

Huprich Law Files Major Discrimination and Whistleblower Lawsuit Against Hollywood Presbyterian Medical Center

LOS ANGELES, CA, UNITED STATES, April 14, 2026 /EINPresswire.com/ -- Huprich Law Firm, PC, a [California race discrimination lawyer](#) firm representing employees in complex workplace disputes, has filed a civil lawsuit in Los Angeles County Superior Court (Case No. 26STCV11786) on behalf of a former hospital Chief Operating Officer alleging race discrimination, harassment, whistleblower retaliation, and wrongful termination against Hollywood Presbyterian Medical Center.

According to the complaint, the plaintiff is an accomplished African American female healthcare executive with more than twenty-five years of leadership experience in hospital operations, regulatory compliance, quality management, and executive administration. She was hired as Chief Operating Officer in 2024 and received a top performance evaluation in May 2025, with the hospital rating her as a "Top Performer" and documenting no performance concerns before her termination.

The lawsuit alleges that shortly after a new Chief Executive Officer (an older white male) assumed leadership in 2025, the plaintiff experienced an

The complex block contains the Huprich Law Firm logo and a photograph. The logo features a stylized illustration of three classical columns above the word "HUPRICH" in large, bold, black letters, with "LAW FIRM" in smaller, gold letters below it, flanked by horizontal lines. Below the logo is the text "Huprich Law Firm". The photograph shows three men in dark suits and ties walking in a hallway with a polished floor and white walls. The man in the center is gesturing with his right hand while talking to the other two men.

Huprich Law Firm

Ontario Employment Attorney

immediate and dramatic shift in treatment. During their first private executive meeting, the complaint alleges the CEO used racially charged language, including a statement involving a “noose,” and referenced being from the “right side of the tracks.” According to the complaint, the hospital’s own internal investigation later confirmed that the “noose” comment had in fact been made.

The lawsuit further alleges that after the leadership transition, the plaintiff’s executive authority was systematically reduced. She was allegedly excluded from executive meetings, bypassed in operational decision-making, removed from presenting to the hospital’s governing board, and denied recognition for operational achievements that generated approximately \$2 million in savings for the hospital. The complaint also alleges that a long-standing hospital policy placing the Chief Operating Officer as second in command was changed without notice, elevating the Chief Financial Officer (a white male) above her in a manner described as highly unusual in hospital administration.

According to the complaint, the plaintiff reported these concerns internally through the hospital’s compliance hotline in June 2025, relying on written anti-retaliation policies that promised protection for employees who report discrimination. The lawsuit alleges that after making that protected complaint, exclusion intensified rather than improved. The plaintiff was allegedly left out of executive conferences attended by other senior leaders while discussions began about assigning operational responsibilities to another executive interested in developing into a COO role.

The complaint alleges that the hospital terminated the plaintiff in February 2026, stating only that the decision was due to an “organizational change.” According to the lawsuit, that explanation was pretextual because the hospital retained consultants, continued executive hiring, and did not eliminate the operational leadership functions the plaintiff had performed. Instead, those responsibilities allegedly continued through reassigned personnel and retained management after her departure.

The lawsuit includes claims under the California Fair Employment and Housing Act (FEHA) for race discrimination, retaliation, harassment, failure to prevent discrimination, wrongful termination, whistleblower retaliation under Labor Code section 1102.5, intentional infliction of emotional distress, and unfair competition.

“This case raises serious issues involving allegations that a high-performing Black female executive was treated differently not simply after reporting discriminatory conduct, but because she occupied a position where race and gender intersected in ways that affected how her authority was perceived and exercised,” said counsel for the plaintiff. “Black women in corporate and executive leadership have historically faced barriers that go beyond individual bias—often described as misogynoir, where race and gender stereotypes intersect to marginalize Black women, deny them equal authority, and subject them to scrutiny not imposed on others. The complaint alleges that those same dynamics were present here, making the conduct especially

serious under California law.”

As a [wrongful termination attorney for executives](#), Huprich Law Firm regularly represents employees in executive employment litigation, FEHA discrimination claims, and whistleblower matters throughout California. The firm also handles complex retaliation cases for professionals seeking a [California workplace retaliation attorney](#) employees can trust.

For more information about California employment discrimination law, retaliation claims, or executive wrongful termination representation, contact:

Joseph Huprich
Huprich Law Firm, P.C.
+1 909-766-2226

[email us here](#)

Visit us on social media:

[LinkedIn](#)

[Facebook](#)

[YouTube](#)

This press release can be viewed online at: <https://www.einpresswire.com/article/905534022>

EIN Presswire's priority is source transparency. We do not allow opaque clients, and our editors try to be careful about weeding out false and misleading content. As a user, if you see something we have missed, please do bring it to our attention. Your help is welcome. EIN Presswire, Everyone's Internet News Presswire™, tries to define some of the boundaries that are reasonable in today's world. Please see our Editorial Guidelines for more information.

© 1995-2026 Newsmatics Inc. All Right Reserved.