

Daniel Garrison SB# 036598
Kevin Garrison SB# 011860
GARRISON LAW FIRM
7972 W. Thunderbird Road, Suite 107
Peoria, AZ 85381
Telephone: (623) 915-1100
Fax: (623) 435-8676
kevin@garrisonlawfirm.com
daniel@garrisonlawfirm.com
Attorneys for Plaintiff

Peter A. Stanford (admitted *pro*
hac vice)
E.D.W.I. Bar No. 1004936
Annie T. Stanford (admitted *pro*
hac vice)
E.D.W.I. Bar No. 1137501
STANFORD LAW OFFICES
225 East Fairmount Avenue
Milwaukee, WI 53217
Phone: (414) 276-8269
Fax: (414) 276-2868
PAS@StanfordLawOffices.com
ATS@StanfordLawOffices.com
Attorneys for Plaintiff

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF ARIZONA**

CRAIG WEBSTER;	)	Case No.
	)	CV-25-08199-PCT-DWL
Plaintiff,	)	
	)	AMENDED COMPLAINT
v.	)	
	)	<u>JURY TRIAL REQUESTED</u>
PHI HEALTH, LLC d/b/a PHI AIR	)	
MEDICAL;	)	
	)	
Defendants	)	

Plaintiff, Craig Webster (“Plaintiff” or “Webster”), by his attorneys, Garrison
Law Firm and Stanford Law Offices, S.C., alleges to the Court as follows:

JURISDICTION AND VENUE

1
2 1. This Court has jurisdiction over this action pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1331.

3 2. Venue in this District is proper pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1391(b) and (c),
4 because a substantial portion of the events or omissions giving rise to Webster's claims
5 occurred in this District, and Defendant PHI Health, LLC d/b/a PHI Air Medical
6 ("PHI" or "Defendant") has substantial and systematic contacts in this District.
7

8 **PARTIES AND EXHAUSTION**

9 3. Webster realleges and incorporates herein by reference the allegations of
10 the preceding paragraphs.
11

12 4. Webster is an adult male resident of the State of Arizona. Webster's race
13 and/or national origin and/or ancestry is Native American and he is an enrolled
14 member of the White Mountain Apache Tribe. At all relevant times as pleaded herein,
15 PHI knew and knows that Webster's race and/or national origin and/or ancestry is
16 Native American and that he is an enrolled member of the White Mountain Apache
17 Tribe. At all times relevant as pleaded herein, Webster was employed by PHI as a
18 Flight Paramedic, working primarily out of PHI's Show Low, Arizona Base ("Show
19 Low Base") from on or about December 27, 2021 through in or around January or
20 February 2024, and then working primarily out of PHI's Safford, Arizona Bases
21 ("Safford Bases") from in or around January or February 2024 through the present.
22 Webster completed "New Hire Academy" training at PHI's Phoenix, Arizona
23 Headquarters.
24
25
26
27
28

1 14. At the Show Low Base, approximately 60% of the patient care calls came
2 from Native American Reservations. At the Safford Bases, approximately 50% of the
3 patient care calls have come from Native American Reservations, until in or around
4 January 2025 when that number began to drop.
5

6 15. Since he began his employment on or about December 27, 2021, and
7 continuing through the present, Webster has been subjected to pervasive discrimination
8 and hostile work environment because of his Native American race, national origin,
9 and/or ancestry.
10

11 16. Since he began his employment on or about December 27, 2021, and
12 continuing through the present, Webster has also observed PHI's policy and practice of
13 a lack of cultural empathy and inclusivity, and discrimination, toward Native American
14 communities, which has added to the hostile and discriminatory work environment he
15 experiences at PHI as a Native American.
16

17 17. When PHI hired Webster, PHI's Human Resources directed Webster to
18 cut his hair under order from PHI's Chief Executive Officer, David Motzkin, despite
19 Webster's adherence to company grooming standards.
20

21 18. PHI only dropped its directive for Webster to cut his hair after Webster
22 and his New Hire Educators reported their concerns and Webster's adherence to
23 company grooming standards to Human Resources.
24

25 19. PHI also provides all clinical care providers with a grief counselor upon
26 request, except for Webster. Webster has requested a grief counselor like other,
27
28

1 similarly situated, non-Native American clinical care providers receive upon request, or
2 even without a request, but he has not received one.

3 20. For example, after a particularly bad patient critical care call in the
4 Spring of 2024, Webster tried to reach a grief counselor through the designated PHI
5 helpline, but he could not reach one. Webster reported his frustrations to his direct
6 supervisor, but he never heard back from anyone.

7
8 21. By way of additional example, after another particularly bad patient
9 critical care call in or around the Fall of 2024, Webster learned that the two nurses with
10 whom he was working received correspondence from a grief counselor and a member
11 of PHI leadership, respectively. However, Webster was never contacted by anyone.

12
13 22. Continuing through the present, Webster still has not received
14 correspondence from a grief counselor, despite multiple difficult calls having come in
15 between the Fall of 2024 and the present, and similarly situated, non-Native American
16 critical care providers having received grief counselor correspondence without request
17 on those occasions.

18
19 23. By way of additional example, in or around the Summer of 2024,
20 Webster observed PHI's leadership training video. PHI's leadership training video
21 instructs viewers to "be an Indian." The speaker is not Native American. In the video,
22 the speaker tries to skip out on taxes by moving his company to a Native American
23 Reservation.

1 24. Webster was deeply disturbed by the video and felt that it mocked the
2 opportunities provided to Native Americans to help offset the hardships and
3 shortcomings that take place on Reservations.

4 25. When Webster was at the Show Low Base, he was subjected to
5 inappropriate and discriminatory comments and conduct about Native Americans on a
6 weekly basis, directed towards him. Since moving to work primarily out of the Safford
7 Bases, almost every time Webster has done a workover shift, which is on an at least
8 monthly or more basis, he has been subjected to inappropriate and discriminatory
9 comments and conduct about Native Americans, directed towards him. At the Safford
10 Base, the only reason Webster does not continue to be subjected to inappropriate and
11 discriminatory comments and conduct about Native Americans on a weekly basis—and
12 instead only on workover shifts, on a monthly or more basis—is because he
13 intentionally puts himself on shifts with individuals who he believes will not engage in
14 such comments or conduct towards him. When he first started at the Safford Base, the
15 comments persisted on a weekly basis until Webster made this adjustment. The
16 adjustment has resulted in often undesirable schedule changes with respect to timing.

17 26. Webster has never heard inappropriate and discriminatory comments or
18 seen inappropriate and discriminatory conduct towards any other race and/or national
19 origin and/or ancestry than the comments and conduct he hears and sees about Native
20 Americans, directed towards him.

21 27. Specifically, when Webster was at the Show Low Base, every time a
22 Native American Reservation made a patient call to PHI on which Webster was staffed
23
24
25
26
27
28

1 (which occurred approximately weekly), one or multiple of Webster's PHI's co-
2 workers on the flight to the Reservation subjected Webster to discriminatory comments
3 and conduct relating to Native Americans.

4 28. The discriminatory comments and conduct by PHI to which Webster was
5 subjected on these flights on a weekly basis included, but were not limited to: (1)
6 comments and conduct relating to how PHI should not respond to Native American
7 Reservations; (2) comments and conduct relating to how Native Americans do not
8 require air medical transportation; (3) comments and conduct relating to how Native
9 Americans are more difficult to care for; and (4) comments and conduct relating to how
10 Native Americans are violent, including comments and conduct about how Native
11 Americans should not be able to own guns, which would control the number of gunshot
12 calls to Reservations that PHI receives and "help control them better." Upon
13 information and belief, the individuals making the comments, at all relevant times,
14 knew and know that Webster's race and/or national origin and/or ancestry is Native
15 American, that he is an enrolled member of the White Mountain Apache Tribe, and
16 directed the comments and conduct specifically towards him. Indeed, similarly
17 situated, non-Native American critical care providers have noticed these comments and
18 conduct and targeted Webster with questions about how he "feels" about them, which
19 heightens the discomfort and humiliation Webster already has about them.

20 29. Since moving to work primarily out of the Safford Bases, almost every
21 time Webster has done a workover shift, which is on an at least monthly or more basis,
22 he has been subjected to the same or similar inappropriate and discriminatory
23
24
25
26
27
28

1 comments and conduct about Native Americans set forth above in Paragraph 28. The
2 comments are pervasive, abusive, humiliating, and Webster feels them everywhere he
3 goes and works at PHI.

4 30. Again, at the Safford Base, the only reason Webster does not continue to
5 be subjected to inappropriate and discriminatory comments and conduct about Native
6 Americans on a weekly basis—and instead only on workover shifts, on a monthly or
7 more basis—is because he intentionally puts himself on shifts with individuals who he
8 believes will not engage in such comments or conduct towards him. When he first
9 started at the Safford Base, the comments persisted on a weekly basis until Webster
10 made this adjustment. The adjustment has resulted in often undesirable schedule
11 changes with respect to timing.

12 31. Additionally, for the duration of Webster’s time at the Show Low Base
13 and on almost every workover shift during his time at the Safford Bases, and
14 continuing through the present, PHI (other than Webster) provided and provides
15 substandard patient care to Native Americans on about one-third of the calls to Native
16 American Reservations. The patient care that PHI (other than Webster) provided and
17 provides to Native Americans on these occasions fell well below the appropriate
18 standard of patient care. Upon information and belief, PHI provided and provides
19 substandard medical care to Native Americans both because of (1) their race and
20 national origin, but also because (2) most Native Americans are either Arizona Health
21 Care Cost Containment System (“AHCCCS”) or Medicare/Medicaid patients, for
22 whom the cost of recoupment to PHI is lower. Similarly situated, non-Native American
23
24
25
26
27
28

1 critical care providers have noticed these trends and targeted Webster with questions
2 about how he “feels” about it, which heightens the discomfort and humiliation Webster
3 already has about it.

4 32. From his hire in December 2021 through in or around April 2023,
5 Webster consistently reported PHI’s inappropriate and discriminatory comments and
6 conduct through PHI’s chain of command and/or Human Resources, with no corrective
7 action taken. During this time, Webster also reported the substandard patient care that
8 PHI provided to Native Americans to PHI leadership, with no corrective action taken.
9

10 33. In or around April 2023, PHI conducted a sham Human Resources
11 investigation into Webster’s concerns and ultimately entirely ignored them. Thus, PHI
12 put Webster into a catch-22, forcing him to remain silent with respect to Human
13 Resources in the face of PHI’s continuing discriminatory conduct. PHI’s
14 discriminatory conduct as set forth above in Paragraphs 25 through 30 continued after
15 the April 2023 sham investigation on a weekly basis at the Show Low Base and on an
16 at least monthly, and often more frequent, basis at the Safford Bases.
17

18 34. Because the conduct continued and Webster was silenced by Human
19 Resources, he was forced to periodically report his concerns and complaints about the
20 inappropriate and discriminatory comments to which he was directly subjected on a
21 monthly, if not more, basis at the Safford Base, informally to his supervisors. His
22 supervisors never took—and still have not taken—any action with respect to Webster’s
23 complaints, which persisted from April 2023 through the Fall of 2024, and continue
24 today. In fact, as set forth below, his supervisors have nit-picked him with “debrief”
25
26
27
28

1 meetings, looking to find something he did wrong, distanced themselves from him, and
2 often refused to speak to him.

3 35. In or around September 2024, Webster heard his PHI supervisors
4 discussing PHI's efforts to intentionally and strategically minimize or abstain from
5 service or patient call response to the White Mountain Apache Reservation, calling
6 service to the White Mountain Apache Reservation a "misuse of resources." Webster
7 did not report the supervisors' comments because the supervisors are the same
8 individuals he is supposed to report to and, as noted above, Human Resources had
9 wholly ignored every single one of his complaints.
10

11 36. During the Fall of 2024, PHI's discrimination towards Webster also
12 escalated, just like its policy and practice of discrimination towards Native Americans
13 generally. On November 14, 2024, PHI contacted its Paramedics to announce a pay
14 raise. Paramedics would receive a pay raise of between 2.5% and 10% based on
15 performance. The four criteria for the pay raise were: Performance Review, Corrective
16 Actions, Clinical Incidents, and Clinical Accidents. In the same email, PHI offered an
17 immediate \$10,000 retention bonus to eligible Paramedics willing to stay with PHI for
18 at least two more years.
19

20 37. Webster's pay raise was capped at 5%. PHI did not offer Webster any
21 clarity on why his pay raise was capped at 5%.
22

23 38. Upon information and belief, Webster did not receive the full
24 performance-based pay raise in retaliation for his consistent complaints to Human
25 Resources, and as a further—but escalated—act of discrimination against him on the
26
27
28

1 basis of his Native American race, national origin, and/or ancestry. Specifically, upon
2 information and belief, the performance-based criteria that PHI used to justify the 5%
3 raise towards Webster were based on a “rigged” system of capping Webster’s
4 performance metrics and inaccurate commentary about Webster’s performance. Upon
5 information and belief, similarly-situated, non-Native American Flight Paramedics
6 received the full performance-based bonus.
7

8 39. On December 2, 2024, Webster denied the retention bonus. PHI’s Human
9 Resources Generalist, Amy Jamieson (“Jamieson”), responded to Webster’s denial to
10 ask why Webster had denied the retention bonus.
11

12 40. On December 12, 2024, Webster responded to Jamieson’s email. Webster
13 explained his extraordinary performance and his satisfaction of each of the four criteria
14 for the full 10% pay raise. Webster further explained that he felt PHI’s denial of the
15 full 10% pay raise to him was because he had consistently and verbally made
16 complaints about PHI’s policy and practice of a lack of cultural empathy and
17 inclusivity toward Native American traditions and communities.
18
19

20 41. Webster provided several examples of PHI’s discriminatory comments,
21 conduct, and treatment relating to Native Americans in his December 12, 2024 email,
22 and he expressed his hope that the feedback would finally inspire meaningful action
23

24 42. On December 13, 2024, Jamieson responded and “noted” Webster’s
25 concerns but, upon information and belief, Human Resources did nothing to investigate
26 Webster’s concerns. PHI never responded to Webster to explain why he fell short for
27
28

1 the pay raise, nor did it ever contact Webster to request more information about his
2 concerns.

3 43. On December 31, 2024, Webster filed his first EEOC Charge of
4 Discrimination.

5
6 44. Since filing his first EEOC Charge of Discrimination, the remarks
7 described above in Paragraphs 28-30 have persisted, in Webster's presence, on an at
8 least monthly, and often more frequent, basis. Again, at the Safford Base, the only
9 reason Webster does not continue to be subjected to inappropriate and discriminatory
10 comments and conduct about Native Americans on a weekly basis—and instead only
11 on workover shifts, on a monthly or more basis—is because he intentionally puts
12 himself on shifts with individuals who he believes will not engage in such comments or
13 conduct towards him. When he first started at the Safford Base, the comments persisted
14 on a weekly basis until Webster made this adjustment. The adjustment has resulted in
15 often undesirable schedule changes with respect to timing.
16
17

18 45. On February 26, 2025, the remarks escalated. On February 26, 2025,
19 Webster was subjected to highly inappropriate and offensive remarks by PHI Flight
20 Nurse Brittany Sokalick (phonetic) ("Brittany"). Specifically, Brittany stated in
21 Webster's presence, and directed to Webster, that she wished another fire would start
22 and "burn the town" so she would no longer have to respond to medical calls from
23 Native American reservations. Brittany's comment trivialized the immense devastation
24 caused by the July 2024 Watch Fire, which destroyed homes and displaced many
25 Native American families, including Webster's. The comment, like all the others
26
27
28

1 Webster has heard and/or been directly subjected to by PHI employees, devastated,
2 humiliated, abused, and ridiculed both him and his culture. Upon information and
3 belief, Western Region Clinical Manager Shanna Butler (“Butler”) also heard
4 Brittany’s comments. Butler took no corrective action and wholly failed to address
5 Brittany’s remarks. Both Brittany and Butler, as well as all other individuals present,
6 upon information and belief, knew, at all relevant times, that Webster’s race and/or
7 national origin and/or ancestry is Native American and that he is an enrolled member
8 of the White Mountain Apache Tribe.
9

10
11 46. On March 26, 2025, Webster reported Brittany’s comments to Human
12 Resources, as well as Butler’s ignorance towards the same. Bryan King (“King”) with
13 PHI’s Human Resources Department responded the same day simply acknowledging
14 receipt of Webster’s report.
15

16 47. Webster did not hear anything else until April 23, 2025, when King
17 followed up with him regarding an “investigation.” This is the first time in Webster’s
18 employment with PHI that he received any substantive follow-up regarding his
19 complaints about discrimination towards Native Americans and, upon information and
20 belief, is the first time PHI’s Human Resources has “investigated” Webster’s
21 complaints. This substantive follow-up, tellingly, was only done after Webster had
22 filed his first EEOC Charge.
23
24

25 48. Two days later, on April 25, 2025, a different Human Resources
26 employee, Brent Norden (“Norden”), emailed Webster to interview him regarding his
27 EEOC Charge.
28

1 49. Webster declined to meet with Norden regarding his ongoing legal
2 proceedings, but on May 5, 2025, he met with King regarding his complaint about
3 Brittany's comments. Throughout the meeting, King repeatedly urged Webster to
4 "admit" that Brittany's comments were jokes. Webster refused to state that any
5 comment amounting to genocide of the Apache people was a "joke," until King
6 dropped the matter.
7

8 50. Webster did not hear from King again about the "investigation" until
9 June 19, 2025, when King informed him that the investigation was closed and
10 "appropriately addressed." Upon information and belief, Brittany was never
11 disciplined.
12

13 51. Additionally, in the spring of 2025, PHI re-hired an individual, Abrianna
14 Pacheco ("Pacheco"), who Webster had previously reported for discriminatory
15 statements about Native Americans.
16

17 52. On June 13, 2025, Webster emailed shift supervisor Jerry Campos
18 ("Campos"), Brittany's base supervisor and Pacheco's ex-boyfriend, to ask for extra
19 shifts, akin to overtime opportunities, on July 3, 2025 and July 9, 2025. Traditionally at
20 PHI, extra shifts are given out based on a first-come, first-serve basis.
21

22 53. Campos told Webster that the shifts had already been picked up. The
23 person who got the shifts instead of Webster is a similarly-situated, non-Native
24 American employee.
25

26 54. Webster asked how much earlier the other individual had requested the
27 shifts. Webster pursued the issue because he felt, based on his prior experience(s) with
28

1 the assignment of extra shifts, that he was being retaliated against based on his
2 protected complaints of discrimination and hostile work environment based on his
3 Native American race, national origin, and ancestry.

4 55. Campos responded that the shifts had already been considered for the
5 other individual based, in large part, on “operational considerations—such as overall
6 cost to the base, including mileage, drive time, and potential lodging needs.” Campos
7 conceded the policy was “informal.” However, in almost 4 years of employment with
8 PHI, Webster had never heard of such a policy being applied to anyone, and still has
9 not seen or heard it applied to anyone but him.

12 56. Indeed, on August 5, 2025, Webster requested an extra shift at the
13 Wickenburg Base, which is four hours away, and he was approved by that Base’s
14 supervisor, who is new to PHI and separate from Campos.

16 57. Since the overtime opportunity denial incident with Campos, and
17 continuing through the present, Webster has again limited his interaction with certain
18 individuals and his attempts to seek overtime opportunities for fear of further
19 retaliation, despite overtime opportunities never having been an issue for Webster
20 before he pursued his claims.

22 58. Additionally, since the overtime opportunity denial incident with
23 Campos, and continuing through the present, just as he does with his Safford Base
24 shifts, Webster checks the schedule for mandatory trainings and chooses which
25 trainings to attend so as to avoid individuals who might retaliate against him or make
26
27
28

1 inappropriate and discriminatory comments about Native Americans directed towards
2 him.

3 59. Since April 2025 when Human Resources contacted him regarding his
4 EEOC Charges, and continuing through the present, Webster's supervisors have overly
5 scrutinized, nit-picked, and double checked his work in a way that they have never
6 done to him before, and in a way that they have never done and do not do to similarly
7 situated critical care providers. For example, despite the fact that multiple critical care
8 providers are staffed on calls, Webster's supervisors have periodically, since April
9 2025, requested that he—and he only—"debrief" patient care choices with them. The
10 "debriefing" includes the supervisors pouring over Webster's patient care choices and
11 claiming there are issues, requiring Webster to refer them to paperwork to verify he did
12 not make mistakes.
13

14
15
16 60. Since April 2025 when Human Resources contacted him regarding his
17 EEOC Charges, and continuing through the present, Webster's supervisors have
18 distanced themselves from him, often refusing to speak to him.
19

20 61. By way of additional example, Webster filled out a form that was sent to
21 all similarly situated critical care providers with a suggestion for improving patient care
22 in surrounding areas—a topic he has raised in his EEOC Charges and this lawsuit. In
23 response, PHI's upper management sent a company-wide email responding to and
24 mocking Webster's suggestion. PHI's upper management had never directly
25 approached or acknowledged Webster prior to him pursuing his claims.
26
27
28

1 62. The combination of the circumstances described in Paragraphs 57
2 through 61 has placed Webster in a spotlight of scrutiny, discomfort, humiliation, and
3 fear, that no similarly situated, non-Native American employees are forced to
4 experience.

5
6 **CAUSES OF ACTION**

7 **I. TITLE VII DISCRIMINATION (RACE, NATIONAL ORIGIN,**
8 **ANCESTRY)**

9 63. Webster reasserts and incorporates all paragraphs set forth above as if
10 restated herein.

11
12 64. For the duration of his employment with PHI, and through the present,
13 Webster has excelled as a Flight Paramedic. He has consistently taken on additional
14 responsibilities, and he has received consistently high performance reviews.

15
16 65. Defendant intentionally discriminated against Webster in the terms and
17 conditions, compensation, and privileges of his employment because of his Native
18 American race and/or national origin and/or ancestry, in violation of Title VII of the
19 Civil Rights Act of 1964, 42 U.S.C. § 2000e et seq., as amended.

20
21 66. Defendant intentionally discriminated against Webster by, inter alia,
22 failing to address his Human Resources complaints, failing to address his periodic
23 complaints to his supervisors, permitting a work culture of constant and pervasive
24 discriminatory comments towards Native Americans made directly to Webster to
25 persist, permitting a work culture of substandard care to Native American communities
26 to persist, denying Webster the full 10% performance-based pay raise in contrast to,
27
28

1 upon information and belief, similarly-situated, non-Native American employees, for
2 pretextual reasons, denying Webster overtime opportunities in contrast to, upon
3 information and belief, similarly-situated, non-Native American employees, for
4 pretextual reasons, denying Webster assistance in times of trouble in contrast to, upon
5 information and belief, similarly-situated, non-Native American employees, for
6 pretextual reasons, extraordinarily scrutinizing Webster's every move with
7 "debriefing" meetings looking to find something Webster had done wrong, in contrast
8 to, upon information and belief, similarly-situated, non-Native American employees,
9 for pretextual reasons, and ostracizing and mocking Webster, in contrast to, upon
10 information and belief, similarly-situated, non-Native American employees, for
11 pretextual reasons, in violation of Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, 42 U.S.C. §
12 2000e et seq., as amended.
13
14
15

16 67. As a result of Defendant's intentional, malicious, and recklessly
17 indifferent discrimination against Webster, Webster has suffered damages in the form
18 of lost wages and benefits, emotional distress, pain and suffering, and attorneys' fees
19 and costs.
20

21 **II. TITLE VII HOSTILE WORK ENVIRONMENT (RACE, NATIONAL** 22 **ORIGIN, ANCESTRY)**

23 68. Webster reasserts and incorporates all paragraphs set forth above as if
24 restated herein.
25

26 69. During the course of his employment with Defendant, Webster has been
27 subjected to pervasive, abusive, demeaning, humiliating, and ridiculing verbal
28

1 statements and actions by PHI employees towards him because of and/or motivated by
2 his Native American race and/or national origin and/or ancestry, in violation of Title
3 VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, 42 U.S.C. § 2000e et seq., as amended.

4 70. The pervasive, abusive, demeaning, humiliating, and ridiculing verbal
5 statements and actions by PHI employees directed towards Webster because of and/or
6 motivated by Webster's Native American race and/or national origin and/or ancestry
7 were not welcome.
8

9 71. The pervasive, abusive, demeaning, humiliating, and ridiculing verbal
10 statements and actions by PHI employees directed towards Webster because of and/or
11 motivated by Webster's Native American race and/or national origin and/or ancestry
12 were so severe and pervasive so as to alter Webster's work environment. He feels
13 discrimination against himself and his culture everywhere he goes at PHI.
14

15 72. The pervasive, abusive, demeaning, humiliating, and ridiculing verbal
16 statements and actions by PHI employees directed towards Webster because of and/or
17 motivated by Webster's Native American race and/or national origin and/or ancestry
18 forced Webster to pursue schedule changes, including often undesirable scheduling
19 changes with respect to timing. Specifically, at the Safford Base, the only reason
20 Webster does not continue to be subjected to inappropriate and discriminatory
21 comments and conduct about Native Americans on a weekly basis—and instead only
22 on workover shifts, on a monthly or more basis—is because he intentionally puts
23 himself on shifts with individuals who he believes will not engage in such comments or
24 conduct towards him. When he first started at the Safford Base, the comments persisted
25
26
27
28

1 on a weekly basis until Webster made this adjustment. The adjustment has resulted in
2 often undesirable schedule changes with respect to timing.

3 73. Due to the pervasive, abusive, demeaning, humiliating, and ridiculing
4 verbal statements and actions by PHI employees directed towards Webster because of
5 and/or motivated by Webster's Native American race and/or national origin and/or
6 ancestry, Webster has limited his interaction with certain individuals and his attempts
7 to seek overtime opportunities for fear of further retaliation, despite overtime
8 opportunities never having been an issue for Webster before he pursued his claims.
9

10
11 74. Due to the pervasive, abusive, demeaning, humiliating, and ridiculing
12 verbal statements and actions by PHI employees directed towards Webster because of
13 and/or motivated by Webster's Native American race and/or national origin and/or
14 ancestry, Webster checks the schedule for mandatory trainings and chooses which
15 trainings to attend so as to avoid individuals who might retaliate against him or make
16 inappropriate and discriminatory comments about Native Americans directed towards
17 him.
18

19
20 75. The pervasive, abusive, demeaning, humiliating, and ridiculing verbal
21 statements and actions by PHI employees directed towards Webster because of and/or
22 motivated by Webster's Native American race and/or national origin and/or ancestry
23 are related closely enough, in inter alia, subject matter, wrongdoers, management
24 involvement and action/inaction, and the same Human Resources' employees' failure
25 to investigate, intervene, prevent, eradicate, remediate, and discipline, so as to
26
27
28

1 constitute continuing violations, in violation of Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of
2 1964, 42 U.S.C. § 2000e et seq., as amended.

3 76. The pervasive, abusive, demeaning, humiliating, and ridiculing verbal
4 statements and actions by PHI employees directly towards Webster, because of and/or
5 motivated by Webster's Native American race and/or national origin and/or ancestry,
6 have been heard by many members of PHI's management and, indeed, have been made
7 frequently by the same PHI supervisors and management, such that PHI intentionally
8 creates, condones, and perpetuates a racially hostile work environment on a continuing
9 violations basis, in violation of Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, 42 U.S.C. §
10 2000e et seq., as amended.

11 77. As a result of Defendant's intentional, malicious, and recklessly
12 indifferent condonation, ratification, tacit approval, and perpetuation of a racially
13 hostile work environment on a closely related and continuing violation basis, Webster
14 has suffered damages in the form of lost wages and benefits, emotional distress, pain
15 and suffering, and attorneys' fees and costs.

16 **III. TITLE VII RETALIATION (RACE, NATIONAL ORIGIN,**
17 **ANCESTRY)**

18 78. Webster reasserts and incorporates all paragraphs set forth above as if
19 restated herein.

20 79. Defendant intentionally retaliated against Webster in the terms and
21 conditions, compensation, and privileges of his employment by, inter alia, denying
22 Webster the full 10% performance-based pay raise, denying Webster overtime
23

1 opportunities, denying Webster assistance in times of trouble, extraordinarily
2 scrutinizing Webster's every move with "debriefing" meetings looking to find
3 something Webster had done wrong, and ostracizing and mocking Webster, all because
4 Webster opposed race and/or national origin and/or ancestry discrimination in the
5 workplace with Human Resources through April 2023 and thereafter periodically with
6 his supervisors and continuing through the present and/or filed administrative charges
7 with the EEOC and/or filed this lawsuit opposing race and/or national origin and/or
8 ancestry discrimination in the workplace, in reckless disregard for his federally
9 protected rights under Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, 42 U.S.C. § 2000e et
10 seq., as amended.
11
12

13 80. As a result of Defendant's intentional, malicious, and recklessly
14 indifferent retaliation against Webster, Webster has suffered damages in the form of
15 back pay/lost wages and/or other employment benefits, pain and suffering, emotional
16 distress, pre-judgment interest and post-judgement interest, and attorneys' fees and
17 costs.
18
19

20 IV. § 1981 DISCRIMINATION

21 81. Webster reasserts and incorporates all paragraphs set forth above as if
22 restated herein.
23

24 82. For the duration of his employment with PHI, and through the present,
25 Webster has excelled as a Flight Paramedic. He has consistently taken on additional
26 responsibilities, and he has received consistently high performance reviews.
27
28

1 83. Defendant intentionally discriminated against Webster in the terms and
2 conditions, compensation, and privileges of his employment because of his Native
3 American race, in violation of 42 U.S.C. § 1981.

4 84. Defendant intentionally discriminated against Webster by, inter alia,
5 failing to address his Human Resources complaints, failing to address his periodic
6 complaints to his supervisors, permitting a work culture of constant and pervasive
7 discriminatory comments towards Native Americans made directly to Webster to
8 persist, permitting a work culture of substandard care to Native American communities
9 to persist, denying Webster the full 10% performance-based pay raise in contrast to,
10 upon information and belief, similarly-situated, non-Native American employees, for
11 pretextual reasons, denying Webster overtime opportunities in contrast to, upon
12 information and belief, similarly-situated, non-Native American employees, for
13 pretextual reasons, denying Webster assistance in times of trouble in contrast to, upon
14 information and belief, similarly-situated, non-Native American employees, for
15 pretextual reasons, extraordinarily scrutinizing Webster's every move with
16 "debriefing" meetings looking to find something Webster had done wrong, in contrast
17 to, upon information and belief, similarly-situated, non-Native American employees,
18 for pretextual reasons, and ostracizing and mocking Webster, in contrast to, upon
19 information and belief, similarly-situated, non-Native American employees, for
20 pretextual reasons, in violation of 42 U.S.C. § 1981.

21 85. As a result of Defendant's intentional, malicious, and recklessly
22 indifferent discrimination against Webster, Webster has suffered damages in the form
23
24
25
26
27
28

1 of lost wages and benefits, emotional distress, pain and suffering, and attorneys' fees
2 and costs.

3 **V. § 1981 HOSTILE WORK ENVIRONMENT**

4 86. Webster reasserts and incorporates all paragraphs set forth above as if
5 restated herein.
6

7 87. During the course of his employment with Defendant, Webster has been
8 subjected to pervasive, abusive, demeaning, humiliating, and ridiculing verbal
9 statements and actions by PHI employees towards him because of and/or motivated by
10 his Native American race, in violation of 42 U.S.C. § 1981.
11

12 88. The pervasive, abusive, demeaning, humiliating, and ridiculing verbal
13 statements and actions by PHI employees directed towards Webster because of and/or
14 motivated by Webster's Native American race were not welcome.
15

16 89. The pervasive, abusive, demeaning, humiliating, and ridiculing verbal
17 statements and actions by PHI employees directed towards Webster because of and/or
18 motivated by Webster's Native American race were so severe and pervasive so as to
19 alter Webster's work environment. He feels discrimination against himself and his
20 culture everywhere he goes at PHI.
21

22 90. The pervasive, abusive, demeaning, humiliating, and ridiculing verbal
23 statements and actions by PHI employees directed towards Webster because of and/or
24 motivated by Webster's Native American race and/or national origin and/or ancestry
25 forced Webster to pursue schedule changes, including often undesirable scheduling
26 changes with respect to timing. Specifically, at the Safford Base, the only reason
27
28

1 Webster does not continue to be subjected to inappropriate and discriminatory
2 comments and conduct about Native Americans on a weekly basis—and instead only
3 on workover shifts, on a monthly or more basis—is because he intentionally puts
4 himself on shifts with individuals who he believes will not engage in such comments or
5 conduct towards him. When he first started at the Safford Base, the comments persisted
6 on a weekly basis until Webster made this adjustment. The adjustment has resulted in
7 often undesirable schedule changes with respect to timing.
8

9
10 91. Due to the pervasive, abusive, demeaning, humiliating, and ridiculing
11 verbal statements and actions by PHI employees directed towards Webster because of
12 and/or motivated by Webster's Native American race and/or national origin and/or
13 ancestry, Webster has limited his interaction with certain individuals and his attempts
14 to seek overtime opportunities for fear of further retaliation, despite overtime
15 opportunities never having been an issue for Webster before he pursued his claims.
16

17 92. Due to the pervasive, abusive, demeaning, humiliating, and ridiculing
18 verbal statements and actions by PHI employees directed towards Webster because of
19 and/or motivated by Webster's Native American race and/or national origin and/or
20 ancestry, Webster checks the schedule for mandatory trainings and chooses which
21 trainings to attend so as to avoid individuals who might retaliate against him or make
22 inappropriate and discriminatory comments about Native Americans directed towards
23 him.
24

25
26 93. The pervasive, abusive, demeaning, humiliating, and ridiculing verbal
27 statements and actions by PHI employees because of and/or motivated by his Native
28

1 American race are related closely enough, in inter alia, subject matter, wrongdoers,
2 management involvement and action/inaction, and the same Human Resources'
3 employees' failure to investigate, intervene, prevent, eradicate, remediate, and
4 discipline, so as to constitute continuing violations, in violation of 42 U.S.C. § 1981.
5

6 94. The pervasive, abusive, demeaning, humiliating, and ridiculing verbal
7 statements and actions by PHI employees because of and/or motivated by his Native
8 American race have been heard by many members of PHI's management and, indeed,
9 have been made frequently by the same PHI supervisors and management, such that
10 PHI intentionally creates, condones, and perpetuates a racially hostile work
11 environment on a continuing violations basis, in violation of 42 U.S.C. § 1981.
12

13 95. As a result of Defendant's intentional, malicious, and recklessly
14 indifferent condonation, ratification, tacit approval, and perpetuation of a racially
15 hostile work environment on a closely related and continuing-violation basis, Webster
16 has suffered damages in the form of lost wages and benefits, emotional distress, pain
17 and suffering, and attorneys' fees and costs.
18
19

20 VI. § 1981 RETALIATION

21 96. Webster reasserts and incorporates all paragraphs set forth above as if
22 restated herein.
23

24 97. Defendant intentionally retaliated against Webster in the terms and
25 conditions, compensation, and privileges of his employment by, inter alia, denying
26 Webster the full 10% performance-based pay raise, denying Webster overtime
27 opportunities, denying Webster assistance in times of trouble, extraordinarily
28

1 scrutinizing and double-checking Webster's every move with "debriefing" meetings
2 looking to find something Webster had done wrong, and ostracizing and mocking
3 Webster, all because Webster opposed race discrimination in the workplace with
4 Human Resources through April 2023 and thereafter periodically with his supervisors
5 and continuing through the present, and/or filed administrative charges with the EEOC
6 opposing race discrimination in the workplace and/or filed this lawsuit opposing race
7 discrimination in the workplace, in reckless disregard for his federally protected rights
8 under 42 U.S.C. § 1981.
9
10

11 98. As a result of Defendant's intentional, malicious, and recklessly
12 indifferent retaliation against Webster, Webster has suffered damages in the form of
13 back pay/lost wages and/or other employment benefits, pain and suffering, emotional
14 distress, pre-judgment interest and post-judgement interest, and attorneys' fees and
15 costs.
16

17 **PRAYER FOR RELIEF**

18 WHEREFORE, Webster respectfully requests that this Court:
19

20 1. Order Defendant to make Webster whole by providing back pay, front
21 pay, liquidated damages, compensatory damages, punitive damages, pre- and post-
22 judgment interest, and reimbursement for other benefits and expenses to be shown at
23 trial;
24

25 2. Grant to Webster attorneys' fees, costs, and disbursements as provided by
26 statute; and
27
28

Dated December 5, 2025.

STANFORD LAW OFFICES, S.C.

GARRISON LAW FIRM

Attorneys for Plaintiff



U.S. EQUAL EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITY COMMISSION

Phoenix District Office
3300 North Central Avenue, Suite 690
Phoenix, AZ 85012
(602) 661-0002
Website: www.eeoc.gov

NOTICE OF RIGHT TO SUE (ISSUED ON REQUEST)

(This Notice replaces EEOC FORMS 161, 161-A & 161-B)

Issued On: 07/16/2025

To: Mr. Craig Webster
2513 Graham Drive
Lakeside, AZ 85929
Charge No: 540-2025-01908

EEOC Representative and email: SHARON LIEBMAN
INVESTIGATOR
SHARON.LIEBMAN@EEOC.GOV

NOTICE OF RIGHT TO SUE (ISSUED ON REQUEST)

The EEOC has granted your request for a Notice of Right to Sue, and more than 180 days have passed since the filing of this charge.

The EEOC is terminating its processing of this charge.

NOTICE OF YOUR RIGHT TO SUE

This is official notice that the EEOC has dismissed your charge and has issued you notice of your right to sue the respondent(s) on this charge. If you choose to file a lawsuit against the respondent(s) on this charge under federal law in federal or state court, **your lawsuit must be filed WITHIN 90 DAYS of your receipt of EEOC's official notice of dismissal.** You should keep a record of the date you received the EEOC's official notice of dismissal. Your right to sue based on this charge will be lost if you do not file a lawsuit in court within 90 days. (The time limit for filing a lawsuit based on a claim under state law may be different.)

If you file a lawsuit based on this charge, please sign-in to the EEOC Public Portal and upload the court complaint to charge 540-2025-01908

On behalf of the Commission,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "m.l. ch", is written over a horizontal line.

Melinda Caraballo
District Director

Cc:

Kimberly Cheeseman
1550 LAMAR ST STE 2000
Houston, TX 77010

Incident Location
Q Investments, L.P.
2800 North 44th Street Suite 800
Phoenix, AZ 85008

Director Human Resources
Q Investments, LP
301 Commerce Street Suite 3200
Fort Worth, TX 76102

Tamsin Woolley Esq.
Norton, Rose, Fullbright US LLP
1550 Lamar St., Ste. 2000
Houston, TX 77010

Annie Stanford Esq.
Stanford Law Offices, S.C.
225 E. Fairmount Ave.
Milwaukee, WI 53217

Peter Stanford Esq.
Stanford Law Offices, S.C.
225 E. Fairmount Ave.
Milwaukee, WI 53217

Sally Ward
Stanford Law Offices, S.C.
225 E. Fairmount Ave.
Milwaukee, WI 53217

Please retain this Notice for your records.

Enclosure with EEOC Notice of Closure and Rights (05/25)

INFORMATION RELATED TO FILING SUIT UNDER THE LAWS ENFORCED BY THE EEOC

*(This information relates to filing suit in Federal or State court **under Federal law**. If you also plan to sue claiming violations of State law, please be aware that time limits may be shorter and other provisions of State law may be different than those described below.)*

IMPORTANT TIME LIMITS – 90 DAYS TO FILE A LAWSUIT

If you choose to file a lawsuit against the respondent(s) named in the charge of discrimination, you must file a complaint in court **within 90 days of the date you receive EEOC's official notice of dismissal**. You should **keep a record of the date you received EEOC's official notice of dismissal**. Once this 90-day period has passed, your right to sue based on the charge referred to in this Notice will be lost. If you intend to consult an attorney, you should do so promptly. Give your attorney a copy of this Notice, and the record of your receiving EEOC's official notice of dismissal (email or envelope).

If your lawsuit includes a claim under the Equal Pay Act (EPA), you must file your complaint in court within 2 years (3 years for willful violations) of the date you did not receive equal pay. This time limit for filing an EPA lawsuit is separate from the 90-day filing period under Title VII, the ADA, GINA, the ADEA, or the PWFA referred to above. Therefore, if you also plan to sue under Title VII, the ADA, GINA, the ADEA, or the PWFA, in addition to suing on the EPA claim, your lawsuit must be filed within 90 days of your receipt of EEOC's official notice of dismissal and within the 2- or 3-year EPA period.

Your lawsuit may be filed in U.S. District Court or a State court of competent jurisdiction. Whether you file in Federal or State court is a matter for you to decide after talking to your attorney. You must file a "complaint" that contains a short statement of the facts of your case which shows that you are entitled to relief. Filing this Notice is not enough. For more information about filing a lawsuit, go to <https://www.eeoc.gov/employees/lawsuit.cfm>.

ATTORNEY REPRESENTATION

For information about locating an attorney to represent you, go to:
<https://www.eeoc.gov/employees/lawsuit.cfm>.

In very limited circumstances, a U.S. District Court may appoint an attorney to represent individuals who demonstrate that they are financially unable to afford an attorney.

HOW TO REQUEST YOUR CHARGE FILE AND 90-DAY TIME LIMIT FOR REQUESTS

There are two ways to request a charge file: 1) a Freedom of Information Act (FOIA) request or 2) a "Section 83" request. You may request your charge file under either or both procedures. EEOC can generally respond to Section 83 requests more promptly than FOIA requests.

Since a lawsuit must be filed within 90 days of EEOC's official notice of dismissal, please submit your FOIA and/or Section 83 request for the charge file promptly to allow sufficient time for EEOC to respond and for your review.

To make a FOIA request for your charge file, submit your request online at <https://eeoc.arkcase.com/foia/portal/login> (this is the preferred method). You may also submit a

Enclosure with EEOC Notice of Closure and Rights (05/25)

FOIA request for your charge file by U.S. Mail by submitting a signed, written request identifying your request as a “FOIA Request” for Charge Number 540-2025-01909 to the District Director, Melinda Caraballo, 3300 North Central Avenue Suite 690, Phoenix, AZ 85012.

To make a Section 83 request for your charge file, submit a signed written request stating it is a “Section 83 Request” for Charge Number 540-2025-01909 to the District Director, Melinda Caraballo, 3300 North Central Avenue Suite 690, Phoenix, AZ 85012.

You may request the charge file up to 90 days after receiving EEOC’s official notice of dismissal. After the 90 days have passed, you may request the charge file only if you have filed a lawsuit in court and provide a copy of the court complaint to EEOC.

For more information on submitting FOIA requests, go to <https://www.eeoc.gov/eeoc/foia/index.cfm>.

For more information on submitted Section 83 requests, go to <https://www.eeoc.gov/foia/section-83-disclosure-information-charge-files>.



U.S. EQUAL EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITY COMMISSION

Phoenix District Office
3300 North Central Avenue, Suite 690
Phoenix, AZ 85012
(602) 661-0002
Website: www.eeoc.gov

NOTICE OF RIGHT TO SUE (ISSUED ON REQUEST)

(This Notice replaces EEOC FORMS 161, 161-A & 161-B)

Issued On: 08/06/2025

To: Craig Webster
2513 Graham Dr
Lakeside, AZ 85929
Charge No: 540-2025-06938

EEOC Representative and email: PATRICIA MINER
SUPERVISORY INVESTIGATOR
PATRICIA.MINER@EEOC.GOV

NOTICE OF RIGHT TO SUE (ISSUED ON REQUEST)

The EEOC has granted your request that the agency issue a Notice of Right to Sue, where it is unlikely that EEOC will be able to complete its investigation within 180 days from the date the charge was filed.

The EEOC is terminating its processing of this charge.

NOTICE OF YOUR RIGHT TO SUE

This is official notice that the EEOC has dismissed your charge and has issued you notice of your right to sue the respondent(s) on this charge. If you choose to file a lawsuit against the respondent(s) on this charge under federal law in federal or state court, **your lawsuit must be filed WITHIN 90 DAYS of your receipt of EEOC's official notice of dismissal.** You should keep a record of the date you received the EEOC's official notice of dismissal. Your right to sue based on this charge will be lost if you do not file a lawsuit in court within 90 days. (The time limit for filing a lawsuit based on a claim under state law may be different.)

If you file a lawsuit based on this charge, please sign-in to the EEOC Public Portal and upload the court complaint to charge 540-2025-06938

On behalf of the Commission,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "m.l. ch", is written over a horizontal line.

Melinda Caraballo
District Director

Cc:

Incident Location
PHI Air Medical
2800 N. 44th Street Suite 800
Phoenix, AZ 85008

Maria Costella
PHI Health, LLC
2800 N. 44th Street Suite 800
Phoenix, AZ 85008

Annie Stanford Esq.
Stanford Law Offices, S.C.
225 E. Fairmount Ave.
Milwaukee, WI 53217

Please retain this Notice for your records.

Enclosure with EEOC Notice of Closure and Rights (05/25)

INFORMATION RELATED TO FILING SUIT UNDER THE LAWS ENFORCED BY THE EEOC

*(This information relates to filing suit in Federal or State court **under Federal law**. If you also plan to sue claiming violations of State law, please be aware that time limits may be shorter and other provisions of State law may be different than those described below.)*

IMPORTANT TIME LIMITS – 90 DAYS TO FILE A LAWSUIT

If you choose to file a lawsuit against the respondent(s) named in the charge of discrimination, you must file a complaint in court **within 90 days of the date you receive EEOC's official notice of dismissal**. You should **keep a record of the date you received EEOC's official notice of dismissal**. Once this 90-day period has passed, your right to sue based on the charge referred to in this Notice will be lost. If you intend to consult an attorney, you should do so promptly. Give your attorney a copy of this Notice, and the record of your receiving EEOC's official notice of dismissal (email or envelope).

If your lawsuit includes a claim under the Equal Pay Act (EPA), you must file your complaint in court within 2 years (3 years for willful violations) of the date you did not receive equal pay. This time limit for filing an EPA lawsuit is separate from the 90-day filing period under Title VII, the ADA, GINA, the ADEA, or the PWFA referred to above. Therefore, if you also plan to sue under Title VII, the ADA, GINA, the ADEA, or the PWFA, in addition to suing on the EPA claim, your lawsuit must be filed within 90 days of your receipt of EEOC's official notice of dismissal and within the 2- or 3-year EPA period.

Your lawsuit may be filed in U.S. District Court or a State court of competent jurisdiction. Whether you file in Federal or State court is a matter for you to decide after talking to your attorney. You must file a "complaint" that contains a short statement of the facts of your case which shows that you are entitled to relief. Filing this Notice is not enough. For more information about filing a lawsuit, go to <https://www.eeoc.gov/employees/lawsuit.cfm>.

ATTORNEY REPRESENTATION

For information about locating an attorney to represent you, go to:
<https://www.eeoc.gov/employees/lawsuit.cfm>.

In very limited circumstances, a U.S. District Court may appoint an attorney to represent individuals who demonstrate that they are financially unable to afford an attorney.

HOW TO REQUEST YOUR CHARGE FILE AND 90-DAY TIME LIMIT FOR REQUESTS

There are two ways to request a charge file: 1) a Freedom of Information Act (FOIA) request or 2) a "Section 83" request. You may request your charge file under either or both procedures. EEOC can generally respond to Section 83 requests more promptly than FOIA requests.

Since a lawsuit must be filed within 90 days of EEOC's official notice of dismissal, please submit your FOIA and/or Section 83 request for the charge file promptly to allow sufficient time for EEOC to respond and for your review.

To make a FOIA request for your charge file, submit your request online at <https://eeoc.arkcase.com/foia/portal/login> (this is the preferred method). You may also submit a

Enclosure with EEOC Notice of Closure and Rights (05/25)

FOIA request for your charge file by U.S. Mail by submitting a signed, written request identifying your request as a “FOIA Request” for Charge Number 540-2025-06938 to the District Director at Melinda Caraballo, 3300 North Central Avenue Suite 690, Phoenix, AZ 85012.

To make a Section 83 request for your charge file, submit a signed written request stating it is a “Section 83 Request” for Charge Number 540-2025-06938 to the District Director at Melinda Caraballo, 3300 North Central Avenue Suite 690, Phoenix, AZ 85012.

You may request the charge file up to 90 days after receiving EEOC’s official notice of dismissal. After the 90 days have passed, you may request the charge file only if you have filed a lawsuit in court and provide a copy of the court complaint to EEOC.

For more information on submitting FOIA requests, go to <https://www.eeoc.gov/eeoc/foia/index.cfm>.

For more information on submitted Section 83 requests, go to <https://www.eeoc.gov/foia/section-83-disclosure-information-charge-files>.