

IN THE SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF DELAWARE
IN AND FOR NEW CASTLE COUNTY

ANIYA HARMON,)	
)	
Plaintiff,)	
)	C.A. No.
)	
v.)	
)	
SUSSEX CENTRAL HIGH SCHOOL)	
and INDIAN RIVER SCHOOL DISTRICT)	
and BRADLEY LAYFIELD and)	
MATTHEW JONES,)	
)	
Defendants.)	

COMPLAINT

The Parties and Jurisdiction

1. Plaintiff, Aniya Harmon (hereinafter “Plaintiff”), is an adult resident of the State of Delaware, and at all times relevant was an 18-year-old student of Sussex Central High School.
2. Defendant, Sussex Central High School (hereinafter “Sussex Central”), is a public high school organized and existing under the laws of the State of Delaware, located at 26026 Patriots Way, Georgetown, Delaware 19947.
3. Defendant, Indian River School District (hereinafter “Indian River”), is a school district organized and existing under the laws of the State of Delaware, and at all times relevant hereto owned and/or operated the Sussex Central High School located in Sussex County, Delaware.

4. Defendant, Bradley Layfield (hereinafter “Mr. Layfield”), at all times relevant to this action, was the Principal of Sussex Central High School on the date of the alleged incident, and was an authorized agent, servant, and employee of Defendants Sussex Central and Indian River.
5. Defendant, Matthew Jones (hereinafter “Mr. Jones”), at all times relevant to this action, was the Assistant Principal of Sussex Central on the date the alleged incident, and was an authorized agent, servant, and employee of Defendants Sussex Central and Indian River.
6. The incident complained of took place on the premises of Sussex Central.

Facts Giving Rise to the Action

7. At about 7:30 a.m. on or about May 17, 2023, Plaintiff was walking on the premises of Sussex Central, heading towards her class.
8. At about the same time and in the same exact area on the premises in Sussex Central, an argument was taking place between a female and male student.
9. As Plaintiff passed the two arguing students, she told the screaming female student to quiet down since her shouting was shattering the ambient peace of the morning.
10. The female student screamed obscenities at Plaintiff and bucked at her threateningly.
11. A female employee of Sussex Central then interceded and pulled Plaintiff forcefully by her jacket, bra strap and tank top strap blouse, which caused Plaintiff’s clothes to come apart, exposing her entire right breast.
12. The entire episode was captured by on-site Sussex Central surveillance cameras.
13. Plaintiff was ushered into the school’s administrative office where a school student monitor and a school behavioral principal were present.

14. While in the school's administrative office, Plaintiff filled out an incident report form describing the occurrences described above.
15. Plaintiff was joined in the administrative office by Mr. Jones, the assistant principal, who took from Plaintiff the filled-out incident, and told Plaintiff that he would review the surveillance/security footage referenced above to find out what happened.
16. Mr. Layfield, the school's principal, without assigning any reason, told Plaintiff that she should leave school for a few days.
17. Based on Mr. Layfield's directive, Plaintiff did not attend school until May 19, 2023.
18. On May 19, 2023, upon Plaintiff's return to Sussex Central, Plaintiff learned that Mr. Jones created a meme of the above-described school surveillance video footage of the incident, replacing Plaintiff's face with that of iconic singer, Janet Jackson.
19. Mr. Jones then showed on his school issued laptop computer images of the meme to other vice principals, administrators, teachers and other recipients.
20. Upon information and belief, Plaintiff also learned that Mr. Layfield showed other vice principals, administrators, teachers and other recipients the surveillance video depicting Plaintiff's exposed breast.
21. Upon information and belief, Mr. Jones has been put on administrative leave due to the unauthorized publication of the school surveillance video depicting Plaintiff's exposed breast.
22. Upon information and belief, Mr. Layfield has been put on administrative leave due to the unauthorized publication of the school surveillance video depicting Plaintiff's exposed breast.

COUNT I
Invasion of Privacy by Intrusion/Publication of Private Matters

23. Plaintiff repeats and realleges the foregoing paragraphs.
24. Mr. Jones and Mr. Layfield intruded upon the seclusion of Plaintiff by wrongfully sharing a video depicting Plaintiff's exposed breast.
25. Mr. Jones worked with Mr. Layfield and possibly others to create a meme image of the surveillance video that was in his possession, even though he was never given permission by Plaintiff to do so and shared the surveillance video with third parties.
26. Mr. Jones and Mr. Layfield's knowing, and intentional distribution of Plaintiff's personal and sensitive data was not carried out for any reasonable or legitimate purposes, but rather to create embarrassment and harm for Plaintiff.
27. The unauthorized publication and dissemination of the surveillance video depicting Plaintiff's breast was highly offensive and objectionable to Plaintiff and would be highly offensive and objectionable to any reasonable person.
28. Mr. Jones and Mr. Layfield knew or should have known that the data they possessed and shared contained private and confidential information and content, including sensitive and private photographs and video of Plaintiff's exposed breast, and that Plaintiff had a reasonable expectation of privacy in this data.

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff demands judgment against Defendants, for such damages as the jury/court will award, punitive damages, plus costs and interest, and attorney's fees.

COUNT II
Civil Conspiracy to Invasion of Privacy by Intrusion/Publication of Private Matters

29. Plaintiff repeats and realleges the foregoing paragraphs.

30. Mr. Jones worked with and made an agreement with Mr. Layfield and possibly others to create a meme image of Plaintiff's exposed breast without Plaintiff's consent.
31. Mr. Jones and Mr. Layfield caused at least six other people to have access to images of Plaintiff's breast, which would be highly offensive to a reasonable person.
32. The object of invading Plaintiff's privacy and disseminating the surveillance video of her breast was not for any legitimate purpose but to cause harm and embarrassment to Plaintiff.
33. As a result of Mr. Jones and Mr. Layfield's unlawful agreement and their conspiracy with others, images and video of Plaintiff's exposed breast were made available to third parties, which is highly offensive, causing harm to Plaintiff.
34. Mr. Jones and Mr. Layfield, in confederation and combination with others, agreed to and committed unlawful acts in furtherance of such conspiracy in violation of Delaware common law and caused Plaintiff to suffer considerable damages.

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff demands judgment against Defendants, for such damages as the jury/court will award, punitive damages, plus costs and interest, and attorney's fees.

COUNT III
Respondeat Superior

35. Plaintiff repeats and realleges the foregoing paragraphs.
36. At all times relevant, Mr. Jones and Mr. Layfield were working within the time, space, and scope of their employment and/or agency with Sussex Central and Indian River when they published and disseminated the video surveillance of Plaintiff's exposed breast to third parties.
37. As the principal of Mr. Jones and Mr. Layfield, Sussex Central and Indian River are liable for its agents' and/or employees' torts under the doctrine of *respondeat superior*.

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff demands judgment against Defendants, for such damages as the jury/court will award plus costs and interest, and attorney's fees and punitive damages.

COUNT IV
Intentional Infliction of Emotional Distress.

38. Plaintiff repeats and realleges the foregoing paragraphs as if alleged here again.
39. The conduct of Defendants towards Plaintiff, as described herein, were outrageous and extreme.
40. Defendants' conduct were intentional and/or malicious and were done for the purpose of causing or with substantial certainty that Plaintiff would suffer humiliation, mental anguish, and emotional or physical distress.
41. As a result of the above-described conduct, Plaintiff has endured and continues to endure pain and suffering, including, but not limited, to anxiety, depression, embarrassment, and emotional distress.
42. Plaintiff's right to be free of the emotional distress intentionally inflicted by Defendants has been denied in violation of the common law of the State of Delaware.
43. The actions of Defendants were intentional and/or malicious and merit an award of punitive damages.

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff demands judgment against Defendants, for such damages as the jury/court will award plus costs and interest, and attorney's fees and punitive damages.

COUNT V
Negligent Infliction of Emotional Distress

44. Plaintiff repeats and realleges the foregoing paragraphs.
45. Defendants acted negligently in that they should have known that their conduct toward Plaintiff would be offensive to her, and that she would suffer emotional distress.

46. As a direct and proximate result of the conduct of Defendants, Plaintiff suffered the injuries and losses set forth above.
47. Plaintiff's right to be free of the emotional distress negligently inflicted by Defendants have been denied in violation of the common law of the State of Delaware.

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff demands judgment against Defendants, for such damages as the jury/court will award plus costs and interest, and attorney's fees and punitive damages.

THE IGWE FIRM

/s/ Raj Srivatsan, Esquire

Raj Srivatsan, Esq (ID No. 4097)
1201 N. Orange Street, Suite 502
Wilmington, DE 19801
Phone: (302) 528-2042
Email: raj@igwefirm.com
Attorney for Plaintiff

Dated: September 11, 2023