to public policy matters.

257. Sánchez-Ríos engaged in functions of a routine nature that required manual competence and efficient performance, not political affiliation.

258. Sánchez-Ríos' principal duties were to transcribe and correct the Daily Record; receive and help the public find information regarding to the information contained in the Daily Record; compile the decisions made by the President to incorporate to a book of such decisions, etc.

259. For the reasons set forth in this Complaint, all Defendants were aware that Sánchez-Ríos is an active member of the NPP. It was of common knowledge in the workplace of the House of Representatives (and by Defendants themselves) that Sánchez-Ríos avidly supported the NPP during the 2012 elections.

260. Moreover, Defendants also knew or assumed that Sánchez-Ríos had voted for the NPP and candidates of the NPP for the House of Representatives in the 2012 General Elections.

261. Sánchez-Ríos actively participated in NPP activities and with NPP candidates.

262. Sánchez-Ríos was a member of the Advance Team for former Speaker of the House of Representatives, Jenniffer González-Colón.

263. Sánchez-Ríos was also the Field Operations Director and the President of the Republican Party in San Lorenzo and a delegate for the party.

264. Sánchez-Ríos received an administrative detailed (“*destaque*”) to work at the State Elections Commission during the 2012 general elections representing the NPP. This administrative detail is performed during working hours and is arranged between the House of Representatives and the State Elections Commission. Evidence of this administrative detail should be part of her personnel record at the House of Representatives.

265. Like some co-workers and the other Plaintiffs, Sánchez-Ríos was seen in photos and videos doing his political work during the 2012 electoral campaign in several media including non-private Facebook accounts.

266. Defendants knew all these facts, as well as others provided throughout this Complaint in connection with the political affiliation, involvement and activism of Sánchez-Ríos.

267. Defendants dismissed Sánchez-Ríos from his job without evaluating his job performance and efficiency.

268. At no time prior to his dismissal did the Defendants discipline Sánchez-Ríos or issue a reprimand related to the performance of his duties.

269. Defendants hired someone to substitute for Sánchez-Ríos after his dismissal. That person is a member and/or supporter of the PDP.

270. The reason that Sánchez-Ríos was dismissed was because the Defendants knew that he belonged to – or otherwise perceived him to be a member of and/or affiliated to – a political party other than the PDP, specifically the NPP.

271. As a result of this dismissal, Defendants have deprived Sánchez-Ríos of the income and benefits by which he sustained himself and his family; have subjected him to personal pain and suffering; and have punished him for the exercise of his civil rights by terminating his employment – all because he is not a member of or affiliated to the PDP, and is perceived by Defendants as not having voted for the PDP or its candidates.

Plaintiff Jonathan De Santiago-Moreno

272. Plaintiff Jonathan De Santiago-Moreno ("Santiago-Moreno") is of legal age, a resident of Puerto Rico and a citizen of the United States of America.

273. Santiago-Moreno started working for the House of Representatives in July 2009. His last appointment at the House of Representatives was as an Accounting Technician.

274. Party affiliation is not an appropriate requirement for Santiago-Moreno's position. At all times relevant and material hereto Santiago-Moreno was a public employee whose position was not a public-policy-making position, or one that required her to perform public-policy functions. Santiago-Moreno did not have access to politically sensitive information or confidential information related to public policy matters.

275. Santiago-Moreno engaged in functions of a routine nature that required manual competence and efficient performance, not political affiliation.

276. Santiago-Moreno's principal duties were to determine the weekly per diem payment for each representative, including any withholding, the contribution to the Coffee Parlor, etc.; to determine the monthly stipend payable to each representative and to register the obligation in the system; to prepare the interagency forms to process the payments to other governmental agencies; to review, process and register in the system the applications for official trips; to

prepare the invoices in the system for the collection of improper payroll payments, personal phone calls, etc.

277. For the reasons set forth in this Complaint, all Defendants were aware that Santiago-Moreno is an active member of the NPP. It was of common knowledge in the workplace of the House of Representatives (and by Defendants themselves) that Santiago-Moreno avidly supported the NPP during the 2012 elections.

278. Moreover, Defendants also knew or assumed that Santiago-Moreno had voted for the NPP and candidates of the NPP for the House of Representatives in the 2012 General Elections.

279. Santiago-Moreno actively participated in NPP activities and with NPP candidates.

280. Defendants knew all these facts, as well as others provided throughout this Complaint in connection with the political affiliation, involvement and activism of Santiago-Moreno.

281. Defendants dismissed Santiago-Moreno from his job without evaluating his job performance and efficiency.

282. At no time prior to his dismissal did the Defendants discipline Santiago-Moreno or issue a reprimand related to the performance of his duties.

283. Defendants hired someone to substitute for Santiago-Moreno after his dismissal. That person is a member and/or supporter of the PDP.

284. The reason that Santiago-Moreno was dismissed was because the Defendants knew that he belonged to – or otherwise perceived him to be a member of and/or affiliated to – a political party other than the PDP, specifically the NPP.

285. As a result of this dismissal, Defendants have deprived Santiago-Moreno of the income and benefits by which he sustained himself and his family; have subjected him to personal pain and suffering; and have punished him for the exercise of his civil rights by terminating his

employment – all because he is not a member of or affiliated to the PDP, and is perceived by Defendants as not having voted for the PDP or its candidates.

Plaintiff Carlos Fernández-Flores

286. Plaintiff Carlos Fernández-Flores ("Fernández-Flores") is of legal age, a resident of Puerto Rico and a citizen of the United States of America.

287. Fernández-Flores started working for the House of Representatives in October 2007. His last appointment at the House of Representatives was as an Accounting Technician performing duties as Budget Technician.

288. Party affiliation is not an appropriate requirement for Fernández-Flores' position. At all times relevant and material hereto Fernández-Flores was a public employee whose position was not a public-policy-making position, or one that required her to perform public-policy functions. Fernández-Flores did not have access to politically sensitive information or confidential information related to public policy matters.

289. Fernández-Flores engaged in functions of a routine nature that required manual competence and efficient performance, not political affiliation.

290. Fernández-Flores's principal duties were to follow-up on the budget for each representative, draft monthly expense reports, input budget data to the system, approve funding for purchase orders in accordance with the available budget for each office or dependency, etc.

291. For the reasons set forth in this Complaint, all Defendants were aware that Fernández-Flores is an active member of the NPP. It was of common knowledge in the workplace of the House of Representatives (and by Defendants themselves) that Fernández-Flores avidly supported the NPP during the 2012 elections.

292. Moreover, Defendants also knew or assumed that Fernández-Flores had voted for the NPP and candidates of the NPP for the House of Representatives in the 2012 General Elections.

293. Fernández-Flores actively participated in NPP activities and with NPP candidates.

294. Fernández-Flores was a member of the Advance Team for former Speaker of the House of Representatives, Jenniffer González-Colón. He also worked as an NPP electoral polling officer.

295. Defendants knew all these facts, as well as others provided throughout this Complaint in connection with the political affiliation, involvement and activism of Fernández-Flores.

296. Defendants dismissed Fernández-Flores from his job without evaluating his job performance and efficiency.

297. At no time prior to his dismissal did the Defendants discipline Fernández-Flores or issue a reprimand related to the performance of his duties.

298. Defendants hired someone to substitute for Fernández-Flores after his dismissal. That person is a member and/or supporter of the PDP.

299. The reason that Fernández-Flores was dismissed was because the Defendants knew that he belonged to – or otherwise perceived him to be a member of and/or affiliated to – a political party other than the PDP, specifically the NPP.

300. As a result of this dismissal, Defendants have deprived Fernández-Flores of the income and benefits by which he sustained himself and his family; have subjected him to personal pain and suffering; and have punished him for the exercise of his civil rights by terminating his employment – all because he is not a member of or affiliated to the PDP, and is perceived by Defendants as not having voted for the PDP or its candidates.

Plaintiff Blanca Serrano-Maldonado

301. Plaintiff Blanca Serrano-Maldonado ("Serrano-Maldonado") is of legal age, a resident of Puerto Rico and a citizen of the United States of America.

302. Serrano-Maldonado started working for the House of Representatives in April 2008. Her last appointment at the House of Representatives was as an Accounts Payable Technician.

303. Party affiliation is not an appropriate requirement for Serrano-Maldonado's position. At all times relevant and material hereto Serrano-Maldonado was a public employee whose position was not a public-policy-making position, or one that required her to perform public-policy functions. Serrano-Maldonado did not have access to politically sensitive information or confidential information related to public policy matters.

304. Serrano-Maldonado engaged in functions of a routine nature that required manual competence and efficient performance, not political affiliation.

305. Serrano-Maldonado's principal duties were to receive the invoices submitted by the contractors, review them, request amendments when errors were detected, refer them to Pre-Intervention for final processing and payment, etc.

306. For the reasons set forth in this Complaint, all Defendants were aware that Serrano-Maldonado is an active member of the NPP. It was of common knowledge in the workplace of the House of Representatives (and by Defendants themselves) that Serrano-Maldonado avidly supported the NPP during the 2012 elections.

307. Moreover, Defendants also knew or assumed that Serrano-Maldonado had voted for the NPP and candidates of the NPP for the House of Representatives in the 2012 General Elections.

308. Serrano-Maldonado actively participated in NPP activities and with NPP candidates.

309. Serrano-Maldonado worked as a polling officer representing the NPP.

310. Defendants knew all these facts, as well as others provided throughout this Complaint in connection with the political affiliation, involvement and activism of Serrano-Maldonado.

311. Defendants dismissed Serrano-Maldonado from her job without evaluating her job performance and efficiency.

312. At no time prior to her dismissal did the Defendants discipline Serrano-Maldonado or issue a reprimand related to the performance of her duties.

313. Defendants hired someone to substitute for Serrano-Maldonado after her dismissal. That person is a member and/or supporter of the PDP.

314. The reason that Serrano-Maldonado was dismissed was because the Defendants knew that she belonged to – or otherwise perceived her to be a member of and/or affiliated to – a political party other than the PDP, specifically the NPP.

315. As a result of this dismissal, Defendants have deprived Serrano-Maldonado of the income and benefits by which she sustained herself and her family; have subjected her to personal pain and suffering; and have punished her for the exercise of her civil rights by terminating her employment – all because she is not a member of or affiliated to the PDP, and is perceived by Defendants as not having voted for the PDP or its candidates.

Plaintiff Leadette González-Colón

316. Plaintiff Leadette González-Colón ("González-Colón") is of legal age, a resident of Puerto Rico and a citizen of the United States of America.

317. González-Colón started working for the House of Representatives in July 2009. Her last appointment at the House of Representatives was as a Deputy Director.

318. Party affiliation is not an appropriate requirement for González-Colón's position. At all times relevant and material hereto González-Colón was a public employee whose position was

not a public-policy-making position, or one that required her to perform public-policy functions. González-Colón did not have access to politically sensitive information or confidential information related to public policy matters.

319. González-Colón engaged in functions of a routine nature that required manual competence and efficient performance, not political affiliation.

320. González-Colón's principal duties were to supervise the work of the employees in her division when the Director is not present; to provide custody to the supplies and equipment in the office; to interview the individuals that come to the office to receive service and to fill the forms in light of the service requested; to visit the governmental agencies or private corporations to serve as a liaison for the individuals requesting services; to draft monthly reports of actives and closed cases; to make purchase orders and applications for supplies; to visit individuals at their home to provide the help requested in light of their needs; etc.

321. For the reasons set forth in this Complaint, all Defendants were aware that González-Colón is an active member of the NPP. It was of common knowledge in the workplace of the House of Representatives (and by Defendants themselves) that González-Colón avidly supported the NPP during the 2012 elections.

322. Moreover, Defendants also knew or assumed that González-Colón had voted for the NPP and candidates of the NPP for the House of Representatives in the 2012 General Elections.

323. González-Colón actively participated in NPP activities and with NPP candidates.

324. González-Colón was Vice-President of the NPP Youth Organization and Delegate for the Republican Party in 1997.

325. González-Colón was a member of the advance team for former Speaker Jenniffer González and for "Pichi" Torres-Zamora.

326. González-Colón worked as a polling officer in various electoral events representing the NPP.

327. González-Colón received an administrative detailed (“destaque”) to work at the State Elections Commission during the 2012 general elections representing the NPP. This administrative detail is performed during working hours and is arranged between the House of Representatives and the State Elections Commission. Evidence of this administrative detail should be part of her personnel record at the House of Representatives.

328. Like some co-workers and the other Plaintiffs, González-Colón was seen in photos and videos doing her political work during the 2012 electoral campaign in several media including non-private Facebook accounts.

329. Defendants knew all these facts, as well as others provided throughout this Complaint in connection with the political affiliation, involvement and activism of González-Colón.

330. Defendants dismissed González-Colón from her job without evaluating her job performance and efficiency.

331. At no time prior to her dismissal did the Defendants discipline González-Colón or issue a reprimand related to the performance of her duties.

332. Defendants hired someone to substitute for González-Colón after her dismissal. That person is a member and/or supporter of the PDP.

333. The reason that González-Colón was dismissed was because the Defendants knew that she belonged to – or otherwise perceived her to be a member of and/or affiliated to – a political party other than the PDP, specifically the NPP.

334. As a result of this dismissal, Defendants have deprived González-Colón of the income and benefits by which she sustained herself and her family; have subjected her to personal pain

and suffering; and have punished her for the exercise of her civil rights by terminating her employment – all because she is not a member of or affiliated to the PDP, and is perceived by Defendants as not having voted for the PDP or its candidates.

Plaintiff Heriberto Figueroa-Santana

335. Plaintiff Heriberto Figueroa-Santana ("Figueroa-Santana") is of legal age, a resident of Puerto Rico and a citizen of the United States of America.

336. Figueroa-Santana started working for the House of Representatives in March 2010. His last appointment at the House of Representatives was as a Driver.

337. Party affiliation is not an appropriate requirement for Figueroa-Santana's position. At all times relevant and material hereto Figueroa-Santana was a public employee whose position was not a public-policy-making position, or one that required him to perform public-policy functions. Figueroa-Santana did not have access to politically sensitive information or confidential information related to public policy matters.

338. Figueroa-Santana engaged in functions of a routine nature that required manual competence and efficient performance, not political affiliation.

339. Figueroa-Santana's principal duties were to drive the personnel from the Press Office to the radio and TV stations and to any other activity they were providing coverage.

340. For the reasons set forth in this Complaint, all Defendants were aware that Figueroa-Santana is an active member of the NPP. It was of common knowledge in the workplace of the House of Representatives (and by Defendants themselves) that Figueroa-Santana avidly supported the NPP during the 2012 elections.

341. Moreover, Defendants also knew or assumed that Figueroa-Santana had voted for the NPP and candidates of the NPP for the House of Representatives in the 2012 General Elections.

342. Figueroa-Santana actively participated in NPP activities and with NPP candidates.

343. Figueroa-Santana worked as an electoral polling officer representing the NPP.

344. Also, Figueroa-Santana received an administrative detail ("*destaque*") to work at the State Elections Commission during the 2012 general elections representing the NPP. This administrative detail was performed during working hours and was arranged between the House of Representatives and the State Elections Commission. Evidence of this administrative detail should be part of her personnel record at the House of Representatives.

345. Moreover, Figueroa-Santana was the driver of one of the campaign vehicles for former Speaker Jenniffer González reelection campaign.

346. Like some co-workers and the other Plaintiffs, Figueroa-Santana was seen in photos and videos doing his political work during the 2012 electoral campaign in several media including non-private Facebook accounts.

347. Defendants knew all these facts, as well as others provided throughout this Complaint in connection with the political affiliation, involvement and activism of Figueroa-Santana.

348. Defendants dismissed Figueroa-Santana from his job without evaluating him as to his job performance and efficiency.

349. At no time prior to his dismissal did the Defendants discipline Figueroa-Santana or issue a reprimand related to the performance of his duties.

350. Defendants hired someone to substitute for Figueroa-Santana after his dismissal. That person is a member and/or supporter of the PDP.

351. The reason that Figueroa-Santana was dismissed was because the Defendants knew that he belonged to – or otherwise perceived him to be a member of and/or affiliated to – a political party other than the PDP, specifically the NPP.

352. As a result of this dismissal, Defendants have deprived Figueroa-Santana of the income and benefits by which he sustained himself and his family; have subjected him to personal pain and suffering; and have punished him for the exercise of his civil rights by terminating his employment – all because he is not a member of or affiliated to the PDP, and is perceived by Defendants as not having voted for the PDP or its candidates.

Plaintiff Florentín Tirado-Carlo

353. Plaintiff Florentín Tirado-Carlo ("Tirado-Carlo") is of legal age, a resident of Puerto Rico and a citizen of the United States of America.

354. Tirado-Carlo started working for the House of Representatives in May 2009. His last appointment at the House of Representatives was as an Assistant Carpenter (*"Auxiliar de Ebanista"*).

355. Party affiliation is not an appropriate requirement for Tirado-Carlo's position. At all times relevant and material hereto Tirado-Carlo was a public employee whose position was not a public-policy-making position, or one that required her to perform public-policy functions. Tirado-Carlo did not have access to politically sensitive information or confidential information related to public policy matters.

356. Tirado-Carlo engaged in functions of a routine nature that required manual competence and efficient performance, not political affiliation.

357. Tirado-Carlo's principal duties were to design, make, install and repair furniture.

358. For the reasons set forth in this Complaint, all Defendants were aware that Tirado-Carlo is an active member of the NPP. It was of common knowledge in the workplace of the House of Representatives (and by Defendants themselves) that Tirado-Carlo avidly supported the NPP during the 2012 elections.

359. Moreover, Defendants also knew or assumed that Tirado-Carlo had voted for the NPP and candidates of the NPP for the House of Representatives in the 2012 General Elections.

360. Tirado-Carlo actively participated in NPP activities and with NPP candidates.

361. Tirado-Carlo was an observer representing the NPP and/or some of its candidates during electoral events.

362. Like some co-workers and the other Plaintiffs, Tirado-Carlo was seen in photos and videos doing his political work during the 2012 electoral campaign in several media including non-private Facebook accounts.

363. Defendants knew all these facts, as well as others provided throughout this Complaint in connection with the political affiliation, involvement and activism of Tirado-Carlo.

364. Defendants dismissed Tirado-Carlo from his job without evaluating his job performance and efficiency.

365. At no time prior to her dismissal did the Defendants discipline Tirado-Carlo or issue a reprimand related to the performance of his duties.

366. Defendants hired someone to substitute for Tirado-Carlo after his dismissal. That person is a member and/or supporter of the PDP.

367. The reason that Tirado-Carlo was dismissed was because the Defendants knew that he belonged to – or otherwise perceived him to be a member of and/or affiliated to – a political party other than the PDP, specifically the NPP.

368. As a result of this dismissal, Defendants have deprived Tirado-Carlo of the income and benefits by which he sustained himself and his family; have subjected him to personal pain and suffering; and have punished him for the exercise of his civil rights by terminating his

employment – all because he is not a member of or affiliated to the PDP, and is perceived by Defendants as not having voted for the PDP or its candidates.

Plaintiff Christian Morales-León

369. Plaintiff Christian Morales-León ("Morales-León") is of legal age, a resident of Puerto Rico and a citizen of the United States of America.

370. Morales-León started working for the House of Representatives in April 2012. His last appointment at the House of Representatives was as a Warehouse Keeper.

371. Party affiliation is not an appropriate requirement for Morales-León's position. At all times relevant and material hereto Morales-León was a public employee whose position was not a public-policy-making position, or one that required her to perform public-policy functions. Morales-León did not have access to politically sensitive information or confidential information related to public policy matters.

372. Morales-León engaged in functions of a routine nature that required manual competence and efficient performance, not political affiliation.

373. Morales-León's principal duties were to provide supplies, parts, equipment and other materials to the different offices of the House of Representatives as requested; to keep the warehouse in order and clean; etc.

374. For the reasons set forth in this Complaint, all Defendants were aware that Morales-León is an active member of the NPP. It was of common knowledge in the workplace of the House of Representatives (and by Defendants themselves) that Morales-León avidly supported the NPP during the 2012 elections.

375. Moreover, Defendants also knew or assumed that Morales-León had voted for the NPP and candidates of the NPP for the House of Representatives in the 2012 General Elections.

376. Morales-León actively participated in NPP activities and with NPP candidates.

377. Morales-León was a member of the advance team for former Speaker Jenniffer González. He was also actively involved in the campaign for the NPP candidate for Mayor of Maunabo.

378. Like some co-workers and the other Plaintiffs, Morales-León was seen in photos and videos doing his political work during the 2012 electoral campaign in several media including non-private Facebook accounts.

379. Defendants knew all these facts, as well as others provided throughout this Complaint in connection with the political affiliation, involvement and activism of Morales-León.

380. At no time prior to his dismissal did the Defendants discipline Morales-León or issue a reprimand related to the performance of her duties.

381. Defendants hired someone to substitute for Morales-León after his dismissal. That person is a member and/or supporter of the PDP.

382. The reason that Morales-León was dismissed was because the Defendants knew that he belonged to – or otherwise perceived him to be a member of and/or affiliated to – a political party other than the PDP, specifically the NPP.

383. As a result of this dismissal, Defendants have deprived Morales-León of the income and benefits by which he sustained himself and his family; have subjected him to personal pain and suffering; and have punished him for the exercise of his civil rights by terminating his employment – all because he is not a member of or affiliated to the PDP, and is perceived by Defendants as not having voted for the PDP or its candidates.

Plaintiff Luz Pérez-Betancourt

384. Plaintiff Luz Pérez-Betancourt ("Pérez-Betancourt ") is of legal age, a resident of Puerto Rico and a citizen of the United States of America.

385. Pérez-Betancourt started working for the House of Representatives in August 2010. Her last appointment at the House of Representatives was as a Protocol Officer.

386. Party affiliation is not an appropriate requirement for Pérez-Betancourt's position. At all times relevant and material hereto Pérez-Betancourt was a public employee whose position was not a public-policy-making position, or one that required her to perform public-policy functions. Pérez-Betancourt did not have access to politically sensitive information or confidential information related to public policy matters.

387. Pérez-Betancourt engaged in functions of a routine nature that required manual competence and efficient performance, not political affiliation.

388. Pérez-Betancourt's principal duties were to coordinate events that were going to take place in the House of Representatives, including requesting and/or renting the equipment and supplies needed, the installation of the equipment, the attendance and participation of the Representatives, the cleaning up after the event, etc.

389. For the reasons set forth in this Complaint, all Defendants were aware that Pérez-Betancourt is an active member of the NPP. It was of common knowledge in the workplace of the House of Representatives (and by Defendants themselves) that Pérez-Betancourt avidly supported the NPP during the 2012 elections.

390. Moreover, Defendants also knew or assumed that Pérez-Betancourt had voted for the NPP and candidates of the NPP for the House of Representatives in the 2012 General Elections.

391. Pérez-Betancourt actively participated in NPP activities and with NPP candidates.

392. Pérez-Betancourt worked as polling officer representing the NPP.

393. Like some co-workers and the other Plaintiffs, Pérez-Betancourt was seen in photos and videos doing her political work during the 2012 electoral campaign in several media including non-private Facebook accounts.

394. Defendants knew all these facts, as well as others provided throughout this Complaint in connection with the political affiliation, involvement and activism of Pérez-Betancourt.

395. Defendants dismissed Pérez-Betancourt from her job without evaluating her job performance and efficiency.

396. At no time prior to her dismissal did the Defendants discipline Pérez-Betancourt or issue a reprimand related to the performance of her duties.

397. Defendants hired someone to substitute for Pérez-Betancourt after her dismissal. That person is a member and/or supporter of the PDP.

398. The reason that Pérez-Betancourt was dismissed was because the Defendants knew that she belonged to – or otherwise perceived her to be a member of and/or affiliated to – a political party other than the PDP, specifically the NPP.

399. As a result of this dismissal, Defendants have deprived Pérez-Betancourt of the income and benefits by which she sustained herself and her family; have subjected her to personal pain and suffering; and have punished her for the exercise of her civil rights by terminating her employment – all because she is not a member of or affiliated to the PDP, and is perceived by Defendants as not having voted for the PDP or its candidates.

Plaintiff Yesenia María Suárez

400. Plaintiff Yesenia María Suárez ("Suárez") is of legal age, a resident of Puerto Rico and a citizen of the United States of America.

401. Suárez started working for the House of Representatives in May 2009. Her last appointment at the House of Representatives was as a Receptionist.

402. Party affiliation is not an appropriate requirement for Suárez' position. At all times relevant and material hereto Suárez was a public employee whose position was not a public-policy-making position, or one that required her to perform public-policy functions. Suárez did not have access to politically sensitive information or confidential information related to public policy matters.

403. Suárez engaged in functions of a routine nature that required manual competence and efficient performance, not political affiliation.

404. Suárez' principal duties were to answer telephone calls and transfer these to their destination, distribute all correspondence received, receive and help visitors and such.

405. For the reasons set forth in this Complaint, all Defendants were aware that Suárez is an active member of the NPP. It was of common knowledge in the workplace of the House of Representatives (and by Defendants themselves) that Suárez avidly supported the NPP during the 2012 elections.

406. Moreover, Defendants also knew or assumed that Suárez had voted for the NPP and candidates of the NPP for the House of Representatives in the 2012 General Elections.

407. Suárez actively participated in NPP activities and with NPP candidates.

408. Suárez was a member of the advance team for former Speaker Jenniffer González.

409. Like some co-workers and the other Plaintiffs, Suárez was seen in photos and videos doing her political work during the 2012 electoral campaign in several media including non-private Facebook accounts.

410. Defendants knew all these facts, as well as others provided throughout this Complaint in connection with the political affiliation, involvement and activism of Suárez.

411. Defendants dismissed Suárez from her job without evaluating her job performance and efficiency.

412. At no time prior to her dismissal did the Defendants discipline Suárez or issue a reprimand related to the performance of her duties.

413. Defendants hired someone to substitute for Suárez after her dismissal. That person is a member and/or supporter of the PDP.

414. The reason that Suárez was dismissed was because the Defendants knew that she belonged to – or otherwise perceived her to be a member of and/or affiliated to – a political party other than the PDP, specifically the NPP.

415. As a result of this dismissal, Defendants have deprived Suárez of the income and benefits by which she sustained herself and her family; have subjected her to personal pain and suffering; and have punished her for the exercise of her civil rights by terminating her employment – all because she is not a member of or affiliated to the PDP, and is perceived by Defendants as not having voted for the PDP or its candidates.

Plaintiff Isabel De La Cruz-Sánchez

416. Plaintiff Isabel De La Cruz-Sánchez ("De La Cruz-Sánchez") is of legal age, a resident of Puerto Rico and a citizen of the United States of America.

417. De La Cruz-Sánchez started working for the House of Representatives in March 2011. Her last appointment at the House of Representatives was as a Maintenance Employee.

418. Party affiliation is not an appropriate requirement for De La Cruz-Sánchez' position. At all times relevant and material hereto De La Cruz-Sánchez was a public employee whose

position was not a public-policy-making position, or one that required her to perform public-policy functions. De La Cruz-Sánchez did not have access to politically sensitive information or confidential information related to public policy matters.

419. De La Cruz-Sánchez engaged in functions of a routine nature that required manual competence and efficient performance, not political affiliation.

420. De La Cruz-Sánchez' principal duties were to clean and provide general maintenance of designated areas in the House of Representatives.

421. For the reasons set forth in this Complaint, all Defendants were aware that De La Cruz-Sánchez is an active member of the NPP. It was of common knowledge in the workplace of the House of Representatives (and by Defendants themselves) that De La Cruz-Sánchez avidly supported the NPP during the 2012 elections.

422. Moreover, Defendants also knew or assumed that De La Cruz-Sánchez had voted for the NPP and candidates of the NPP for the House of Representatives in the 2012 General Elections.

423. De La Cruz-Sánchez actively participated in NPP activities and with NPP candidates.

424. De La Cruz-Sánchez was a member of the advance team for former Speaker Jenniffer González.

425. Like some co-workers and the other Plaintiffs, De La Cruz-Sánchez was seen in photos and videos doing her political work during the 2012 electoral campaign in several media including non-private Facebook accounts.

426. Defendants knew all these facts, as well as others provided throughout this Complaint in connection with the political affiliation, involvement and activism of De La Cruz-Sánchez.

427. Defendants dismissed De La Cruz-Sánchez from her job without evaluating her job performance and efficiency.

428. At no time prior to her dismissal did the Defendants discipline De La Cruz-Sánchez or issue a reprimand related to the performance of her duties.

429. Defendants hired someone to substitute for De La Cruz-Sánchez after her dismissal. That person is a member and/or supporter of the PDP.

430. The reason that De La Cruz-Sánchez was dismissed was because the Defendants knew that she belonged to – or otherwise perceived her to be a member of and/or affiliated to – a political party other than the PDP, specifically the NPP.

431. As a result of this dismissal, Defendants have deprived De La Cruz-Sánchez of the income and benefits by which she sustained herself and her family; have subjected her to personal pain and suffering; and have punished her for the exercise of her civil rights by terminating her employment – all because she is not a member of or affiliated to the PDP, and is perceived by Defendants as not having voted for the PDP or its candidates.

Plaintiff Ángel Acabá-Vázquez

432. Plaintiff Ángel Acabá-Vázquez ("Acabá-Vázquez") is of legal age, a resident of Puerto Rico and a citizen of the United States of America.

433. Acabá-Vázquez started working for the House of Representatives in February 2005. His last appointment at the House of Representatives was as an Internal Security Officer.

434. Party affiliation is not an appropriate requirement for Acabá-Vázquez' position. At all times relevant and material hereto Acabá-Vázquez was a public employee whose position was not a public-policy-making position, or one that required her to perform public-policy functions. Acabá-Vázquez did not have access to politically sensitive information or confidential information related to public policy matters.

435. Acabá-Vázquez engaged in functions of a routine nature that required manual competence and efficient performance, not political affiliation.

436. Acabá-Vázquez' principal duties involved internal security and regular surveillance inside the House of Representatives facilities, similar to the duties performed by Court Security Officers.

437. For the reasons set forth in this Complaint, all Defendants were aware that Acabá-Vázquez is an active member of the NPP. It was of common knowledge in the workplace of the House of Representatives (and by Defendants themselves) that Acabá-Vázquez avidly supported the NPP during the 2012 elections.

438. Moreover, Defendants also knew or assumed that Acabá-Vázquez had voted for the NPP and candidates of the NPP for the House of Representatives in the 2012 General Elections.

439. Acabá-Vázquez actively participated in NPP activities and with NPP candidates.

440. Acabá-Vázquez worked as a polling officer representing the NPP and was a member of the advance team for former Speaker Jenniffer González.

441. Like some co-workers and the other Plaintiffs, Acabá-Vázquez was seen in photos and videos doing his political work during the 2012 electoral campaign in several media including non-private Facebook accounts.

442. Defendants knew all these facts, as well as others provided throughout this Complaint in connection with the political affiliation, involvement and activism of Acabá-Vázquez.

443. Defendants dismissed Acabá-Vázquez from his job without evaluating his job performance and efficiency.

444. At no time prior to his dismissal did the Defendants discipline Acabá-Vázquez or issue a reprimand related to the performance of his duties.

445. Defendants hired someone to substitute for Acabá-Vázquez after his dismissal. That person is a member and/or supporter of the PDP.

446. The reason that Acabá-Vázquez was dismissed was because the Defendants knew that he belonged to – or otherwise perceived him to be a member of and/or affiliated to – a political party other than the PDP, specifically the NPP.

447. As a result of this dismissal, Defendants have deprived Acabá-Vázquez of the income and benefits by which he sustained himself and his family; have subjected him to personal pain and suffering; and have punished him for the exercise of his civil rights by terminating his employment – all because he is not a member of or affiliated to the PDP, and is perceived by Defendants as not having voted for the PDP or its candidates.

Plaintiff Miguel Santiago-Calderón

448. Plaintiff Miguel Santiago-Calderón ("Santiago-Calderón") is of legal age, a resident of Puerto Rico and a citizen of the United States of America.

449. Santiago-Calderón started working for the House of Representatives in October 2009. His last appointment at the House of Representatives was as an Usher.

450. Party affiliation is not an appropriate requirement for Santiago-Calderón's position. At all times relevant and material hereto Santiago-Calderón was a public employee whose position was not a public-policy-making position, or one that required her to perform public-policy functions. Santiago-Calderón did not have access to politically sensitive information or confidential information related to public policy matters.

451. Santiago-Calderón engaged in functions of a routine nature that required manual competence and efficient performance, not political affiliation.

452. Santiago-Calderón's principal duties were to inspect the areas where legislative hearings would take place to make sure that the equipment is placed correctly and that there are enough materials for the participants; arranging rooms for hearings and conferences (by placing and accommodating chairs, tables, coffee, water, paper, and other materials); providing participants with materials, etc.

453. For the reasons set forth in this Complaint, all Defendants were aware that Santiago-Calderón is an active member of the NPP. It was of common knowledge in the workplace of the House of Representatives (and by Defendants themselves) that Santiago-Calderón avidly supported the NPP during the 2012 elections.

454. Moreover, Defendants also knew or assumed that Santiago-Calderón had voted for the NPP and candidates of the NPP for the House of Representatives in the 2012 General Elections.

455. Santiago-Calderón actively participated in NPP activities and with NPP candidates.

456. Santiago-Calderón was a member of the advance team for former Speaker Jennifer González and worked posting leaflets during her campaign.

457. Santiago-Calderón also worked as a polling officer representing the NPP.

458. Like some co-workers and the other Plaintiffs, Santiago-Calderón was seen in photos and videos doing his political work during the 2012 electoral campaign in several media including non-private Facebook accounts.

459. Defendants knew all these facts, as well as others provided throughout this Complaint in connection with the political affiliation, involvement and activism of Santiago-Calderón.

460. Defendants dismissed Santiago-Calderón from his job without evaluating his job performance and efficiency.

461. At no time prior to his dismissal did the Defendants discipline Santiago-Calderón or issue a reprimand related to the performance of his duties.

462. Defendants hired someone to substitute for Santiago-Calderón after his dismissal. That person is a member and/or supporter of the PDP.

463. The reason that Santiago-Calderón was dismissed was because the Defendants knew that he belonged to – or otherwise perceived him to be a member of and/or affiliated to – a political party other than the PDP, specifically the NPP.

464. As a result of this dismissal, Defendants have deprived Santiago-Calderón of the income and benefits by which he sustained himself and his family; have subjected him to personal pain and suffering; and have punished him for the exercise of his civil rights by terminating his employment – all because he is not a member of or affiliated to the PDP, and is perceived by Defendants as not having voted for the PDP or its candidates.

Plaintiff Thelma Delgado-Pedrogo

465. Plaintiff Thelma Delgado-Pedrogo ("Delgado-Pedrogo") is of legal age, a resident of Puerto Rico and a citizen of the United States of America.

466. Delgado-Pedrogo started working for the House of Representatives in January 2009. Her last appointment at the House of Representatives was as a Secretary.

467. Party affiliation is not an appropriate requirement for Delgado-Pedrogo's position. At all times relevant and material hereto Delgado-Pedrogo was a public employee whose position was not a public-policy-making position, or one that required her to perform public-policy functions. Delgado-Pedrogo did not have access to politically sensitive information or confidential information related to public policy matters.

468. Delgado-Pedrogo engaged in functions of a routine nature that required manual competence and efficient performance, not political affiliation.

469. Delgado-Pedrogo's principal duties were clerical in nature, such as answering the phone; drafting letters and reports; filing and such.

470. For the reasons set forth in this Complaint, all Defendants were aware that Delgado-Pedrogo is an active member of the NPP. It was of common knowledge in the workplace of the House of Representatives (and by Defendants themselves) that Delgado-Pedrogo avidly supported the NPP during the 2012 elections.

471. Moreover, Defendants also knew or assumed that Delgado-Pedrogo had voted for the NPP and candidates of the NPP for the House of Representatives in the 2012 General Elections.

472. Delgado-Pedrogo actively participated in NPP activities and with NPP candidates.

473. Delgado-Pedrogo worked as a polling officer representing the NPP and was a delegate for the NPP. She also was a member of the advance team for former Speaker Jenniffer González.

474. Delgado-Pedrogo has been involved in the political campaigns of all the recent NPP representatives and candidates in the Carolina District.

475. Like some co-workers and the other Plaintiffs, Delgado-Pedrogo was seen in photos and videos doing her political work during the 2012 electoral campaign in several media including non-private Facebook accounts.

476. Defendants knew all these facts, as well as others provided throughout this Complaint in connection with the political affiliation, involvement and activism of Delgado-Pedrogo.

477. Defendants dismissed Delgado-Pedrogo from her job without evaluating her job performance and efficiency.

478. At no time prior to her dismissal did the Defendants discipline Delgado-Pedrogo or issue a reprimand related to the performance of her duties.

479. Defendants hired someone to substitute for Delgado-Pedrogo after her dismissal. That person is a member and/or supporter of the PDP.

480. The reason that Delgado-Pedrogo was dismissed was because the Defendants knew that she belonged to – or otherwise perceived her to be a member of and/or affiliated to – a political party other than the PDP, specifically the NPP.

481. As a result of this dismissal, Defendants have deprived Delgado-Pedrogo of the income and benefits by which she sustained herself and her family; have subjected her to personal pain and suffering; and have punished her for the exercise of her civil rights by terminating her employment – all because she is not a member of or affiliated to the PDP, and is perceived by Defendants as not having voted for the PDP or its candidates.

Plaintiff Nydia Tosas-Cordero

482. Plaintiff Nydia Tosas-Cordero ("Tosas-Cordero") is of legal age, a resident of Puerto Rico and a citizen of the United States of America.

483. Rodríguez-Marrero started working for the House of Representatives in November 2010. Her last appointment at the House of Representatives was as a Photographer.

484. Party affiliation is not an appropriate requirement for Tosas-Cordero's position. At all times relevant and material hereto Tosas-Cordero was a public employee whose position was not a public-policy-making position, or one that required her to perform public-policy functions. Tosas-Cordero did not have access to politically sensitive information or confidential information related to public policy matters.

485. Tosas-Cordero engaged in functions of a routine nature that required manual competence and efficient performance, not political affiliation.

486. Tosas-Cordero's principal duties were to provide coverage taking pictures of the activities taking place in the House of Representatives, to develop photographic material, to distribute photographic material to the press, etc.

487. For the reasons set forth in this Complaint, all Defendants were aware that Tosas-Cordero is an active member of the NPP. It was of common knowledge in the workplace of the House of Representatives (and by Defendants themselves) that Tosas-Cordero avidly supported the NPP during the 2012 elections.

488. Moreover, Defendants also knew or assumed that Tosas-Cordero had voted for the NPP and candidates of the NPP for the House of Representatives in the 2012 General Elections.

489. Tosas-Cordero actively participated in NPP activities and with NPP candidates.

490. Tosas-Cordero was the photographer for former NPP Governor Pedro Rosselló for over four years. She also worked as photographer during the political campaign of Carlos Pesquera when he was running for Governor and for former Speaker Jenniffer González.

491. Like some co-workers and the other Plaintiffs, Tosas-Cordero was seen in photos and videos doing her political work during the 2012 electoral campaign in several media including non-private Facebook accounts.

492. Defendants knew all these facts, as well as others provided throughout this Complaint in connection with the political affiliation, involvement and activism of Tosas-Cordero.

493. Tosas-Cordero was informed verbally that her appointment expired on December 31, 2012 and that it was not renewed, but that she should come on the next working day.

494. Tosas-Cordero went to work on January 2, 2013 and when they confirmed that the appointment was not renewed, she asked if there was a chance she could stay any longer. Later, her supervisor informed her that she manage to get an extension until January 15, 2013.

495. Come January 15, 2013, when the extended appointment expired, the supervisor told Tosas-Cordero that there were no more extensions and that she had to go.

496. Defendants dismissed Tosas-Cordero from her job without evaluating her job performance and efficiency.

497. At no time prior to her dismissal did the Defendants discipline Tosas-Cordero or issue a reprimand related to the performance of her duties.

498. Defendants hired someone to substitute for Tosas-Cordero after her dismissal. That person is a member and/or supporter of the PDP.

499. The reason that Tosas-Cordero was dismissed was because the Defendants knew that she belonged to – or otherwise perceived her to be a member of and/or affiliated to – a political party other than the PDP, specifically the NPP.

500. As a result of this dismissal, Defendants have deprived Tosas-Cordero of the income and benefits by which she sustained herself and her family; have subjected her to personal pain and suffering; and have punished her for the exercise of her civil rights by terminating her employment – all because she is not a member of or affiliated to the PDP, and is perceived by Defendants as not having voted for the PDP or its candidates.

Plaintiff Eleonor Rodríguez-Avilés

501. Plaintiff Eleonor Rodríguez-Avilés ("Rodríguez-Avilés") is of legal age, a resident of Puerto Rico and a citizen of the United States of America.

502. Rodríguez-Avilés started working for the House of Representatives in January 2006. Her last appointment at the House of Representatives was as a Press Officer.

503. Party affiliation is not an appropriate requirement for Rodríguez-Avilés' position. At all times relevant and material hereto Rodríguez-Avilés was a public employee whose position was not a public-policy-making position, or one that required her to perform public-policy functions. Rodríguez-Avilés did not have access to politically sensitive information or confidential information related to public policy matters.

504. Rodríguez-Avilés engaged in functions of a routine nature that required manual competence and efficient performance, not political affiliation.

505. Rodríguez-Avilés' principal duties were to draft press releases regarding the activities taking place in the House of Representatives; to attend the public hearings, press conferences and other activities to provide coverage about them; to supply recordings of the activities to the press; to collect information regarding issues about the legislature, the central government and the municipalities, to prepare the calendar of activities taking place in the House of Representatives, to monitor the press media, etc.

506. For the reasons set forth in this Complaint, all Defendants were aware that Rodríguez-Avilés is an active member of the NPP. It was of common knowledge in the workplace of the House of Representatives (and by Defendants themselves) that Rodríguez-Avilés avidly supported the NPP during the 2012 elections.

507. Moreover, Defendants also knew or assumed that Rodríguez-Avilés had voted for the NPP and candidates of the NPP for the House of Representatives in the 2012 General Elections.

508. Rodríguez-Avilés actively participated in NPP activities and with NPP candidates.

509. Rodríguez-Avilés worked as a polling officer representing the NPP.

510. Like some co-workers and the other Plaintiffs, Rodríguez-Avilés was seen in photos and videos doing her political work during the 2012 electoral campaign in several media including non-private Facebook accounts.

511. Defendants knew all these facts, as well as others provided throughout this Complaint in connection with the political affiliation, involvement and activism of Rodríguez-Avilés.

512. Rodríguez-Avilés was informed verbally that her appointment expired on December 31, 2012 and that it was not renewed, but that she should come on the next working day.

513. Rodríguez-Avilés went to work on January 2, 2013 and when they confirmed that the appointment was not renewed, she asked if there was a chance she could stay any longer. Later, her supervisor informed her that she manage to get an extension until January 15, 2013.

514. Come January 15, 2013, when the extended appointment expired, the supervisor told Rodríguez-Avilés that there were no more extensions and that she had to go.

515. Defendants dismissed Rodríguez-Avilés from her job without evaluating her job performance and efficiency.

516. At no time prior to her dismissal did the Defendants discipline Rodríguez-Avilés or issue a reprimand related to the performance of her duties.

517. Defendants hired someone to substitute for Rodríguez-Avilés after her dismissal. That person is a member and/or supporter of the PDP.

518. The reason that Rodríguez-Avilés was dismissed was because the Defendants knew that she belonged to – or otherwise perceived her to be a member of and/or affiliated to – a political party other than the PDP, specifically the NPP.

519. As a result of this dismissal, Defendants have deprived Rodríguez-Avilés of the income and benefits by which she sustained herself and her family; have subjected her to personal pain

and suffering; and have punished her for the exercise of her civil rights by terminating her employment – all because she is not a member of or affiliated to the PDP, and is perceived by Defendants as not having voted for the PDP or its candidates.

Plaintiff Edwin Torres-Cruz

520. Plaintiff Edwin Torres-Cruz ("Torres-Cruz ") is of legal age, a resident of Puerto Rico and a citizen of the United States of America.

521. Torres-Cruz started working for the House of Representatives in October 2005. His last appointment at the House of Representatives was as a Computer Technician.

522. Party affiliation is not an appropriate requirement for Torres-Cruz' position. At all times relevant and material hereto Torres-Cruz was a public employee whose position was not a public-policy-making position, or one that required her to perform public-policy functions. Torres-Cruz did not have access to politically sensitive information or confidential information related to public policy matters.

523. Torres-Cruz engaged in functions of a routine nature that required manual competence and efficient performance, not political affiliation.

524. Torres-Cruz' principal duties were to provide technical support, to install hardware, software and peripherals, to solve issues the users may have with their computers, etc.

525. For the reasons set forth in this Complaint, all Defendants were aware that Torres-Cruz is an active member of the NPP. It was of common knowledge in the workplace of the House of Representatives (and by Defendants themselves) that Torres-Cruz avidly supported the NPP during the 2012 elections.

526. Moreover, Defendants also knew or assumed that Torres-Cruz had voted for the NPP and candidates of the NPP for the House of Representatives in the 2012 General Elections.

527. Torres-Cruz actively participated in NPP activities and with NPP candidates.

528. Torres-Cruz was a member of the advance teams of several well known politicians of the NPP such as former speaker Jenniffer González, former Speaker José Aponte and former Representative Cristobal Colón.

529. Torres-Cruz also worked as polling officer representing the NPP.

530. Like some co-workers and the other Plaintiffs, Torres-Cruz was seen in photos and videos doing his political work during the 2012 electoral campaign in several media including non-private Facebook accounts.

531. Defendants knew all these facts, as well as others provided throughout this Complaint in connection with the political affiliation, involvement and activism of Torres-Cruz.

532. Torres-Cruz was notified that his appointment would not be renewed after its expiration on January 31, 2013 by way of a letter of the same date signed by co-Defendant González-Calderón.

533. Defendants dismissed Torres-Cruz from his job without evaluating his job performance and efficiency.

534. At no time prior to his dismissal did the Defendants discipline Torres-Cruz or issue a reprimand related to the performance of his duties.

535. Defendants hired someone to substitute for Torres-Cruz after his dismissal. That person is a member and/or supporter of the PDP.

536. The reason that Torres-Cruz was dismissed was because the Defendants knew that he belonged to – or otherwise perceived him to be a member of and/or affiliated to – a political party other than the PDP, specifically the NPP.

537. As a result of this dismissal, Defendants have deprived Torres-Cruz of the income and benefits by which he sustained himself and his family; have subjected him to personal pain and suffering; and have punished him for the exercise of his civil rights by terminating his employment – all because he is not a member of or affiliated to the PDP, and is perceived by Defendants as not having voted for the PDP or its candidates.

Plaintiff Joel Seijo-Rivera

538. Plaintiff Joel Seijo-Rivera ("Seijo-Rivera") is of legal age, a resident of Puerto Rico and a citizen of the United States of America.

539. Seijo-Rivera started working for the House of Representatives in February 2010. His last appointment at the House of Representatives was as a Legislative Technician.

540. Party affiliation is not an appropriate requirement for Seijo-Rivera's position. At all times relevant and material hereto Seijo-Rivera was a public employee whose position was not a public-policy-making position, or one that required her to perform public-policy functions. Seijo-Rivera did not have access to politically sensitive information or confidential information related to public policy matters.

541. Seijo-Rivera engaged in functions of a routine nature that required manual competence and efficient performance, not political affiliation.

542. Seijo-Rivera's principal duties were to deal with all the matters pertaining the status of the bills that were pending before the House of Representatives, including its processing, communications, etc. He also worked with the compilation of the decisions issued by the Speaker for publication.

543. For the reasons set forth in this Complaint, all Defendants were aware that Seijo-Rivera is an active member of the NPP. It was of common knowledge in the workplace of the House of

Representatives (and by Defendants themselves) that Seijo-Rivera avidly supported the NPP during the 2012 elections.

544. Moreover, Defendants also knew or assumed that Seijo-Rivera had voted for the NPP and candidates of the NPP for the House of Representatives in the 2012 General Elections.

545. Seijo-Rivera actively participated in NPP activities and with NPP candidates.

546. Seijo-Rivera was a member of the advance team for former Speaker Jenniffer González.

547. Like some co-workers and the other Plaintiffs, Seijo-Rivera was seen in photos and videos doing his political work during the 2012 electoral campaign in several media including non-private Facebook accounts.

548. Defendants knew all these facts, as well as others provided throughout this Complaint in connection with the political affiliation, involvement and activism of Seijo-Rivera.

549. Seijo-Rivera was notified that his appointment would not be renewed after its expiration on January 31, 2013 by way of a letter of the same date signed by co-Defendant Figueroa-Vázquez.

550. Defendants dismissed Seijo-Rivera from his job without evaluating his job performance and efficiency.

551. At no time prior to his dismissal did the Defendants discipline Seijo-Rivera or issue a reprimand related to the performance of his duties.

552. Defendants hired someone to substitute for Seijo-Rivera after his dismissal. That person is a member and/or supporter of the PDP.

553. The reason that Seijo-Rivera was dismissed was because the Defendants knew that he belonged to – or otherwise perceived him to be a member of and/or affiliated to – a political party other than the PDP, specifically the NPP.

554. As a result of this dismissal, Defendants have deprived Seijo-Rivera of the income and benefits by which he sustained himself and his family; have subjected him to personal pain and suffering; and have punished him for the exercise of his civil rights by terminating his employment – all because he is not a member of or affiliated to the PDP, and is perceived by Defendants as not having voted for the PDP or its candidates.

Plaintiff William Torrellas-Díaz

555. Plaintiff William Torrellas-Díaz ("Torrellas-Díaz") is of legal age, a resident of Puerto Rico and a citizen of the United States of America.

556. Torrellas-Díaz started working for the House of Representatives in September 2005. His last appointment at the House of Representatives was as an Accounting Technician.

557. Party affiliation is not an appropriate requirement for Torrellas-Díaz' position. At all times relevant and material hereto Torrellas-Díaz was a public employee whose position was not a public-policy-making position, or one that required her to perform public-policy functions. Torrellas-Díaz did not have access to politically sensitive information or confidential information related to public policy matters.

558. Torrellas-Díaz engaged in functions of a routine nature that required manual competence and efficient performance, not political affiliation.

559. Torrellas-Díaz' principal duties were to determine the weekly per diem payment for each representative, including any withholding, the contribution to the Coffee Parlor, etc.; to determine the monthly stipend payable to each representative and to register the obligation in the system; to prepare the interagency forms to process the payments to other governmental agencies; to review, process and register in the system the applications for official trips; to

prepare the invoices in the system for the collection of improper payroll payments, personal phone calls, etc.

560. For the reasons set forth in this Complaint, all Defendants were aware that Torrellas-Díaz is an active member of the NPP. It was of common knowledge in the workplace of the House of Representatives (and by Defendants themselves) that Torrellas-Díaz avidly supported the NPP during the 2012 elections.

561. Moreover, Defendants also knew or assumed that Torrellas-Díaz had voted for the NPP and candidates of the NPP for the House of Representatives in the 2012 General Elections.

562. Torrellas-Díaz actively participated in NPP activities and with NPP candidates.

563. During the 2008 electoral campaign, Torrellas-Díaz was a member of the advance team for former Speakers José Aponte y Jenniffer González.

564. During the 2012 electoral campaign, Torrellas-Díaz was a ward president and electoral coordinator.

565. Torrellas-Díaz was also a delegate for the NPP.

566. Like some co-workers and the other Plaintiffs, Torrellas-Díaz was seen in photos and videos doing his political work during the 2012 electoral campaign in several media including non-private Facebook accounts.

567. Defendants knew all these facts, as well as others provided throughout this Complaint in connection with the political affiliation, involvement and activism of Torrellas-Díaz.

568. Torrellas-Díaz was notified that his appointment would not be renewed after its expiration on January 31, 2013 by way of a letter of the same date signed by co-Defendant González-Calderón.

569. Defendants dismissed Torrellas-Díaz from his job without evaluating his job performance and efficiency.

570. At no time prior to his dismissal did the Defendants discipline Torrellas-Díaz or issue a reprimand related to the performance of his duties.

571. Defendants hired someone to substitute for Torrellas-Díaz after his dismissal. That person is a member and/or supporter of the PDP.

572. The reason that Torrellas-Díaz was dismissed was because the Defendants knew that he belonged to – or otherwise perceived him to be a member of and/or affiliated to – a political party other than the PDP, specifically the NPP.

573. As a result of this dismissal, Defendants have deprived Torrellas-Díaz of the income and benefits by which he sustained himself and his family; have subjected him to personal pain and suffering; and have punished him for the exercise of his civil rights by terminating his employment – all because he is not a member of or affiliated to the PDP, and is perceived by Defendants as not having voted for the PDP or its candidates.

Plaintiff Roberto Valentín-Santiago

574. Plaintiff Roberto Valentín-Santiago ("Valentín-Santiago") is of legal age, a resident of Puerto Rico and a citizen of the United States of America.

575. Valentín-Santiago started working for the House of Representatives in October 2009. His last appointment at the House of Representatives was as a Printing Technician.

576. Party affiliation is not an appropriate requirement for Valentín-Santiago's position. At all times relevant and material hereto Valentín-Santiago was a public employee whose position was not a public-policy-making position, or one that required her to perform public-policy functions.

Valentín-Santiago did not have access to politically sensitive information or confidential information related to public policy matters.

577. Valentín-Santiago engaged in functions of a routine nature that required manual competence and efficient performance, not political affiliation.

578. Valentín-Santiago's principal duties were to operate all the machines in the Printing Office, to verify the correction and complete all the printing jobs, etc.

579. For the reasons set forth in this Complaint, all Defendants were aware that Valentín-Santiago is an active member of the NPP. It was of common knowledge in the workplace of the House of Representatives (and by Defendants themselves) that Valentín-Santiago avidly supported the NPP during the 2012 elections.

580. Moreover, Defendants also knew or assumed that Valentín-Santiago had voted for the NPP and candidates of the NPP for the House of Representatives in the 2012 General Elections.

581. Valentín-Santiago actively participated in NPP activities and with NPP candidates.

582. Valentín-Santiago worked as a polling officer representing the NPP and was a member of the advance team for former Speaker Jenniffer González.

583. Like some co-workers and the other Plaintiffs, Valentín-Santiago was seen in photos and videos doing his political work during the 2012 electoral campaign in several media including non-private Facebook accounts.

584. Defendants knew all these facts, as well as others provided throughout this Complaint in connection with the political affiliation, involvement and activism of Valentín-Santiago.

585. Valentín-Santiago was notified that his appointment would not be renewed after its expiration on January 31, 2013 by way of a letter of the same date signed by co-Defendant González-Calderón.

586. Defendants dismissed Valentín-Santiago from his job without evaluating his job performance and efficiency.

587. At no time prior to his dismissal did the Defendants discipline Valentín-Santiago or issue a reprimand related to the performance of his duties.

588. Defendants hired someone to substitute for Valentín-Santiago after his dismissal. That person is a member and/or supporter of the PDP.

589. The reason that Valentín-Santiago was dismissed was because the Defendants knew that he belonged to – or otherwise perceived him to be a member of and/or affiliated to – a political party other than the PDP, specifically the NPP.

590. As a result of this dismissal, Defendants have deprived Valentín-Santiago of the income and benefits by which he sustained himself and his family; have subjected him to personal pain and suffering; and have punished him for the exercise of his civil rights by terminating his employment – all because he is not a member of or affiliated to the PDP, and is perceived by Defendants as not having voted for the PDP or its candidates.

Plaintiff Yamaira Ortiz-Perea

591. Plaintiff Yamaira Ortiz-Perea ("Ortiz-Perea") is of legal age, a resident of Puerto Rico and a citizen of the United States of America.

592. Ortiz-Perea started working for the House of Representatives in June 2006. Her last appointment at the House of Representatives was as an Administrative Assistant.

593. Party affiliation is not an appropriate requirement for Ortiz-Perea's position. At all times relevant and material hereto Ortiz-Perea was a public employee whose position was not a public-policy-making position, or one that required her to perform public-policy functions. Ortiz-Perea

did not have access to politically sensitive information or confidential information related to public policy matters.

594. Ortiz-Perea engaged in functions of a routine nature that required manual competence and efficient performance, not political affiliation.

595. Ortiz-Perea's principal duties were to correct in the system the bills that were discussed during the session and to send them to the Minutes and Records Area.

596. For the reasons set forth in this Complaint, all Defendants were aware that Ortiz-Perea is an active member of the NPP. It was of common knowledge in the workplace of the House of Representatives (and by Defendants themselves) that Ortiz-Perea avidly supported the NPP during the 2012 elections.

597. Moreover, Defendants also knew or assumed that Ortiz-Perea had voted for the NPP and candidates of the NPP for the House of Representatives in the 2012 General Elections.

598. Ortiz-Perea actively participated in NPP activities and with NPP candidates.

599. Ortiz-Perea was a member of the advance team for former Speaker Jenniffer González.

600. Like some co-workers and the other Plaintiffs, Ortiz-Perea was seen in photos and videos doing her political work during the 2012 electoral campaign in several media including non-private Facebook accounts.

601. Defendants knew all these facts, as well as others provided throughout this Complaint in connection with the political affiliation, involvement and activism of Ortiz-Perea.

602. Ortiz-Perea was notified that her appointment would not be renewed after its expiration on January 31, 2013 by way of a letter of the same date signed by co-Defendant González-Calderón.

603. Defendants dismissed Ortiz-Perea from her job without evaluating her job performance and efficiency.

604. At no time prior to her dismissal did the Defendants discipline Ortiz-Perea or issue a reprimand related to the performance of her duties.

605. Defendants hired someone to substitute for Ortiz-Perea after her dismissal. That person is a member and/or supporter of the PDP.

606. The reason that Ortiz-Perea was dismissed was because the Defendants knew that she belonged to – or otherwise perceived her to be a member of and/or affiliated to – a political party other than the PDP, specifically the NPP.

607. As a result of this dismissal, Defendants have deprived Ortiz-Perea of the income and benefits by which she sustained herself and her family; have subjected her to personal pain and suffering; and have punished her for the exercise of her civil rights by terminating her employment – all because she is not a member of or affiliated to the PDP, and is perceived by Defendants as not having voted for the PDP or its candidates.

Plaintiff Omayra Garay-García

608. Plaintiff Omayra Garay-García ("Garay-García") is of legal age, a resident of Puerto Rico and a citizen of the United States of America.

609. Garay-García started working for the House of Representatives in August 2010. Her last appointment at the House of Representatives was as an Adjudication Technician.

610. Party affiliation is not an appropriate requirement for Garay-García's position. At all times relevant and material hereto Garay-García was a public employee whose position was not a public-policy-making position, or one that required her to perform public-policy functions.

Garay-García did not have access to politically sensitive information or confidential information related to public policy matters.

611. Garay-García engaged in functions of a routine nature that required manual competence and efficient performance, not political affiliation.

612. Garay-García's principal duties were to adjudicate and coordinate the purchases made in the House of Representatives, to supervise the purchase process, to provide orientation to the representatives regarding the purchase process, etc.

613. For the reasons set forth in this Complaint, all Defendants were aware that Garay-García is an active member of the NPP. It was of common knowledge in the workplace of the House of Representatives (and by Defendants themselves) that Garay-García avidly supported the NPP during the 2012 elections.

614. Moreover, Defendants also knew or assumed that Garay-García had voted for the NPP and candidates of the NPP for the House of Representatives in the 2012 General Elections.

615. Garay-García actively participated in NPP activities and with NPP candidates.

616. Garay-García was a member of the advance team for former Speaker Jenniffer González.

617. Garay-García worked as polling officer representing the NPP. She also was a member of the advance team for Norma Burgos during her 2000 campaign.

618. Like some co-workers and the other Plaintiffs, Garay-García was seen in photos and videos doing her political work during the 2012 electoral campaign in several media including non-private Facebook accounts.

619. Defendants knew all these facts, as well as others provided throughout this Complaint in connection with the political affiliation, involvement and activism of Garay-García.

620. Garay-García was notified that her appointment would not be renewed after its expiration on January 31, 2013 by way of a letter of the same date signed by co-Defendant González-Calderón.

621. Defendants dismissed Garay-García from her job without evaluating her job performance and efficiency.

622. At no time prior to her dismissal did the Defendants discipline Garay-García or issue a reprimand related to the performance of her duties.

623. Defendants hired someone to substitute for Garay-García after her dismissal. That person is a member and/or supporter of the PDP.

624. The reason that Garay-García was dismissed was because the Defendants knew that she belonged to – or otherwise perceived her to be a member of and/or affiliated to – a political party other than the PDP, specifically the NPP.

625. As a result of this dismissal, Defendants have deprived Garay-García of the income and benefits by which she sustained herself and her family; have subjected her to personal pain and suffering; and have punished her for the exercise of her civil rights by terminating her employment – all because she is not a member of or affiliated to the PDP, and is perceived by Defendants as not having voted for the PDP or its candidates.

Plaintiff Enid Pillot-Martínez

626. Plaintiff Enid Pillot-Martínez ("Pillot-Martínez") is of legal age, a resident of Puerto Rico and a citizen of the United States of America.

627. Pillot-Martínez started working for the House of Representatives in June 2009. Her last appointment at the House of Representatives was as a Secretary/Receptionist.

628. Party affiliation is not an appropriate requirement for Pillot-Martínez' position. At all times relevant and material hereto Pillot-Martínez was a public employee whose position was not a public-policy-making position, or one that required her to perform public-policy functions. Pillot-Martínez did not have access to politically sensitive information or confidential information related to public policy matters.

629. Pillot-Martínez engaged in functions of a routine nature that required manual competence and efficient performance, not political affiliation.

630. Pillot-Martínez' principal duties were clerical in nature, such as answering the phone; drafting letters and reports; filing, receiving the documents submitted by the contractors to complete the contracting process, digitalizing documents, etc.

631. For the reasons set forth in this Complaint, all Defendants were aware that Pillot-Martínez is an active member of the NPP. It was of common knowledge in the workplace of the House of Representatives (and by Defendants themselves) that Pillot-Martínez avidly supported the NPP during the 2012 elections.

632. Moreover, Defendants also knew or assumed that Pillot-Martínez had voted for the NPP and candidates of the NPP for the House of Representatives in the 2012 General Elections.

633. Pillot-Martínez actively participated in NPP activities and with NPP candidates.

634. Like some co-workers and the other Plaintiffs, Pillot-Martínez was seen in photos and videos doing her political work during the 2012 electoral campaign in several media including non-private Facebook accounts.

635. Defendants knew all these facts, as well as others provided throughout this Complaint in connection with the political affiliation, involvement and activism of Pillot-Martínez.

636. Pillot-Martínez was notified that her appointment would not be renewed after its expiration on January 31, 2013 by way of a letter of the same date signed by co-Defendant González-Calderón.

637. Defendants dismissed Pillot-Martínez from her job without evaluating her job performance and efficiency.

638. At no time prior to her dismissal did the Defendants discipline Pillot-Martínez or issue a reprimand related to the performance of her duties.

639. Defendants hired someone to substitute for Pillot-Martínez after her dismissal. That person is a member and/or supporter of the PDP.

640. The reason that Pillot-Martínez was dismissed was because the Defendants knew that she belonged to – or otherwise perceived her to be a member of and/or affiliated to – a political party other than the PDP, specifically the NPP.

641. As a result of this dismissal, Defendants have deprived Pillot-Martínez of the income and benefits by which she sustained herself and her family; have subjected her to personal pain and suffering; and have punished her for the exercise of her civil rights by terminating her employment – all because she is not a member of or affiliated to the PDP, and is perceived by Defendants as not having voted for the PDP or its candidates.

Plaintiff Laura Rivera-Rullán

642. Plaintiff Laura Rivera-Rullán ("Rivera-Rullán") is of legal age, a resident of Puerto Rico and a citizen of the United States of America.

643. Rivera-Rullán started working for the House of Representatives in January 2009. Her last appointment at the House of Representatives was as a Contract Technician.

644. Party affiliation is not an appropriate requirement for Rivera-Rullán's position. At all times relevant and material hereto Rivera-Rullán was a public employee whose position was not a public-policy-making position, or one that required her to perform public-policy functions. Rivera-Rullán did not have access to politically sensitive information or confidential information related to public policy matters.

645. Rivera-Rullán engaged in functions of a routine nature that required manual competence and efficient performance, not political affiliation.

646. Rodríguez-Marrero's principal duties were to verify that the documents submitted in order to proceed with a contract comply with the applicable laws and regulations; to follow-up regarding any pending document the contractors must submit in order to proceed with a contract; to prepare the file for the contract including all the supporting documents; to draft the contracts and the certification for the Comptroller's Office; to convert to digital form, register and send the contract electronically to the Comptroller's Office; to keep a contract registry in manual and electronic form; etc.

647. For the reasons set forth in this Complaint, all Defendants were aware that Rivera-Rullán is an active member of the NPP. It was of common knowledge in the workplace of the House of Representatives (and by Defendants themselves) that Rivera-Rullán avidly supported the NPP during the 2012 elections.

648. Moreover, Defendants also knew or assumed that Rivera-Rullán had voted for the NPP and candidates of the NPP for the House of Representatives in the 2012 General Elections.

649. Rivera-Rullán actively participated in NPP activities and with NPP candidates.

650. Rivera-Rullán was a member of the advance team for former Speaker Jenniffer González.

651. Like some co-workers and the other Plaintiffs, Rivera-Rullán was seen in photos and videos doing her political work during the 2012 electoral campaign in several media including non-private Facebook accounts.

652. Defendants knew all these facts, as well as others provided throughout this Complaint in connection with the political affiliation, involvement and activism of Rivera-Rullán.

653. Rivera-Rullán was notified that her appointment would not be renewed after its expiration on January 31, 2013 by way of a letter of the same date signed by co-Defendant González-Calderón.

654. Defendants dismissed Rivera-Rullán from her job without evaluating her job performance and efficiency.

655. At no time prior to her dismissal did the Defendants discipline Rivera-Rullán or issue a reprimand related to the performance of her duties.

656. Defendants hired someone to substitute for Rivera-Rullán after her dismissal. That person is a member and/or supporter of the PDP.

657. The reason that Rivera-Rullán was dismissed was because the Defendants knew that she belonged to – or otherwise perceived her to be a member of and/or affiliated to – a political party other than the PDP, specifically the NPP.

658. As a result of this dismissal, Defendants have deprived Rivera-Rullán of the income and benefits by which she sustained herself and her family; have subjected her to personal pain and suffering; and have punished her for the exercise of her civil rights by terminating her employment – all because she is not a member of or affiliated to the PDP, and is perceived by Defendants as not having voted for the PDP or its candidates.

Plaintiff Alex Rivera-Portela

659. Plaintiff Alex Rivera-Portela ("Rivera-Portela") is of legal age, a resident of Puerto Rico and a citizen of the United States of America.

660. Rivera-Portela started working for the House of Representatives in January 2009. His last appointment at the House of Representatives was as a Warehouse Keeper.

661. Party affiliation is not an appropriate requirement for Rivera-Portela's position. At all times relevant and material hereto Rivera-Portela was a public employee whose position was not a public-policy-making position, or one that required her to perform public-policy functions. Rivera-Portela did not have access to politically sensitive information or confidential information related to public policy matters.

662. Rivera-Portela engaged in functions of a routine nature that required manual competence and efficient performance, not political affiliation.

663. Rivera-Portela's principal duties were to provide supplies, parts, equipment and other materials to the different offices of the House of Representatives as requested; to keep an inventory of the supplies in the warehouse; to keep the warehouse in order and clean; to keep updated the requests for supplies received and served on a daily basis; etc.

664. For the reasons set forth in this Complaint, all Defendants were aware that Rivera-Portela is an active member of the NPP. It was of common knowledge in the workplace of the House of Representatives (and by Defendants themselves) that Rivera-Portela avidly supported the NPP during the 2012 elections.

665. Moreover, Defendants also knew or assumed that Rivera-Portela had voted for the NPP and candidates of the NPP for the House of Representatives in the 2012 General Elections.

666. Rivera-Portela actively participated in NPP activities and with NPP candidates.

667. Rivera-Portela was a member of the advance team for former Speaker Jenniffer González and worked posting leaflets during her campaign.

668. Rivera-Portela also worked as polling officer representing the NPP.

669. Like some co-workers and the other Plaintiffs, Rivera-Portela was seen in photos and videos doing his political work during the 2012 electoral campaign in several media including non-private Facebook accounts.

670. Defendants knew all these facts, as well as others provided throughout this Complaint in connection with the political affiliation, involvement and activism of Rivera-Portela.

671. Rivera-Portela was notified that her appointment would not be renewed after its expiration on January 31, 2013 by way of a letter of the same date signed by co-Defendant González-Calderón.

672. At no time prior to his dismissal did the Defendants discipline Rivera-Portela or issue a reprimand related to the performance of his duties.

673. Defendants hired someone to substitute for Rivera-Portela after his dismissal. That person is a member and/or supporter of the PDP.

674. The reason that Rivera-Portela was dismissed was because the Defendants knew that he belonged to – or otherwise perceived him to be a member of and/or affiliated to – a political party other than the PDP, specifically the NPP.

675. As a result of this dismissal, Defendants have deprived Rivera-Portela of the income and benefits by which he sustained himself and his family; have subjected him to personal pain and suffering; and have punished him for the exercise of his civil rights by terminating his employment – all because he is not a member of or affiliated to the PDP, and is perceived by Defendants as not having voted for the PDP or its candidates.

Plaintiff Emmanuel Fontanilla-Espinal

676. Plaintiff Emmanuel Fontanilla-Espinal ("Fontanilla-Espinal") is of legal age, a resident of Puerto Rico and a citizen of the United States of America.

677. Fontanilla-Espinal started working for the House of Representatives in January 2006. His last appointment at the House of Representatives was as an Usher.

678. Party affiliation is not an appropriate requirement for Fontanilla-Espinal's position. At all times relevant and material hereto Fontanilla-Espinal was a public employee whose position was not a public-policy-making position, or one that required her to perform public-policy functions. Fontanilla-Espinal did not have access to politically sensitive information or confidential information related to public policy matters.

679. Fontanilla-Espinal engaged in functions of a routine nature that required manual competence and efficient performance, not political affiliation.

680. Fontanilla-Espinal's principal duties were to inspect the areas where legislative hearings would take place to make sure that the equipment is placed correctly and that there are enough materials for the participants; arranging rooms for hearings and conferences (by placing and accommodating chairs, tables, coffee, water, paper, and other materials); providing participants with materials, etc.

681. For the reasons set forth in this Complaint, all Defendants were aware that Fontanilla-Espinal is an active member of the NPP. It was of common knowledge in the workplace of the House of Representatives (and by Defendants themselves) that Fontanilla-Espinal avidly supported the NPP during the 2012 elections.

682. Moreover, Defendants also knew or assumed that Fontanilla-Espinal had voted for the NPP and candidates of the NPP for the House of Representatives in the 2012 General Elections.

683. Fontanilla-Espinal actively participated in NPP activities and with NPP candidates.

684. Fontanilla-Espinal worked as a polling officer representing the NPP and was a member of the advance team for former Speakers Jenniffer González and José Aponte as well as for Pedro Rosselló during his 1996 campaign.

685. Like some co-workers and the other Plaintiffs, Fontanilla-Espinal was seen in photos and videos doing her political work during the 2012 electoral campaign in several media including non-private Facebook accounts.

686. Defendants knew all these facts, as well as others provided throughout this Complaint in connection with the political affiliation, involvement and activism of Fontanilla-Espinal.

687. Fontanilla-Espinal was notified that his appointment would not be renewed after its expiration on January 31, 2013 by way of a letter of the same date signed by co-Defendant González-Calderón.

688. Defendants dismissed Fontanilla-Espinal from his job without evaluating his job performance and efficiency.

689. At no time prior to his dismissal did the Defendants discipline Fontanilla-Espinal or issue a reprimand related to the performance of his duties.

690. Defendants hired someone to substitute for Fontanilla-Espinal after his dismissal. That person is a member and/or supporter of the PDP.

691. The reason that Fontanilla-Espinal was dismissed was because the Defendants knew that he belonged to – or otherwise perceived him to be a member of and/or affiliated to – a political party other than the PDP, specifically the NPP.

692. As a result of this dismissal, Defendants have deprived Fontanilla-Espinal of the income and benefits by which he sustained himself and his family; have subjected him to personal pain

and suffering; and have punished him for the exercise of his civil rights by terminating his employment – all because he is not a member of or affiliated to the PDP, and is perceived by Defendants as not having voted for the PDP or its candidates.

Plaintiff Miguel González-Rolón

693. Plaintiff Miguel González-Rolón ("González-Rolón") is of legal age, a resident of Puerto Rico and a citizen of the United States of America.

694. González-Rolón started working for the House of Representatives in January 2011. His last appointment at the House of Representatives was as a Sous Chef.

695. Party affiliation is not an appropriate requirement for González-Rolón's position. At all times relevant and material hereto González-Rolón was a public employee whose position was not a public-policy-making position, or one that required him to perform public-policy functions. González-Rolón did not have access to politically sensitive information or confidential information related to public policy matters.

696. González-Rolón engaged in functions of a routine nature that required manual competence and efficient performance, not political affiliation.

697. González-Rolón's principal duties were to assist the executive Chef in the preparation of food for the Coffee Parlor ("Salón Café") and for special activities that took place in the House of Representatives.

698. For the reasons set forth in this Complaint, all Defendants were aware that González-Rolón is an active member of the NPP. It was of common knowledge in the workplace of the House of Representatives (and by Defendants themselves) that González-Rolón avidly supported the NPP during the 2012 elections.

699. Moreover, Defendants also knew or assumed that González-Rolón had voted for the NPP and candidates of the NPP for the House of Representatives in the 2012 General Elections.

700. González-Rolón actively participated in NPP activities and with NPP candidates.

701. González-Rolón worked as a polling officer representing the NPP.

702. González-Rolón was also a member of the advance team for former Speaker Jennifer González and was in charge of preparing the food for the team. He also worked posting leaflets during the campaign.

703. Like some co-workers and the other Plaintiffs, González-Rolón was seen in photos and videos doing his political work during the 2012 electoral campaign in several media including non-private Facebook accounts.

704. Defendants knew all these facts, as well as others provided throughout this Complaint in connection with the political affiliation, involvement and activism of González-Rolón.

705. Defendants dismissed Rodríguez-Marrero from his job without evaluating his job performance and efficiency.

706. At no time prior to his dismissal did the Defendants discipline González-Rolón or issue a reprimand related to the performance of his duties.

707. Defendants hired someone to substitute for González-Rolón after his dismissal. That person is a member and/or supporter of the PDP.

708. The reason that González-Rolón was dismissed was because the Defendants knew that he belonged to – or otherwise perceived him to be a member of and/or affiliated to – a political party other than the PDP, specifically the NPP.

709. As a result of this dismissal, Defendants have deprived González-Rolón of the income and benefits by which he sustained himself and his family; have subjected him to personal pain

and suffering; and have punished him for the exercise of his civil rights by terminating his employment – all because he is not a member of or affiliated to the PDP, and is perceived by Defendants as not having voted for the PDP or its candidates.

Plaintiff Omar Santiago-Rodríguez

710. Plaintiff Omar Santiago-Rodríguez ("Santiago-Rodríguez") is of legal age, a resident of Puerto Rico and a citizen of the United States of America.

711. Santiago-Rodríguez started working for the House of Representatives in September 2005. His last appointment at the House of Representatives was as Vehicle Washer.

712. Party affiliation is not an appropriate requirement for Santiago-Rodríguez' position. At all times relevant and material hereto Santiago-Rodríguez was a public employee whose position was not a public-policy-making position, or one that required her to perform public-policy functions. Santiago-Rodríguez did not have access to politically sensitive information or confidential information related to public policy matters.

713. Santiago-Rodríguez engaged in functions of a routine nature that required manual competence and efficient performance, not political affiliation.

714. Santiago-Rodríguez' principal duties were to wash the vehicles, perform duties as driver, answer the phones, perform messenger duties, etc.

715. For the reasons set forth in this Complaint, all Defendants were aware that Santiago-Rodríguez is an active member of the NPP. It was of common knowledge in the workplace of the House of Representatives (and by Defendants themselves) that Santiago-Rodríguez avidly supported the NPP during the 2012 elections.

716. Moreover, Defendants also knew or assumed that Santiago-Rodríguez had voted for the NPP and candidates of the NPP for the House of Representatives in the 2012 General Elections.

717. Santiago-Rodríguez actively participated in NPP activities and with NPP candidates.

718. Santiago-Rodríguez drove one of the campaign vehicles for former Speakers Jennifer González and José Aponte.

719. Defendants knew all these facts, as well as others provided throughout this Complaint in connection with the political affiliation, involvement and activism of Santiago-Rodríguez.

720. Santiago-Rodríguez was notified that his appointment would not be renewed after its expiration on January 31, 2013 by way of a letter of the same date signed by co-Defendant González-Calderón.

721. Defendants dismissed Santiago-Rodríguez from his job without evaluating his job performance and efficiency.

722. At no time prior to his dismissal did the Defendants discipline Rodríguez-Marrero or issue a reprimand related to the performance of his duties.

723. Defendants hired someone to substitute for Santiago-Rodríguez after his dismissal. That person is a member and/or supporter of the PDP.

724. The reason that Santiago-Rodríguez was dismissed was because the Defendants knew that he belonged to – or otherwise perceived him to be a member of and/or affiliated to – a political party other than the PDP, specifically the NPP.

725. As a result of this dismissal, Defendants have deprived Santiago-Rodríguez of the income and benefits by which he sustained himself and his family; have subjected him to personal pain and suffering; and have punished him for the exercise of his civil rights by terminating his employment – all because he is not a member of or affiliated to the PDP, and is perceived by Defendants as not having voted for the PDP or its candidates.

Plaintiff Claimy Ramírez-Díaz

726. Plaintiff Claimy Ramírez-Díaz ("Ramírez-Díaz ") is of legal age, a resident of Puerto Rico and a citizen of the United States of America.

727. Ramírez-Díaz started working for the House of Representatives around 2008. Her last appointment at the House of Representatives was as Process Officer.

728. Party affiliation is not an appropriate requirement for Ramírez-Díaz' position. At all times relevant and material hereto Ramírez-Díaz was a public employee whose position was not a public-policy-making position, or one that required her to perform public-policy functions. Ramírez-Díaz did not have access to politically sensitive information or confidential information related to public policy matters.

729. Ramírez-Díaz engaged in functions of a routine nature that required manual competence and efficient performance, not political affiliation.

730. Ramírez-Díaz' principal duties were to correct bills that were presented and that were going to be discussed during the sessions, prepare motions, etc.

731. For the reasons set forth in this Complaint, all Defendants were aware that Ramírez-Díaz is an active member of the NPP. It was of common knowledge in the workplace of the House of Representatives (and by Defendants themselves) that Ramírez-Díaz avidly supported the NPP during the 2012 elections.

732. Moreover, Defendants also knew or assumed that Ramírez-Díaz had voted for the NPP and candidates of the NPP for the House of Representatives in the 2012 General Elections.

733. Ramírez-Díaz actively participated in NPP activities and with NPP candidates.

734. Ramírez-Díaz was a member of the advance teams for former Speakers Jenniffer González and José Aponte, for Jorge Navarro and for Julissa Nolasco.

735. Ramírez-Díaz worked as polling officer representing the NPP.

736. Ramírez-Díaz also was featured in several pictures that were published in newspapers during political activities supporting the NPP.

737. Like some co-workers and the other Plaintiffs, Ramírez-Díaz was seen in photos and videos doing her political work during the 2012 electoral campaign in several media including non-private Facebook accounts.

738. Defendants knew all these facts, as well as others provided throughout this Complaint in connection with the political affiliation, involvement and activism of Ramírez-Díaz.

739. While receiving treatment – in rest – at the Worker's Compensation Fund, Ramírez-Díaz received a letter dated January 31, 2013 signed by co-Defendant González-Calderón notifying that her appointment would be extended until February 5, 2013. Said letter stated that, come February 5, 2013 without additional notice of extension, she should understand that her appointment at the House of Representatives had ended.

740. No further communication was received by Ramírez-Díaz. Therefore, her appointment ended effective February 5, 2013 and was not renewed.

741. Defendants dismissed Ramírez-Díaz from her job without evaluating her job performance and efficiency.

742. At no time prior to her dismissal did the Defendants discipline Ramírez-Díaz or issue a reprimand related to the performance of her duties.

743. Defendants hired someone to substitute for Ramírez-Díaz after her dismissal. That person is a member and/or supporter of the PDP.

744. The reason that Ramírez-Díaz was dismissed was because the Defendants knew that she belonged to – or otherwise perceived her to be a member of and/or affiliated to – a political party other than the PDP, specifically the NPP.

745. As a result of this dismissal, Defendants have deprived Ramírez-Díaz of the income and benefits by which she sustained herself and her family; have subjected her to personal pain and suffering; and have punished her for the exercise of her civil rights by terminating her employment – all because she is not a member of or affiliated to the PDP, and is perceived by Defendants as not having voted for the PDP or its candidates.

CAUSES OF ACTION

I.

FIRST AMENDMENT VIOLATIONS

(POLITICAL DISCRIMINATION AND RETALIATION)

746. Plaintiffs incorporate by reference all previous paragraphs in this Complaint.

747. It is clearly established that the First Amendment of the United States Constitution guarantees the right to freedom of speech, the right to freedom of expression, the right to freedom of association, the right to assemble and to petition the Government for redress, the right to vote and the right to affiliate with a political party of one's choosing. Applicable case law is as clear as it is consistent on this score.

748. It is also well established that government bodies or officials, or individuals acting under color of state law and/or whose acts constitute state action, are forbidden by the First Amendment from discriminating, retaliating, abusing their authority, or taking adverse action against public employees on the basis of political affiliation, unless political loyalty is an appropriate requirement of the employment. Similarly, the First Amendment protects public employees from discrimination, retaliation, being subjected to abuses of authority, or suffering

adverse employment actions in response for engaging in political activity unless political loyalty is an appropriate requirement of the employment.

749. As Defendants have done to Plaintiffs here, subjecting individuals to dismissals, terminations, denial of benefits, refusals to hire, rehire or recall, and/or to acts of harassment and work conditions inferior to the norm, constitute actionable adverse employment actions protected by the First Amendment.

750. Political activity, affiliation, beliefs and the right to vote are also matters of public concern.

751. It is clear that the Plaintiffs' First Amendment speech and activities were a substantial or motivating factor in the adverse employment actions complained of herein. By subjecting Plaintiffs to adverse employment actions and/or retaliating against them on the basis of political affiliation, and/or for engaging in political activity, Defendants deprived Plaintiffs of their First Amendment Rights.

752. Defendants' actions Plaintiffs have caused a chilling effect on Plaintiffs' First Amendment rights and their exercise of First Amendment protected activity.

II.

VIOLATIONS TO CONSTITUTION AND LAWS OF THE COMMONWEALTH OF PUERTO RICO

753. Plaintiffs incorporate by reference all previous paragraphs in this Complaint.

754. Defendants' actions also constitute a violation of Plaintiffs' rights secured by Article II, Sections 1, 2, 4, 6 and 7 of the Puerto Rico Constitution.

755. Defendants' actions also constitute violations of Article 1802 and 1803 of the Civil Code, §5141-5142 of Title 31.

PRAYER FOR RELIEF

WHEREFORE, Plaintiffs request the following relief, jointly and severally against all Defendants:

1. That this Court determine and declare that the actions by all Defendants were in violation of the Constitution and laws of the United States and of Puerto Rico;
2. Compensatory damages and punitive damages in excess of \$54,000,000.00, comprised of the following amounts:
 - a. An amount in excess of \$1,000,000.00 for each Plaintiff, for a total of \$35,000,000.00 in compensatory damages for the harm done to the Plaintiffs due to the actions taken against them and/or their spouses;
 - b. Punitive damages in excess of \$500,000.00 for each plaintiff, for a total of \$17,500,000.00, due to the malicious and wanton nature of the violations alleged herein.
3. Equitable relief in the form of a permanent injunction ordering Defendants to reinstate Plaintiffs to their positions, with all corresponding privileges and benefits, and ordering Defendants to refrain from further engaging in adverse employment action on the basis of political affiliations and beliefs.
4. Attorneys' fees, costs and litigation expenses incurred in connection to this action pursuant to, *inter alia*, 42 U.S.C. §1988, and other applicable statutes.
5. All applicable interests, including pre- and post- judgment interest.
6. Jury Trial is demanded.
7. That the Court retain jurisdiction over this action in order to ensure compliance with any decree issued by this court;

8. Any such other and further relief as the Court may deem just and proper.

Respectfully submitted, this 5th day of December, 2013.

Attorneys for Plaintiffs

ALB Plaza, Suite 400
16 Las Cumbres Ave. (Road 199)
Guaynabo, P.R. 00969
Tel 787-474-5447
Fax 787-474-5451

/s/ Iván M. Castro-Ortiz
IVÁN M. CASTRO-ORTIZ
USDCPR No. 214703
Email – icastro@alblegal.net

/s/ Sheila Torres-Delgado
SHEILA TORRES-DELGADO
USDCPR No. 222706
Email – storres@alblegal.net