

JLS

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA

UNITED STATES EQUAL EMPLOYMENT)
OPPORTUNITY COMMISSION,)

Plaintiff,)

vs.)

SERVICE CASTER CORPORATION,)

Defendant.)

CIVIL ACTION NO.

COMPLAINT

JURY TRIAL DEMANDED

19

4525

NATURE OF THE ACTION

This is an action under Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 and Title I of the Civil Rights Act of 1991, each as amended, to correct unlawful employment practices on the bases of national origin (Puerto Rican), religion (Pentecostal), and retaliation and to provide appropriate relief to a class of workers who were adversely affected by such practices. As alleged with greater particularity below, Defendant violated Title VII when it discriminated against Charging Parties Vicente Sepulveda, Hiram Santana, and Fredymar Perez by subjecting them to a hostile work environment and disparate treatment because of their national origin and religion, and unlawfully retaliated against them.

JURISDICTION AND VENUE

1. Jurisdiction of this Court is invoked pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §§ 451, 1331, 1337, 1343, and 1345. This action is authorized and instituted pursuant to Section 706(f)(1) and (3) of Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, as amended, 42 U.S.C. § 2000e-5(f)(1) and (3) ("Title VII") and pursuant to Section 102 of the Civil Rights Act of 1991, 42 U.S.C. § 1981a.

2. The employment practices alleged to be unlawful were committed within the jurisdiction of the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania.

PARTIES

3. Plaintiff, the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission (the “Commission”), is the agency of the United States of America charged with the administration, interpretation, and enforcement of Title VII and is expressly authorized to bring this action by Sections 706(f)(1) and (3) of Title VII, 42 U.S.C. §§ 2000e-5(f)(1) and (3).

4. At all relevant times, Defendant, Service Caster Corporation, a Pennsylvania corporation headquartered in West Reading, Pennsylvania, has been doing business in West Reading, Pennsylvania, and continuously has had at least 15 employees.

5. At all relevant times, Defendant continuously has been an employer engaged in an industry affecting commerce under Sections 701(b), (g), and (h) of Title VII, 42 U.S.C. §§ 2000e(b), (g), and (h).

6. Defendant is a caster supplier that manufactures and sells over 40,000 different combinations of casters and wheels at its plant in West Reading, Pennsylvania.

ADMINISTRATIVE PROCEDURES

7. More than thirty days prior to the institution of this lawsuit, Charging Parties Vicente Sepulveda, Hiram Santana, and Fredymar Perez filed charges of discrimination that were dual-filed with the Commission alleging violations of Title VII by Defendant.

8. On September 24, 2018, the Commission issued to Defendant Letters of Determination and, on August 28, 2019, the agency issued Amended Letters of Determination finding reasonable cause to believe that Title VII was violated and inviting Defendant to join

with the Commission in informal methods of conciliation to endeavor to eliminate the unlawful employment practices and provide appropriate relief.

9. The Commission engaged in communications with Defendant to provide Defendant the opportunity to remedy the discriminatory practices described in the Letters of Determination.

10. The Commission was unable to secure from Defendant a conciliation agreement acceptable to the Commission.

11. On September 11, 2019, the Commission issued to Defendant Notices of Failure of Conciliation advising Defendant that the Commission was unable to secure from Defendant a conciliation agreement acceptable to the Commission.

12. All conditions precedent to the institution of this lawsuit have been fulfilled.

STATEMENT OF CLAIM

13. Since at least 2015, Defendant engaged in unlawful employment practices in violation of Section 703(a) of Title VII, 42 U.S.C. § 2000e-2(a), by subjecting Charging Parties to a hostile work environment and disparate treatment because of national origin and religion. These unlawful practices include, but are not limited to, the following:

- a. In or about February 2014, Defendant hired Jenry Arias as an assembler.
- b. Arias is of Colombian national origin and his religion is Roman Catholic.
- c. In or about September 2014, Defendant promoted Jenry Arias to Plant Manager.
- d. As Plant Manager, Arias was responsible for managing plant personnel, including assemblers and assembly line supervisors.

e. As Plant Manager, Arias had responsibility for, among other things, hiring, training, selecting and managing work assignments, managing time and attendance, denying or granting leaves of absence, transferring, disciplining, and firing assemblers and assembly line supervisors.

f. As Plant Manager, Arias reported to and was directly supervised by Defendant's President and owner, Ronald Manz.

g. Charging Parties Sepulveda, Santana, and Perez are of Puerto Rican national origin and they are Pentecostal.

h. In August 2015, Charging Party Sepulveda began performing work for Defendant as an assembler. In June 2016, Sepulveda began working for Defendant as an assembly line supervisor and he held that position until his termination in March, 2018.

i. In June 2017, Charging Party Santana began performing work for Defendant as an assembler and he held that position until the termination of his employment and/or assignment in November, 2017.

j. In June 2017, Charging Party Perez began performing work for Defendant as an assembler and he held that position until the termination of his employment and/or assignment in February, 2018.

k. During the course of their employment, Arias routinely subjected Charging Parties to an unlawful hostile work environment based on national origin and religion, by subjecting them to offensive and unwelcome derogatory remarks about persons of Puerto Rican national origin, including but not limited to the following: that they are "filthy," drug-addicted, welfare recipients; that they are "lazy" and do not like to work; that when they move into a community they devalue it and render it "bad" and undesirable; that they are so

undesirable and worthless that they “deserved” to experience the devastating effects of hurricanes, such as Hurricane Maria; and that Puerto Rican males come from and create dysfunctional families. Additionally, Arias subjected them to offensive and unwelcome derogatory remarks about Pentecostal persons, including but not limited to the following: that Pentecostalism is a disgusting “cult,” whose followers “talk shit” about the Virgin Mary who they believe was “fucking Joseph”; referring to his own religion, Catholicism, as the one “true” religion; and falsely accusing Charging Parties of talking about religion in the workplace while allowing other non-Pentecostal employees/workers to engage in religious discussions; and other adverse action taken against Charging Parties.

1. The hostile work environment culminated in tangible employment action against Charging Parties, such as, for example, suspension without pay, reduced hours, reduced assignments, denial of superior assignments, reduced responsibilities, denial of overtime, and termination of employment or assignment.

m. Defendant subjected Charging Parties to disparate treatment based on national origin and religion, such as, for example, delayed responses to leave requests, suspension without pay, reduced hours, reduced assignments, denial of superior assignments, exclusion from meetings, reduced responsibilities, denial of overtime, and termination of employment or assignment.

14. Since at least 2015, Defendant engaged in unlawful retaliation in violation of Section 704(a) of Title VII, 42 U.S.C. § 2000e-3(a).

a. Charging Parties engaged in protected activities when they, for example: opposed or complained about the national origin and religious harassment and disparate treatment specified in Paragraph 13 above, including, but not limited to, telling Arias that they

did not like what he was saying about their national origin or religion and asking him to stop or otherwise showing that they did not welcome his comments and actions and complaining to Manz; participated in an employment discrimination proceeding by filing charges of discrimination; and associated with others who had engaged in protected activity.

b. Defendant unlawfully retaliated against Charging Parties because they engaged in protected activity by taking action that a reasonable worker/employee would find materially adverse or that would dissuade a reasonable worker/employee from making or supporting a charge of discrimination, including, but not limited to, continued harassment; excluding from meetings and otherwise withholding production information; criticizing, threatening, and intimidating them for filing charges; denying overtime; reducing work hours; reducing pay; denying superior assignments; coercing them into signing documents that they did not understand or did not agree with; and termination of employment or assignment.

15. The effect of the practices complained of in Paragraphs 13 and 14 above has been to deprive Charging Parties of equal employment opportunities and otherwise adversely affect their status as an employee because of their national origin (Puerto Rican), religion (Pentecostal), and in retaliation all in violation of Title VII.

16. The unlawful employment practices complained of in Paragraphs 13 and 14 above were intentional.

17. The unlawful employment practices complained of in Paragraphs 13 and 14 above were done with malice or with reckless indifference to the federally protected rights of Charging Parties.

18. Defendant is liable for the unlawful employment practices complained of in Paragraphs 13 and 14 above as an employer as defined by the applicable law or, in the alternative, as a third-party that interfered with an existing employment relationship.

PRAYER FOR RELIEF

Wherefore, the Commission respectfully requests that this Court:

A. Grant a permanent injunction enjoining Defendant, its officers, agents, servants, employees, attorneys, and all persons in active concert or participation with it, from engaging in national origin and religious harassment and retaliation.

B. Order Defendant to institute and carry out policies, practices, and programs which provide equal employment opportunities for Puerto Ricans and Pentecostals, and those who have availed themselves of Title VII protected activities and that eradicate the effects of its past and present unlawful employment practices.

C. Order Defendant to make whole Charging Parties by providing appropriate backpay with prejudgment interest, in amounts to be determined at trial, and other affirmative relief necessary to eradicate the effects of its unlawful employment practices, including, but not limited to, reinstatement and reinstatement.

D. Order Defendant to make whole Charging Parties by providing compensation for past and future pecuniary losses resulting from the unlawful employment practices described above, in amounts to be determined at trial.

E. Order Defendant to make whole Charging Parties by providing compensation for past and future nonpecuniary losses resulting from the unlawful practices described above, in amounts to be determined at trial.

- F. Order Defendant to pay punitive damages for its malicious and reckless conduct, as described in paragraphs above, in amounts to be determined at trial.
- G. Grant such further relief as the Court deems necessary and proper in the public interest.
- H. Award the Commission its costs of this action.

JURY TRIAL DEMAND

The Commission requests a jury trial on all questions of fact raised by its Complaint.

Respectfully submitted,

U.S. EQUAL EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITY
COMMISSION
Washington, D.C.

SHARON FAST GUSTAFSON
General Counsel

GWENDOLYN Y. REAMS
Associate General Counsel



DEBRA LAWRENCE
Regional Attorney, Philadelphia District Office



KATE NORTHRUP
Supervisory Trial Attorney, Baltimore Field Office
kate.northrup@eeoc.gov

U.S. EQUAL EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITY
COMMISSION
Baltimore Field Office
George H. Fallon Federal Building
31 Hopkins Plaza, Suite 1432
Baltimore, MD 21201
Tel. (410) 209-2722



MELANIE M. PETERSON
Senior Trial Attorney, Philadelphia District Office

melanie.peterson@eeoc.gov
EEOC Philadelphia District Office
801 Market Street, Suite 1300
Philadelphia, PA 19107-3127
Tel. (267) 589-9759

CIVIL COVER SHEET

The JS 44 civil cover sheet and the information contained herein neither replace nor supplement the filing and service of pleadings or other papers as required by law, except as provided by local rules of court. This form, approved by the Judicial Conference of the United States in September 1974, is required for the use of the Clerk of Court for the purpose of initiating the civil docket sheet. (SEE INSTRUCTIONS ON NEXT PAGE OF THIS FORM.)

I. (a) PLAINTIFFS

U.S. EEOC

DEFENDANTS

19 4525

Service Caster Corporation

(b) County of Residence of First Listed Plaintiff

(EXCEPT IN U.S. PLAINTIFF CASES)

Ala

County of Residence of First Listed Defendant

(IN U.S. PLAINTIFF CASES ONLY)

NOTE: IN LAND CONDEMNATION CASES, USE THE LOCATION OF THE TRACT OF LAND INVOLVED.

Attorneys (If Known)

(c) Attorneys (Firm Name, Address, and Telephone Number)

Melanie M. Peterson, Sr. Trial Attorney, U.S. EEOC, 801 Market Street, Philadelphia, PA 19107

II. BASIS OF JURISDICTION (Place an "X" in One Box Only)

- 1 U.S. Government Plaintiff
2 U.S. Government Defendant
3 Federal Question (U.S. Government Not a Party)
4 Diversity (Indicate Citizenship of Parties in Item III)

III. CITIZENSHIP OF PRINCIPAL PARTIES (Place an "X" in One Box for Plaintiff and One Box for Defendant)

- Citizen of This State
Citizen of Another State
Citizen or Subject of a Foreign Country
Incorporated or Principal Place of Business In This State
Incorporated and Principal Place of Business In Another State
Foreign Nation

IV. NATURE OF SUIT (Place an "X" in One Box Only)

Table with columns: CONTRACT, REAL PROPERTY, TORTS, CIVIL RIGHTS, PRISONER PETITIONS, FORFEITURE/PENALTY, LABOR, IMMIGRATION, BANKRUPTCY, SOCIAL SECURITY, FEDERAL TAX SUITS, OTHER STATUTES.

V. ORIGIN (Place an "X" in One Box Only)

- 1 Original Proceeding
2 Removed from State Court
3 Remanded from Appellate Court
4 Reinstated or Reopened
5 Transferred from Another District (specify)
6 Multidistrict Litigation - Transfer
8 Multidistrict Litigation - Direct File

VI. CAUSE OF ACTION

Cite the U.S. Civil Statute under which you are filing (Do not cite jurisdictional statutes unless diversity): Title VII, 42 U.S.C. § 2000e-2(a) and 2000e-3(a)
Brief description of cause: National origin and religious harassment and disparate treatment and retaliation under Title VII

VII. REQUESTED IN COMPLAINT:

CHECK IF THIS IS A CLASS ACTION DEMAND \$ CHECK YES only if demanded in complaint: JURY DEMAND: Yes No

VIII. RELATED CASE(S) IF ANY

(See instructions): JUDGE DOCKET NUMBER SEP 30 2019

DATE 09/30/2019 SIGNATURE OF ATTORNEY OF RECORD /s/Melanie M. Peterson

FOR OFFICE USE ONLY RECEIPT # AMOUNT APPLYING IFP JUDGE MAG. JUDGE

INSTRUCTIONS FOR ATTORNEYS COMPLETING CIVIL COVER SHEET FORM JS 44

Authority For Civil Cover Sheet

The JS 44 civil cover sheet and the information contained herein neither replaces nor supplements the filings and service of pleading or other papers as required by law, except as provided by local rules of court. This form, approved by the Judicial Conference of the United States in September 1974, is required for the use of the Clerk of Court for the purpose of initiating the civil docket sheet. Consequently, a civil cover sheet is submitted to the Clerk of Court for each civil complaint filed. The attorney filing a case should complete the form as follows:

- I.(a) **Plaintiffs-Defendants.** Enter names (last, first, middle initial) of plaintiff and defendant. If the plaintiff or defendant is a government agency, use only the full name or standard abbreviations. If the plaintiff or defendant is an official within a government agency, identify first the agency and then the official, giving both name and title.
 - (b) **County of Residence.** For each civil case filed, except U.S. plaintiff cases, enter the name of the county where the first listed plaintiff resides at the time of filing. In U.S. plaintiff cases, enter the name of the county in which the first listed defendant resides at the time of filing. (NOTE: In land condemnation cases, the county of residence of the "defendant" is the location of the tract of land involved.)
 - (c) **Attorneys.** Enter the firm name, address, telephone number, and attorney of record. If there are several attorneys, list them on an attachment, noting in this section "(see attachment)".
- II. **Jurisdiction.** The basis of jurisdiction is set forth under Rule 8(a), F.R.Cv.P., which requires that jurisdictions be shown in pleadings. Place an "X" in one of the boxes. If there is more than one basis of jurisdiction, precedence is given in the order shown below.
- United States plaintiff. (1) Jurisdiction based on 28 U.S.C. 1345 and 1348. Suits by agencies and officers of the United States are included here.
 - United States defendant. (2) When the plaintiff is suing the United States, its officers or agencies, place an "X" in this box.
 - Federal question. (3) This refers to suits under 28 U.S.C. 1331, where jurisdiction arises under the Constitution of the United States, an amendment to the Constitution, an act of Congress or a treaty of the United States. In cases where the U.S. is a party, the U.S. plaintiff or defendant code takes precedence, and box 1 or 2 should be marked.
 - Diversity of citizenship. (4) This refers to suits under 28 U.S.C. 1332, where parties are citizens of different states. When Box 4 is checked, the citizenship of the different parties must be checked. (See Section III below; **NOTE: federal question actions take precedence over diversity cases.**)
- III. **Residence (citizenship) of Principal Parties.** This section of the JS 44 is to be completed if diversity of citizenship was indicated above. Mark this section for each principal party.
- IV. **Nature of Suit.** Place an "X" in the appropriate box. If there are multiple nature of suit codes associated with the case, pick the nature of suit code that is most applicable. Click here for: [Nature of Suit Code Descriptions](#).
- V. **Origin.** Place an "X" in one of the seven boxes.
- Original Proceedings. (1) Cases which originate in the United States district courts.
 - Removed from State Court. (2) Proceedings initiated in state courts may be removed to the district courts under Title 28 U.S.C., Section 1441.
 - Remanded from Appellate Court. (3) Check this box for cases remanded to the district court for further action. Use the date of remand as the filing date.
 - Reinstated or Reopened. (4) Check this box for cases reinstated or reopened in the district court. Use the reopening date as the filing date.
 - Transferred from Another District. (5) For cases transferred under Title 28 U.S.C. Section 1404(a). Do not use this for within district transfers or multidistrict litigation transfers.
 - Multidistrict Litigation – Transfer. (6) Check this box when a multidistrict case is transferred into the district under authority of Title 28 U.S.C. Section 1407.
 - Multidistrict Litigation – Direct File. (8) Check this box when a multidistrict case is filed in the same district as the Master MDL docket. **PLEASE NOTE THAT THERE IS NOT AN ORIGIN CODE 7.** Origin Code 7 was used for historical records and is no longer relevant due to changes in statute.
- VI. **Cause of Action.** Report the civil statute directly related to the cause of action and give a brief description of the cause. **Do not cite jurisdictional statutes unless diversity.** Example: U.S. Civil Statute: 47 USC 553 Brief Description: Unauthorized reception of cable service
- VII. **Requested in Complaint.** Class Action. Place an "X" in this box if you are filing a class action under Rule 23, F.R.Cv.P.
- Demand. In this space enter the actual dollar amount being demanded or indicate other demand, such as a preliminary injunction.
 - Jury Demand. Check the appropriate box to indicate whether or not a jury is being demanded.
- VIII. **Related Cases.** This section of the JS 44 is used to reference related pending cases, if any. If there are related pending cases, insert the docket numbers and the corresponding judge names for such cases.

Date and Attorney Signature. Date and sign the civil cover sheet.

JLS

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA

19

4525

DESIGNATION FORM

(to be used by counsel or pro se plaintiff to indicate the category of the case for the purpose of assignment to the appropriate calendar)

Address of Plaintiff: 801 Market Street, Suite 1300, Philadelphia, PA 19107
Address of Defendant: Riverfront Business Center, 9 South First Avenue, West Reading, PA 19611
Place of Accident, Incident or Transaction: Same - plant

RELATED CASE, IF ANY:

Case Number: N/A Judge: AIR Date Terminated: _____

Civil cases are deemed related when Yes is answered to any of the following questions:

- 1. Is this case related to property included in an earlier numbered suit pending or within one year previously terminated action in this court? Yes No
- 2. Does this case involve the same issue of fact or grow out of the same transaction as a prior suit pending or within one year previously terminated action in this court? Yes No
- 3. Does this case involve the validity or infringement of a patent already in suit or any earlier numbered case pending or within one year previously terminated action of this court? Yes No
- 4. Is this case a second or successive habeas corpus, social security appeal, or pro se civil rights case filed by the same individual? Yes No

I certify that, to my knowledge, the within case is / is not related to any case now pending or within one year previously terminated action in this court except as noted above.

DATE: 9/30/2019 Melanie M. Peterson NY 2958163
Attorney-at-Law / Pro Se Plaintiff Attorney I.D. # (if applicable)

CIVIL: (Place a ✓ in one category only)

A. Federal Question Cases:

- 1. Indemnity Contract, Marine Contract, and All Other Contracts
- 2. FELA
- 3. Jones Act-Personal Injury
- 4. Antitrust
- 5. Patent
- 6. Labor-Management Relations
- 7. Civil Rights
- 8. Habeas Corpus
- 9. Securities Act(s) Cases
- 10. Social Security Review Cases
- 11. All other Federal Question Cases (Please specify): _____

B. Diversity Jurisdiction Cases:

- 1. Insurance Contract and Other Contracts
- 2. Airplane Personal Injury
- 3. Assault, Defamation
- 4. Marine Personal Injury
- 5. Motor Vehicle Personal Injury
- 6. Other Personal Injury (Please specify): _____
- 7. Products Liability
- 8. Products Liability - Asbestos
- 9. All other Diversity Cases (Please specify): _____

ARBITRATION CERTIFICATION

(The effect of this certification is to remove the case from eligibility for arbitration.)

I, Melanie M. Peterson, counsel of record or pro se plaintiff, do hereby certify:

- Pursuant to Local Civil Rule 53.2, § 3(c) (2), that to the best of my knowledge and belief, the damages recoverable in this civil action case exceed the sum of \$150,000.00 exclusive of interest and costs:
- Relief other than monetary damages is sought.

DATE: 09/30/2019 Melanie M. Peterson SEP 30 2019
Attorney-at-Law / Pro Se Plaintiff Attorney I.D. # (if applicable) NY 2958163

NOTE: A trial de novo will be a trial by jury only if there has been compliance with F.R.C.P. 38.

JLS

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA

CASE MANAGEMENT TRACK DESIGNATION FORM

U.S. EEOC

v.
Service Center Corp.

: AIR

CIVIL ACTION

NO. 19 4525

In accordance with the Civil Justice Expense and Delay Reduction Plan of this court, counsel for plaintiff shall complete a Case Management Track Designation Form in all civil cases at the time of filing the complaint and serve a copy on all defendants. (See § 1:03 of the plan set forth on the reverse side of this form.) In the event that a defendant does not agree with the plaintiff regarding said designation, that defendant shall, with its first appearance, submit to the clerk of court and serve on the plaintiff and all other parties, a Case Management Track Designation Form specifying the track to which that defendant believes the case should be assigned.

SELECT ONE OF THE FOLLOWING CASE MANAGEMENT TRACKS:

- (a) Habeas Corpus – Cases brought under 28 U.S.C. § 2241 through § 2255. ()
- (b) Social Security – Cases requesting review of a decision of the Secretary of Health and Human Services denying plaintiff Social Security Benefits. ()
- (c) Arbitration – Cases required to be designated for arbitration under Local Civil Rule 53.2. ()
- (d) Asbestos – Cases involving claims for personal injury or property damage from exposure to asbestos. ()
- (e) Special Management – Cases that do not fall into tracks (a) through (d) that are commonly referred to as complex and that need special or intense management by the court. (See reverse side of this form for a detailed explanation of special management cases.) ()
- (f) Standard Management – Cases that do not fall into any one of the other tracks.

<u>9/30/2019</u>	<u>Melanie M. Peterson</u>	<u>EEOC</u>
Date	Attorney-at-law	Attorney for
<u>267-589-9759</u>	<u>N/A</u>	<u>Melanie.Peterson@eoc.gov</u>
Telephone	FAX Number	E-Mail Address

(Civ. 660) 10/02

SEP 30 2019

**Civil Justice Expense and Delay Reduction Plan
Section 1:03 - Assignment to a Management Track**

- (a) The clerk of court will assign cases to tracks (a) through (d) based on the initial pleading.
- (b) In all cases not appropriate for assignment by the clerk of court to tracks (a) through (d), the plaintiff shall submit to the clerk of court and serve with the complaint on all defendants a case management track designation form specifying that the plaintiff believes the case requires Standard Management or Special Management. In the event that a defendant does not agree with the plaintiff regarding said designation, that defendant shall, with its first appearance, submit to the clerk of court and serve on the plaintiff and all other parties, a case management track designation form specifying the track to which that defendant believes the case should be assigned.
- (c) The court may, on its own initiative or upon the request of any party, change the track assignment of any case at any time.
- (d) Nothing in this Plan is intended to abrogate or limit a judicial officer's authority in any case pending before that judicial officer, to direct pretrial and trial proceedings that are more stringent than those of the Plan and that are designed to accomplish cost and delay reduction.
- (e) Nothing in this Plan is intended to supersede Local Civil Rules 40.1 and 72.1, or the procedure for random assignment of Habeas Corpus and Social Security cases referred to magistrate judges of the court.

**SPECIAL MANAGEMENT CASE ASSIGNMENTS
(See §1.02 (e) Management Track Definitions of the
Civil Justice Expense and Delay Reduction Plan)**

Special Management cases will usually include that class of cases commonly referred to as "complex litigation" as that term has been used in the Manuals for Complex Litigation. The first manual was prepared in 1969 and the Manual for Complex Litigation Second, MCL 2d was prepared in 1985. This term is intended to include cases that present unusual problems and require extraordinary treatment. See §0.1 of the first manual. Cases may require special or intense management by the court due to one or more of the following factors: (1) large number of parties; (2) large number of claims or defenses; (3) complex factual issues; (4) large volume of evidence; (5) problems locating or preserving evidence; (6) extensive discovery; (7) exceptionally long time needed to prepare for disposition; (8) decision needed within an exceptionally short time; and (9) need to decide preliminary issues before final disposition. It may include two or more related cases. Complex litigation typically includes such cases as antitrust cases; cases involving a large number of parties or an unincorporated association of large membership; cases involving requests for injunctive relief affecting the operation of large business entities; patent cases; copyright and trademark cases; common disaster cases such as those arising from aircraft crashes or marine disasters; actions brought by individual stockholders; stockholder's derivative and stockholder's representative actions; class actions or potential class actions; and other civil (and criminal) cases involving unusual multiplicity or complexity of factual issues. See §0.22 of the first Manual for Complex Litigation and Manual for Complex Litigation Second, Chapter 33.