

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF
CALIFORNIA

Gammon v. Granholm

Gammon · No. 24-cv-05001-JSW · Decided March 4, 2025

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the Northern District of California partially granted and partially denied motions to dismiss claims brought by Stuart Gammon against federal defendants and Lawrence Livermore National Security, LLC. The court dismissed claims involving disability discrimination, sex discrimination, race discrimination, hostile work environment, and whistleblower retaliation, while denying without prejudice LLNS’s exhaustion challenge to the race-discrimination claim. The court granted leave to amend and set deadlines for an amended complaint and case management conference.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the Northern District of California
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Jeffrey S. White
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the Northern District of California
DECIDED	March 4, 2025
DOCKET	24-cv-05001-JSW
DISPOSITION	other
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	Plaintiff brought federal employment-discrimination, retaliation, whistleblower, and related state-law claims. The Federal Defendants and Lawrence Livermore National Security, LLC moved to dismiss under Federal Rules of Civil Procedure 12(b)(1) and 12(b)(6).
STANDARD OF REVIEW	For a facial Rule 12(b)(1) challenge, the court accepts the complaint's factual allegations as true and construes them in the plaintiff's favor; for a factual jurisdictional attack, the court may consider affidavits and other evidence. On a Rule 12(b)(6) motion, the court accepts well-pleaded allegations as true, construes them in the plaintiff's favor, and asks whether the complaint states a facially plausible claim under Rules 8(a)(2) and 12(b)(6).
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	unpublished district court order; precedential status unknown
PARTIES	Stuart Gammon v. Chris Wright, Secretary, U.S. Department of Energy, National Nuclear Security Administration, Lawrence

TOPICS

[motions to dismiss](#) [subject matter jurisdiction](#) [employment discrimination](#) [ada / disability](#) [whistleblower](#)

PRACTICE AREAS

[employment law](#) [civil rights](#) [federal employment law](#) [civil procedure](#) [disability discrimination](#)
[whistleblower](#)

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether the Federal Defendants were subject to suit where Gammon alleged only that LLNS was a federal contractor and that DOE and NNSA exercised certain control over LLNS's work.
2. Whether Gammon plausibly alleged that the Federal Defendants were his employer or joint employers for purposes of Title VII, the Rehabilitation Act, the ADEA, and the Whistleblower Protection Act.
3. Whether Gammon plausibly alleged disability discrimination by asserting that LLNS required a fitness-for-duty examination.
4. Whether Gammon plausibly alleged sex discrimination under California law.
5. Whether Gammon exhausted his administrative remedies for his FEHA race-discrimination claim.
6. Whether Gammon plausibly alleged race discrimination under FEHA.
7. Whether Gammon plausibly alleged a hostile work environment.
8. Whether Gammon plausibly alleged retaliation under California Labor Code section 1102.5(b).
9. Whether leave to amend should be granted.

HOLDINGS

1. The court dismissed Gammon's claims against the Federal Defendants because he failed to allege facts showing that he was a federal employee or that the Federal Defendants were his joint employers, and therefore failed to establish a waiver of sovereign immunity.
2. Gammon failed to state a disability-discrimination claim against LLNS because he did not allege facts showing that the fitness-for-duty examination materially affected the terms, conditions, or privileges of his employment.
3. Gammon failed to state a sex-discrimination claim against LLNS because he did not adequately allege a materially adverse employment action caused by sex or facts showing that similarly situated female employees received more favorable treatment.
4. The court denied LLNS's motion to dismiss the FEHA race-discrimination claim on exhaustion grounds without prejudice to renewal in a later motion or at summary judgment.
5. Gammon failed to plausibly allege race discrimination because his allegations concerning comparators and tuition reimbursement did not adequately connect differential treatment or an adverse employment

action to race.

6. Gammon failed to state a hostile-work-environment claim because he did not allege facts connecting the challenged conduct to one of his protected characteristics or showing harassment sufficiently severe or pervasive to alter the conditions of employment.
7. Gammon failed to state a retaliation claim under California Labor Code section 1102.5(b) because he did not identify a federal or state law, rule, or regulation that he reasonably believed LLNS's conduct violated.
8. The court granted leave to amend because it could not conclude that amendment would be futile.

KEY QUOTATIONS

“a plaintiff’s obligation to provide the ‘grounds’ of his ‘entitle[ment] to relief’ requires more than labels and conclusions, and a formulaic recitation of the elements of a cause of action will not do.” (at 2)

“A claim has facial plausibility when the plaintiff pleads factual content that allows the court to draw the reasonable inference that the defendant is liable for the misconduct alleged.” (at 2)

“It is now well-settled that an individual can have more than one employer for Title VII purposes.” (at 3)

“Although discrimination and harassment are separate wrongs, they are sometimes closely interrelated, and even overlapping, particularly with regard to proof.” (at 7)

“Gammon has not alleged which – if any – federal or state laws he reasonably believed this conduct violated.” (at 8)

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Stuart Gammon, a mixed-race male over forty with Attention Deficit Disorder, had worked as an SES chemist for LLNS since 1998. He alleged that LLNS received directions from the Department of Energy and the National Nuclear Security Administration, that DOE approved his security clearance, and that NNSA directed projects and provided funding related to LLNS audits. Gammon alleged discrimination, harassment, retaliation, and whistleblower activity arising from workplace treatment, a fitness-for-duty examination, alleged differential treatment, and reports concerning lithium hydroxide disposal and safety protocols. He filed a complaint with the California Civil Rights Department and received a right-to-sue letter.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Gammon filed a complaint alleging discrimination, hostile work environment, and retaliation claims against the Federal Defendants and LLNS. The court granted the Federal Defendants' motion based on failure to allege facts establishing federal employment or a joint-employment relationship, and granted most of LLNS's motion for failure to plead plausible claims. The court denied LLNS's exhaustion argument as to the race-discrimination claim without prejudice, dismissed that claim on the merits, granted leave to amend, and set a case management conference.

DISPOSITION

CASES CITED

- Federation of African American Contractors v. City of Oakland, 96 F.3d 1204, 1207 (9th Cir. 1996)
- Leite v. Crane Co., 749 F.3d 1117, 1121 (9th Cir. 2014)
- Lazy Y Ranch Ltd. v. Behrens, 546 F.3d 580, 588 (9th Cir. 2008)
- Lee v. City of Los Angeles, 250 F.3d 668, 688-89 (9th Cir. 2001)
- Bell Atlantic Corp. v. Twombly, 550 U.S. 544, 555, 570 (2007)
- Papasan v. Allain, 478 U.S. 265, 286 (1986)
- Ashcroft v. Iqbal, 556 U.S. 662, 678 (2009)
- F.D.I.C. v. Meyer, 510 U.S. 471, 475 (1994)
- Lopez v. Johnson, 333 F.3d 959, 961 (9th Cir. 2003)
- Daniels v. Browner, 63 F.3d 906, 908 (9th Cir. 1995)
- Kerr v. Jewell, 836 F.3d 1048, 1053 (9th Cir. 2016)
- EEOC v. Global Horizons, Inc., 915 F.3d 631, 637-38 (9th Cir. 2019)
- Nationwide Mutual Insurance Co. v. Darden, 503 U.S. 318, 323-24 (1992)
- Zamora v. Security Industry Specialists, Inc., 71 Cal. App. 5th 1, 31 (2021)
- Glynn v. Superior Court, 42 Cal. App. 5th 47, 53 n.1 (2019)
- Santos v. County of Humboldt, No. 22-cv-7485-RMI, 2023 WL 6882748, at *5-*6 (N.D. Cal. Oct. 18, 2023)
- Brooks v. City of San Mateo, 229 F.3d 917, 928 n.2 (9th Cir. 2000)
- Yanowitz v. L'Oreal USA, Inc., 36 Cal. 4th 1028, 1051 (2005)
- Guz v. Bechtel National, Inc., 24 Cal. 4th 317, 355 (2000)
- Miller v. United Airlines, 174 Cal. App. 3d 878, 890 (1985)
- Guzman v. NBA Automotive, Inc., 68 Cal. App. 5th 1109, 1118 (2021)
- Achal v. Gate Gourmet, Inc., 114 F. Supp. 3d 781, 794 (N.D. Cal. 2015)
- B.K.B. v. Maui Police Department, 276 F.3d 1091, 1100 (9th Cir. 2002)
- Fort Bend County, Texas v. Davis, 587 U.S. 541 (2019)
- Roby v. McKesson Corp., 47 Cal. 4th 686, 707 (2009)
- Bailey v. San Francisco District Attorney's Office, 16 Cal. 5th 611, 627 (2024)
- Harris v. Forklift Systems, Inc., 510 U.S. 17, 21 (1993)
- Mueller v. County of Los Angeles, 176 Cal. App. 4th 809, 822 (2009)
- Reddy v. Litton Industries, Inc., 912 F.2d 291, 296 (9th Cir. 1990)
- Cook, Perkiss & Liehe, Inc. v. Northern California Collection Service, Inc., 911 F.2d 242, 246-47 (9th Cir. 1990)

OPINION

Gammon v. Granholm

PER CURIAM.

1 2 3

4 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

5 NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

6 7 STUART GAMMON, Case No. 24-cv-05001-JSW 8 Plaintiff,

ORDER GRANTING, IN PART, AND

9 v. DENYING, IN PART, MOTIONS TO

DISMISS AND SETTING CASE

10 CHRIS WRIGHT, Secretary, U.S. MANAGEMENT CONFERENCE Department of Energy, et
al., Re: Dkt. Nos. 23, 36 11 Defendants. 12 13 Now before the Court are motions to dismiss filed
by (1) Chris Wright, Secretary, U.S. 14 Department of Energy (“DOE”) and the National Nuclear
Security Administration (“NNSA”) 15 (collectively the “Federal Defendants”), and (2) Lawrence
Livermore National Security, LLC 16 (“LLNS”).¹ The Court has considered the parties’ papers,
relevant legal authority, and the record 17 in this case. For the reasons that follow, the Court
HEREBY GRANTS, IN PART, AND 18 DENIES, IN PART, the motions. 19

BACKGROUND

20 Plaintiff Stuart Gammon (“Gammon”) is a mixed race male, over 40 years old, who suffers 21
from Attention Deficit Disorder. (Compl. ¶ 12.) He has worked as an SES.² Chemist at LLNS 22
since July 14, 1998 and alleges that he performed well and received positive performance reviews.
23 (Id. ¶¶ 13, 15.) Gammon alleges that as a federal contractor LLNS “receives directions through
24 NNSA and DOE.” (Id. ¶ 14.) Some of Gammon’s work involves national security related 25
activities, and he alleges that has a security clearance approved by DOE. (Id. ¶¶ 14, 16.) 26 27 1
Secretary Wright is automatically substituted in pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 25(d).
1 On March 13, 2024, Gammon filed a complaint with the California Civil Rights 2 Department
(“CCRD”) alleging harassment based on sex/gender, age, disability, and race, 3 discrimination
based on sex/gender, age, and disability, and retaliation. (Id. ¶ 11; LLNS Req. for 4 Judicial
Notice, Ex. A.)² Gammon received a right to sue letter that same day. (Compl. ¶ 11.) 5 Based on
allegations discussed in more detail below, Gammon asserts claims against the 6 Federal
Defendants for: age discrimination in violation of the Age Discrimination in Employment 7 Act,
disability discrimination in violation of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973; sex and race 8
discrimination and a hostile work environment in violation of Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 9
1964 (“Title VII”); violations of the Whistleblower Protection Act, 5 U.S.C. section 2302(b)(8) 10
(the “WPA claim”). Gammon brings analogous claims against LLNS under California’s Fair 11
Housing and Employment Act (“FEHA”) and California Labor Code section 1102.5.³

12 ANALYSIS

13 A. Applicable Legal Standards. 14 Defendants move to dismiss for lack of subject matter
jurisdiction under Federal Rule of 15 Civil Procedure 12(b)(1). In a facial attack on jurisdiction,

the factual allegations of the complaint 16 are taken as true. *Fed’n of African Am. Contractors v. City of Oakland*, 96 F.3d 1204, 1207 (9th

17 Cir. 1996). A plaintiff is then entitled to have those facts construed in the light most favorable to

18 him. *Id.* In contrast, a factual attack on subject matter jurisdiction occurs when a defendant 19 challenges the actual lack of jurisdiction with affidavits or other evidence. See *Leite v. Crane Co.*, 20 749 F.3d 1117, 1121 (9th Cir. 2014). 21 Defendants also move to dismiss for failure to state a claim under Rule 12(b)(6). Under

22 Rule 12(b)(6), a court’s inquiry generally is limited to the allegations in the complaint, which are

23 accepted as true and construed in the light most favorable to the plaintiff.” *Lazy Y Ranch Ltd. v. 24 Behrens*, 546 F.3d 580, 588 (9th Cir. 2008). However, the Court can consider documents on

25 2 The Court GRANTS the request and takes judicial notice of the existence of the CDR 26 complaint and statements he made in that document but does not take any disputed facts as true.

Lee v. City of Los Angeles, 250 F.3d 668, 688-89 (9th Cir. 2001). 27 1 which the complaint necessarily relies, if a plaintiff does not contest their authenticity. *Lee v. City 2 of Los Angeles*,

250 F.3d 668, 688 (9th Cir. 2001). A court may also take judicial notice of certain 3 facts, including matters of public record. *Id.* at 688-89. 4 Even under the liberal pleading standard of

Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 8(a)(2), “a 5 plaintiff’s obligation to provide the ‘grounds’ of his ‘entitle[ment] to relief’ requires more than 6 labels and conclusions, and a formulaic recitation of the elements of a cause of action will not do.” 7 *Bell Atlantic Corp. v. Twombly*, 550 U.S. 544, 555

(2007) (citing *Papasan v. Allain*, 478 U.S. 265, 8 286 (1986)). Pursuant to *Twombly*, a plaintiff must not merely allege conduct that is conceivable 9 but must instead allege “enough facts to state

a claim to relief that is plausible on its face.” *Id.* at 10 570. “A claim has facial plausibility when the plaintiff pleads factual content that allows the court 11 to draw the reasonable inference that

the defendant is liable for the misconduct alleged.” *Ashcroft 12 v. Iqbal*, 556 U.S. 662, 678 (2009) (citing *Twombly*, 550 U.S. at 556). 13 B. The Court Grants the Federal Defendants’ Motion. 14

The Court lacks jurisdiction over claims against the Federal Government, or its agencies, 15 unless the government has waived sovereign immunity. *F.D.I.C. v. Meyer*, 510 U.S. 471, 475 16 (1994).

Federal Defendants argue that Gammon fails to allege he is a federal employee and, 17 therefore, fails to allege they have waived sovereign immunity. See *Lopez v. Johnson*, 333 F.3d 18 959, 961

(9th Cir. 2003) (Title VII and Rehabilitation Act); *Daniels v. Browner*, 63 F.3d 906, 908 19 (9th Cir. 1995) (ADEA); see also *Kerr v. Jewell*, 836 F.3d 1048, 1053 (9th Cir. 2016) (noting 20 WPA protects federal employees).

21 Gammon makes the conclusory allegation that the Federal Defendants were “[a]t all 22 relevant times” his employer. (Compl. ¶¶ 2-3.) In his opposition,

Gammon clarifies that he 23 alleges that he relies on a theory of joint employment. See *EEOC v. Global Horizons, Inc.*, 915 24 F.3d 631, 637 (9th Cir. 2019) (“It is now well-settled that an individual can have more than one 25 employer for Title VII purposes.”). In that *Global Horizons*,

the court adopted a common law 26 agency test to determine if an entity is a joint employer. *Id.* at 637-38 (citing factors from 27 *Nationwide Mut. Ins. Co v. Darden*, 503 U.S. 318 (2003)). Those factors include: 1 the skill required; the source of the instrumentalities and tools; the location of the work; the duration of the relationship between the 2 parties; whether the hiring party has the right to assign additional projects to the hired party; the extent of the hired party's discretion 3 over when and how long to work; the method of payment; the hired party's role in hiring and paying assistants; whether the work is part 4 of the regular business of the hiring party; whether the hiring party is in business; the provision of employee benefits; and the tax 5 treatment of the hired party. 6 *Darden*, 503 U.S. at 323-24. 7 The only facts Gammon alleges to support a joint employment relationship are: LLNS 8 "receives directions through" the Federal Defendants; clearances are issued by DOE; NNSA is 9 responsible for "directing what projects are needed for the Department of Defense"; and NNSA 10 "provides funds for safety audits and financial audits at LLNS, the outcome of [which] can impact 11 whether or not LLNS is paid." (Compl. ¶ 14.) The Court concludes these facts are insufficient to 12 plead that either Federal Defendant is his employer, joint or otherwise. 13 Accordingly, the Court GRANTS the Federal Defendants' motion.⁴ 14 C. The Court Grants, in Part, and Denies, in Part, LLNS's Motion. 15 1. Disability Discrimination. 16 In order to state a claim for disability discrimination, Gammon must allege he "(1) suffered 17 from a disability or was regarded as suffering from a disability, (2) could perform the essential 18 duties of a job with or without reasonable accommodations, and (3) was subjected to an adverse 19 employment action because of the disability or perceived disability." *Zamora v. Sec. Indus. 20 Specialists, Inc.*, 71 Cal. App. 5th 1, 31 (2021) (quoting *Glynn v. Sup. Ct.*, 42 Cal. App. 5th 47, 53 21 n.1 (2019)). The third element is the only element at issue. 22 According to Gammon, three LLNS management officials required him to undergo a 23 fitness for duty examination, "based on [his] mental health," with the intent to revoke his security 24 25 4 The Federal Defendants also argued that even if Gammon alleged he was a federal employee he failed to sufficiently allege he properly exhausted his Whistleblower Retaliation 26 claim. Gammon did not address that argument in his opposition. The Court does not reach this alternative argument but will require Gammon to address this issue if he files an amended 27 complaint. In addition, because Gammon's federal discrimination and retaliation claims are based on many of the same facts as his state law claims, he must be prepared to remedy the defects 1 clearance. (Compl. ¶ 53.) LLNS argues that a fitness for duty examination was a business 2 necessity that does not qualify as an adverse employment action, relying in part on *Santos v. 3 County of Humboldt*, No. 22-cv-7485-RMI, 2023 WL 6882748, at *5 (N.D. Cal. Oct. 18, 2023). 4 In *Santos*, the plaintiff brought a claim based on the failure to engage in the interactive process and 5 alleged the defendant retaliated against him by requiring a fitness for duty exam. The court 6 reasoned that the fitness for duty exam was a necessary part of that process. It also reasoned that 7 the exam "did not materially impact Plaintiffs employment, which is the lynchpin of adverse 8 employment action analysis." *Id.*, at *6 (citing *Brooks v. City of San Mateo*, 229 F.3d 917, 928 9 n.2 (9th Cir. 2000));

see also *Yanowitz v. L'Oreal USA, Inc.*, 36 Cal. 4th 1028, 1051 (2005) (“[A]n employee must demonstrate that he or she has been subjected to an adverse employment action that materially affects the terms, conditions, or privileges of employment.”). The Court expresses no opinion on whether the request for Gammon to submit to a fitness for duty examination was, as a matter of law, job related and a business necessity. However, Gammon fails to include any facts that suggest it materially affected the terms, conditions, or privileges of his employment with LLNS. By way of example only, he does not allege that his security clearance was revoked or that LLNS disciplined or demoted him. Accordingly, the Court GRANTS LLNS’s motion to dismiss this claim.

2. Sex Discrimination. In order to state a claim for sex discrimination, Gammon must allege facts that he was a member of a protected class, was performing his job satisfactorily, and suffered an adverse employment action because of his sex. See, e.g., *Guz v. Bechtel Nat’l, Inc.*, 24 Cal. 4th 317, 355 (2000). Gammon alleges that “males are not given an opportunity to job share, which was carried out by management with the intent to decrease [his] hours by 50%.” (Compl. ¶ 74.) Gammon neither alleges that he requested the opportunity to job share nor alleges that female employees who were similarly situated to him received that opportunity. Gammon also alleges that female employees were able to report directly to their spouses but male employees were not. Again, Gammon fails to connect those allegations to himself. (Id.) Gammon fails to allege that filling chemicals was unrelated to his job duties and fails to demonstrate how those requests materially impacted the terms and conditions of his employment. Finally, Gammon incorporates allegations relating to the conduct of four female employees who allegedly were aware that Gammon was a victim of domestic violence but fails to provide a nexus to any adverse employment action and their conduct. (Id. ¶ 68.) Accordingly, the Court GRANTS LLNS’s motion to dismiss this claim.

3. Race Discrimination.

a. Exhaustion. A plaintiff must exhaust administrative remedies as a “jurisdictional prerequisite” to bringing a claim for violations of FEHA. *Miller v. United Airlines*, 174 Cal. App. 3d 878, 890 (1985). “The administrative exhaustion requirement is satisfied if FEHA claims in a judicial complaint are like and reasonably related to those in the [CCRD] complaint or likely to be uncovered in the course of a [CCRD] investigation.” *Guzman v. NBA Automotive, Inc.*, 68 Cal.

14 App. 5th 1109, 1118 (2021) (cleaned up).

15 A court should construe FEHA’s exhaustion requirement liberally “to accomplish its purposes, including the resolution of potentially meritorious claims on the merits.” *Achal v. Gate Gourmet, Inc.*, 114 F. Supp. 3d 781, 794 (N.D. Cal. 2015). In order to determine if a claim has been exhausted courts may “consider such factors as the alleged basis of the discrimination, dates of discriminatory acts specified within the charge, perpetrators of discrimination named in the charge, and any locations at which discrimination is alleged to have occurred. ... The crucial element of a charge of discrimination is the factual statement contained therein.” *B.K.B. v. Maui Police Dept.*, 276 F.3d 1091, 1100 (9th Cir. 2002), abrogated on other grounds by *Fort*

Bend Cty., 23 Texas v. Davis, 587 U.S. 541 (2019). 24 Gammon did not cite race as a basis for discrimination, and the complaint he submitted to 25 the CCRD is sparse. (CCRD Complaint ¶ 3.) Gammon argues that he did exhaust his 26 discrimination claim because harassment is a form of discrimination. He also alleges he suffered 27 adverse employment actions because of his race. FEHA treats discrimination and harassment as 1 failed to exhaust his discrimination claim. See, e.g., Roby v. McKesson Corp., 47 Cal. 4th 686, 2 707 (2009) (“Although discrimination and harassment are separate wrongs, they are sometimes 3 closely interrelated, and even overlapping, particularly with regard to proof.”). 4 The Court DENIES LLNS’s motion to dismiss, without prejudice to renewing this 5 argument in a subsequent motion to dismiss or in a motion for summary judgment. 6 b. Elements. 7 To state a claim for racial discrimination, Gammon must allege he was a member of a 8 protected class, was performing his job satisfactorily, and suffered an adverse employment action 9 because of his race. Guz, 24 Cal. 4th at 955. Gammon makes the conclusory allegation that two 10 Caucasian employees and one Asian employee were treated “more favorably than [him], and were 11 not subject to adverse employment actions.” (Compl. ¶ 90.) There are no additional facts from 12 about the alleged adverse actions or about how the comparator employees were treated differently. 13 The Court concludes that these allegations are insufficient to plausibly allege that Gammon was 14 subject to an adverse employment action, or otherwise discriminated against, because of his race. 15 Gammon also alleges that non-white female employees were given opportunities for 16 tuition reimbursement that he did not receive. (Id. ¶ 89.) Although these allegations may be 17 sufficient to allege a claim for discrimination based on sex, the Court concludes they do not 18 plausibly allege differential treatment based on race. 19 Accordingly, the Court GRANTS the motion to dismiss this claim. 20 4. Hostile Work Environment. 21 In order to state a claim for a hostile work environment, Gammon must discriminatory 22 harassment that was “sufficiently severe or pervasive to alter the conditions of [his] employment 23 and create an abusive work environment.” Bailey v. San Francisco Dist. Attorney’s Office, 16 Cal. 24 5th 611, 627 (2024) (cleaned up); see also Harris v. Forklift Sys., Inc., 510 U.S. 17, 21 (1993) 25 (“When the workplace is permeated with discriminatory intimidation, ridicule, and insult, that is 26 sufficiently severe or pervasive to alter the conditions of the victim’s employment and create an 27 abusive working environment, Title VII is violated.”) (emphasis added). Gammon incorporates by 1 unsafe work environment and was subject to a “near physical altercation” with another employee. 2 (Compl. ¶¶ 102-106.) However, he does not include facts to create a nexus to any of his allegedly 3 protected traits and the conduct at issue. 4 Accordingly, the GRANTS LLNS’s motion to dismiss this claim. 5 5. Whistleblower Retaliation. 6 Gammon’s final claim against LLNS is for retaliation in violation of California Labor 7 Code section 1102.5(b), which prohibits retaliation if an employee discloses information they 8 reasonably believe “violate[s] a federal or state law, rule or regulation.” Cal. Lab. Code § 9 1102.5(b); see also Mueller v. Cty. of Los Angeles, 176 Cal. App. 4th 809, 822 (2009). Gammon 10 alleges that he reported issues relating to the dumping of Lithium Hydroxide and alleged 11

violations of LLNS's Laboratory Waste Management guidelines and violated "safety protocols 12 and policy." (Compl. ¶¶ 21-22; see also id. ¶¶ 24-26, 115-117.) Gammon has not alleged which – 13 if any – federal or state laws he reasonably believed this conduct violated. 14 Accordingly, the Court GRANTS LLNS's motion to dismiss this claim. 15 D. The Court Grants Leave to Amend. 16 A court generally should grant a plaintiff leave to amend. See, e.g., Reddy v. Litton Indus., 17 Inc., 912 F.2d 291, 296 (9th Cir. 1990); Cook, Perkiss & Liehe, Inc. v. N. Cal. Collection Serv., 18 Inc., 911 F.2d 242, 246-47 (9th Cir. 1990). The Court cannot say amendment would be futile in 19 this case. Accordingly, if Gammon can do so in accordance with his obligations under Federal 20 Rule of Civil Procedure 11, he may file an amended complaint.

21 CONCLUSION

22 For the foregoing reasons, the Court GRANTS, IN PART, AND DENIES, IN PART, 23 Defendants' motions to dismiss. If Gammon decides to amend his claims, he shall file an 24 amended complaint by no later than March 25, 2025. Defendants shall answer or otherwise 25 respond by April 15, 2025. 26 // 27 //] The Court FURTHER ORDERS to appear for an initial case management conference on 2 |} May 2, 2025 at 11:00 a.m. The parties' joint case management conference statement shall be due 3 || by April 25, 2025. 4 IT IS SO ORDERED. a) 5 || Dated: March 4, 2025 (| f Nt } 6 \ etfs

JEFFREY ,S./WHIT

7 United Syfet Distrift Judge 8 i 10 1] as 12 13 «14 16 17 Oo Z 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28