Rancho Cucamonga Whistleblower Retaliation Lawsuit Alleges Wrongful Termination

Huprich Law Firm represents a California employee alleging retaliation after raising compliance and legal concerns at a property management company.

RANCHO CUCAMONGA, CA, UNITED STATES, August 15, 2026 /EINPresswire.com/ -- Attorney Joseph J. Huprich of Huprich Law Firm, PC is representing a California real estate professional in a lawsuit alleging whistleblower retaliation and wrongful termination after she repeatedly raised concerns about potential violations of California and federal laws and regulations.

Huprich Law Firm

The First Amended Complaint was filed January 6, 2026, in the Superior Court of California, County of San Bernardino – Rancho Cucamonga District. The case is CIVRS 2510335 and names Homeriver California Property Management, Inc., HRG Management LLC, Homeriver, LLC, and Does 1 through 10 as defendants. The complaint asserts claims for whistleblower retaliation under California Labor Code section 1102.5 and wrongful termination in violation of public policy, with a demand for jury trial.

> Employees should be able to raise legitimate concerns about potential legal violations without facing retaliation for speaking up.”
>
> *Joseph J. Huprich, Attorney at Law, Huprich Law Firm, PC*

According to the complaint, the plaintiff is a licensed California real estate broker with more than 27 years of industry experience. She began working for HomePoint Property Management in November 2005 and continued working for the organization after defendants acquired HomePoint in 2018.

The complaint alleges that compliance became an increasing concern as the company attempted to align operations across markets governed by different state and local laws. According to the plaintiff, lease agreements, notices, and other practices did not always account for California's more stringent requirements.

Ontario Employment Attorney

Ontario Employment Attorneys

In September 2023, the plaintiff allegedly reported that a newly hired offshore team replacing a state-side team was not adequately trained on fair housing guidelines. She allegedly urged immediate training because fair housing violations could expose the company and supervisors to liability. According to the lawsuit, her concerns were met with resistance.

The plaintiff also allegedly reported in April and October 2023 that the vendor onboarding department was adding unlicensed companies to an approved vendor list for work at clients' properties. After her concerns were allegedly ignored, she directed her team to avoid using the vendors in question to limit potential liability exposure.

In January 2024, the plaintiff allegedly raised concerns about reduced rental criteria adopted in 2022 and tenant placements involving tenants who allegedly stopped paying shortly after moving in. She also allegedly warned about changes in California law concerning additional security deposits for applicants with low credit, rental history, or income. The complaint states that the President of Operations declined to make adjustments.

The lawsuit alleges that these compliance concerns were followed by adverse employment actions. In February 2024, the plaintiff was allegedly passed over for a Regional Vice President position in favor of a less experienced candidate whom the complaint states did not hold a broker's license. In March 2024, she allegedly reported that the underwriting department was failing to issue legally required application fee receipts, and the complaint alleges that the report was met with hostility.

Later that month, the plaintiff was allegedly passed over for a Senior Regional Manager position. The complaint also alleges that two additional promotions were subsequently announced without promoting her, despite her stated strong performance evaluations from 2021 through 2023.

The plaintiff allegedly continued raising compliance concerns. In August 2024, she reportedly challenged changes to California lease language. According to the complaint, outside counsel confirmed her concerns, but recommended corrections were allegedly not implemented. In October 2024, she allegedly raised concerns about missing privacy disclosures concerning the collection and sharing of client and tenant information. The complaint alleges that the disclosures were not added to the company website until March 2025.

The lawsuit alleges that the retaliation intensified in 2025. In February, the plaintiff was allegedly passed over for a fourth promotion when another employee became Regional Vice President for the West Coast. The complaint states that the plaintiff had substantially more industry experience and held a broker's license.

Beginning in March 2025, the plaintiff alleges that she was subjected to an effort to undermine, ostracize, and unfairly criticize her performance. The complaint describes alleged argumentative conduct during meetings, exclusion from discussions involving her staff, criticism that she “pushes back too much,” alleged attempts to document an unfounded absence, and alleged taunting and harassment during compliance-related meetings.

The complaint further alleges that a damaging and untruthful 2024 performance review was prepared by a supervisor who allegedly had not supervised the plaintiff during that period, and that company procedures for notifying her about the review were not followed.

According to the First Amended Complaint, on June 23, 2025, the plaintiff's team was allegedly informed that her last day would be July 3, although the plaintiff had not received prior notice. Her employment was terminated on July 3, 2025. The complaint characterizes the termination as the culmination of nearly two years of alleged retaliation and efforts to push her out.

The lawsuit alleges that the defendants violated California Labor Code section 1102.5 by retaliating against the plaintiff after she reported actual or potential violations of law, including by terminating her employment. The complaint further alleges that her termination violated public policies protecting employees who raise concerns about potentially unlawful conduct.

The plaintiff seeks alleged financial losses, including lost salary and benefits, compensatory and general damages, attorneys' fees and costs, punitive damages, restitutionary damages, prejudgment interest, injunctive relief, and other relief according to proof. The complaint seeks no less than $1 million in financial losses and no less than $1 million in compensatory and general damages, in addition to other requested relief.

Attorney Joseph J. Huprich of Huprich Law Firm, PC represents the plaintiff. The lawsuit is pending in the Superior Court of California, County of San Bernardino – Rancho Cucamonga District.

The allegations in the First Amended Complaint are allegations by the plaintiff. The filing does not constitute a finding of liability against any defendant, and liability remains to be determined through the judicial process.

Joseph Huprich
Huprich Law Firm, P.C.
+1 909-766-2226
email us here
Visit us on social media:
LinkedIn
Bluesky
Instagram
Facebook
YouTube
TikTok
X
Other
