

Cornell University ILR School

Cornell University ILR School DigitalCommons@ILR

ADAAA Case Repository

Labor and Employment Law Program

6-13-2002

# U.S. Equal Employment Opportunity Commission, Plaintiff, v. Temcor, Inc., Defendant.

Judge Wm. Matthew Byrne

Follow this and additional works at: https://digitalcommons.ilr.cornell.edu/adaaa Thank you for downloading this resource, provided by the ILR School's Labor and Employment Law Program. Please help support our student research fellowship program with a gift to the Legal Repositories!

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the Labor and Employment Law Program at DigitalCommons@ILR. It has been accepted for inclusion in ADAAA Case Repository by an authorized administrator of DigitalCommons@ILR. For more information, please contact catherwood-dig@cornell.edu.

If you have a disability and are having trouble accessing information on this website or need materials in an alternate format, contact web-accessibility@cornell.edu for assistance.

# U.S. Equal Employment Opportunity Commission, Plaintiff, v. Temcor, Inc., Defendant.

#### Keywords

U.S. Equal Employment Opportunity Commission, Temcor, Inc., 2:01-cv-08351-WMB-RNB, Consent decree / Settlement, Disparate Treatment, Failure to Accommodate, Termination, Other physical impairment disability, Hearing, Manufacturing, Employment Law, ADAAA

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8	ANNA PARK, State Bar No. 164242 DANA C. JOHNSON, State Bar No. 187341 PETER F. LAURA, State Bar No. 116426 U.S. EQUAL EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITY COMMISSION 255 East Temple Street, 4th Floor Los Angeles, CA 90012 Telephone: (213) 894-1079 Facsimile: (213) 894-1301 Attorneys for Plaintiff U.S. EQUAL EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITY COMMISSION	CLERK, U.S. DISTRICT COURT JUN I I 2002 CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA BY DEPUTY DEPUTY CENTRAL DISTRICT COURT DEPUTY					
9 10 11	Additional Counsel set forth on page ii	G-13-02 JUN 1.3 2002 CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA DEPUTY Enter					
12	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT JS-5/JS-6 JS-2/JS-3						
13	CENTRAL DISTRIC	CT OF CALIFORNIA					
14 15 16	U.S. EQUAL EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITY COMMISSION, Plaintiff,	CASE NO. CV 01-8351 WMB (RNBx)					
17	v. }						
18	TEMCOR, INC.,						
19	Defendant.						
20 21 22	FRED ROBISON Plaintiff/Intervenor						
23	TEMCOR, INC.,	Docketer					
24 25	Defendant.	JS - 5(JS - 6)					
25 26	)	JS - 2/J <del>S - 3</del> CLSD					
26 27							
28							
	-	210					

-

-

.

-----

1	BARRETT S. LITT, State Bar No. 65717 PAUL J. ESTUAR, State Bar No. 167764
2	BRYAN B. MILLER, State Bar No. 178134 LITT & ASSOCIATES, A LAW CORPORATION
3	3435 Wilshire Blvd., Ste 1100
4	Los Angeles, CA 90010-1912 Telephone: (213) 386-3114 Facsimile: (213) 380-4585
5	Attorneys for Plaintiff/Intervenor
6	FRED ROBISON
7	H. LEE HORTON, State Bar No. 57350 RAYMOND E. HANE III, State Bar No. 149960
8	WALLER LANSDEN DORTCH & DAVIS, LLP 520 S. Grand Avenue, Suite 675
9	Los Angeles, CA 90071
10	Telephone: (213) 362-3680 Facsimile: (213) 362 3679
11	JOHN B. GOLPER, State Bar No. 65963
12	BALLARD, ROSENBERG, GOLPER & SAVITT, LLP 10 Universal City Plaza, 16 <sup>th</sup> Floor
13	Universal City, CA 91608-1097 Telephone: (818) 508-3700
14	Facsimile: (818) 506-4827
15	Attorneys for Defendant TEMCOR, INC.
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
26	
27	
28	

2

#### I.

#### **INTRODUCTION**

Fred Robison, a hearing impaired 62 year old man, filed a charge of discrimination with
with Plaintiff Equal Employment Opportunity Commission ("EEOC" or "Commission") on
December 1, 1997, against his former employer Defendant Temcor Inc., ("Temcor" or
"defendant") alleging that Temcor discriminated against him because of his hearing impairment.

The EEOC investigated the charge of discrimination and found that there was reasonable
cause to believe that Temcor had violated the Americans with Disabilities Act ("ADA") by
discharging Robison because of his hearing impairment and by failing to engage in the interactive
process of reasonable accommodation required under the ADA. The EEOC invited Temcor to
conciliate the matter. Conciliation, however, was not successful.

On September 27, 2001, the EEOC filed the instant lawsuit alleging two violations of the ADA, *i.e.* discriminatory discharge and failure to engage in the interactive process of reasonable accommodation. On December 4, 2001, Plaintiff Intervenor Robison filed a motion to intervene and alleged that Defendant had also discriminated against Robison because of his disability in violation of the California Fair Employment and Housing Act, Cal. Govt. Code § 12940 et seq., ("FEHA")).

#### II.

#### **JURISDICTION**

The Court has jurisdiction over the parties and the subject matter of this lawsuit, pursuant to 28 U.S.C. Sections 451, 1331, 1337, 1343, 1367 and 42 U.S.C. Section 12117(a). The Court shall retain jurisdiction of this action during the duration of the Decree for the purposes of entering all orders, judgments and decrees which may be necessary to implement the relief provided herein.

## 25 26

27

18

19

#### PURPOSES OF THE CONSENT DECREE AND FINDINGS

III.

The parties have entered into this Decree for the following purposes:

28 A. To provide appropriate monetary and injunctive relief;

•

.

•

1	B.	To ensure that defendant's employment practices comply with federal law;
2	C.	To ensure training for defendant's managers and employees with respect to their
3		obligations under the ADA;
4	D.	To provide an appropriate and effective mechanism for handling requests for
5		accommodation in the workplace;
6	E.	To avoid the time, risk and expense of protracted litigation; and
7	F.	To provide a final and binding settlement upon the parties as to all ADA and
8		FEHA claims alleged in the Complaint filed in this action.
9	Having	g examined the terms and provisions of this Decree and based on the pleadings,
10	record and stij	pulation of the parties, the Court finds the following:
11	А.	The Court has jurisdiction over the parties and the subject matter of this action.
12		The Complaint asserts claims that, if proven, would authorize the Court to grant
13		the relief set forth in this Decree.
14	В.	The terms and provisions of this Decree are adequate, fair, reasonable, equitable
15		and just. The rights of the defendant, the Commission and those for whom the
16		Commission seeks relief are protected adequately by this Decree.
17	C.	This Decree conforms with the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, and the ADA
18		and is not in derogation of the rights and privileges of any person. The entry of this
19		Decree will further the objectives of the ADA and will be in the best interests of
20		the parties.
21		IV.
22		RELEASE OF CLAIMS
23	А.	This Decree fully and completely resolves all issues, claims and allegations
24	concerning dis	scrimination based upon Fred Robison's disabilities.
25	B.	Nothing in this Decree shall be construed to limit or reduce defendant's
26	obligations to	fully comply with the ADA.
27	C.	The parties shall use their best efforts to defend this Decree from any legal
28	challenge whe	ther by appeal, collateral attack or objection.

2

13

14

#### V.

#### **NON-DEROGATION OF EEOC RIGHTS**

A. This Decree in no way effects the EEOC's rights to proceed against the defendant
nor does it in any way effect the EEOC's rights to process charges against the defendant not
otherwise covered by this Decree in accordance with standard EEOC procedures and to
commence civil action on any such charges.

B. Under no circumstances shall the EEOC, by commenting or electing not to
comment upon proposed policies or procedures pursuant to Section IX (Injunctive Relief), be
deemed to have waived its right to investigate or litigate any alleged adverse effects of said policy
upon equal employment opportunities. Nor shall the EEOC, by commenting or electing not to
comment upon said policies or procedures, be considered to have accepted the validity of, or
approved, the provisions adopted by defendant.

#### VI.

#### **DECREE ENFORCEMENT**

15 A. It is expressly agreed that if the Commission has reason to believe that the Decree has 16 been breached, the Commission may bring an action before this Court to enforce the Decree. Prior to initiating such action, the Commission will notify the defendant and its legal counsel of 17 18 record, in writing, of the nature of the dispute. This notice shall specify the particular 19 provision(s) that the Commission believes has/have been breached, and a concise factual 20statement of the issues in dispute. A thirty (30) day dispute resolution period will be provided 21 from the date of notice prior to the institution of any legal proceeding, absent a showing by either 22 party that the delay will cause irreparable harm.

B. The parties agree to cooperate with each other and use their best efforts to resolve any
dispute referenced in the EEOC notice.

C. After the expiration of the thirty (30) day dispute resolution period, the Commission
may initiate an enforcement action in this Court, seeking all available relief, including an
extension of the Decree for such time as the defendant is shown to be out of compliance.

28 || ///

Document 26

D. The Commission may petition this Court for compliance with this Decree at any time
 during which this Court maintains jurisdiction over this action. Should the Court determine that
 the defendant has not complied with this Decree, in whole or in part, it may impose appropriate
 relief, including but not limited to the imposition of costs on the defendant and extension of the
 duration of this Decree for such a period as may be necessary to remedy the defendant's non compliance.

#### VII.

#### MODIFICATION AND SEVERABILITY

9 A. This Decree constitute the complete understanding of the parties with respect to
10 the matters contained within it. No waiver, modification or amendment of any provision of this
11 Decree will be effective unless made in writing and signed by an authorized representative of
12 each of the parties.

B. If one or more provisions of the Decree are rendered unlawful or unenforceable,
the parties shall make good faith efforts to agree upon appropriate amendments to this Decree in
order to effectuate the purposes of the Decree. If the parties are unable to reach agreement, the
Court shall order appropriate alternative provisions in order to effectuate the purposes of the
Decree. Should one or more provisions of this Decree be deemed unlawful, all other lawful and
enforceable provisions will remain in full force and effect.

19

7

8

20

24

25

26

# VIII.

#### EFFECTIVE DATE AND DURATION OF DECREE

A. This Decree shall be deemed effective as of the Date of Final Approval of this Decree
by the Court. The Date of Final Approval means the date upon which the Court approves the
Decree. This Decree shall remain in effect for three (3) years.

#### IX.

#### **INJUNCTIVE RELIEF**

A. Non-Discrimination

The defendant, its officers, agents, employees, successors, assigns and all persons in
active concert or participation with it are enjoined for the duration of the Decree from

Case 2:01-cv-08351-WMB-RNB

Document 26

discriminating against any individual because of his or her disability or failing to reasonably
 accomodate an individual with a disability.

3

**B**.

#### Equal Employment Opportunity Consultant

Within thirty (30) days of the Effective Date of this Decree and for a period of three
 (3) years from the Effective Date of this Decree, defendant shall designate its President as its
 Equal Employment Opportunity Consultant ("EEO Consultant") to implement and monitor
 defendant's compliance with the ADA and with the provisions of this Decree.

8

2. The EEO Consultant's responsibilities shall include:

- 9 a. Assisting defendant in developing an anti-discrimination policy addressing ADA
  10 issues, including but not limited to a prohibition against discrimination on the
  11 basis of disability, a prohibition against retaliation for engaging in activities
  12 protected under the ADA, and a description of the employer's obligation to
  13 reasonably accommodate persons covered under the ADA;
- b. Assisting defendant in developing a complaint procedure whereby disability
  discrimination complaints are received and processed, which procedure shall
  require that all complaints be referred to the EEO Consultant for his/her direct
  attention and resolution;
- c. Assisting defendant in developing a reasonable accommodation procedure
   whereby the need for reasonable accommodation is identified, potential reasonable
   , and appropriate reasonable accommodations are
- selected, which procedure shall require that all issues of reasonable
  accommodation be referred to the EEO Consultant for his/her direct attention and
  resolution;
  - d. Assisting defendant in training defendant's managerial and personnel employees
     on their responsibilities under the ADA; and
- 26 e. Ensuring that all reports required by this Decree are accurately compiled and
  27 timely submitted, and further ensuring compliance with the terms of this Decree.

28 ///

24

25

3. The EEOC shall be notified withing sixty (60) days of the Effective Date of this
 Decree of all policies and procedures required under this Section. The EEOC shall have thirty
 (30) days after notification to comment upon such policies and procedures prior to their
 implementation.

5 4. Temcor shall bear all costs associated with the performance of the EEO Consultant's6 duties.

#### C. Training

7

20

21

22

23

24

25

1

8 1. The defendant shall submit to the EEOC proposed non-discrimination training pro-9 grams and identify the person(s) and/or organization(s) conducting the non-discrimination 10 training programs for the instruction of all currently employed human resources and management 11 personnel. Trainings shall be conducted on an annual basis for the duration of the Decree, with 12 the first training taking place within 3 months of the Effective Date of this Decree. The 13 defendant shall notify the EEOC of the dates, times and locations at least ten (10) business days prior to each of the training sessions, and the EEOC shall have the right to attend or participate in 14 15 any or all such training.

16
2. At a minimum, the non-discrimination training programs shall include the following:
a. instruction on the requirements of all applicable equal employment opportunity
("EEO") laws including, but not limited to the ADA including accomodation
responsibilities;

b. a review of defendant's non-discrimination, non-retaliation and reasonable

c. training of management and human resources personnel in dealing with discrimination complaints and reasonable accommodation requests.

- D. Reporting and Record Keeping
  - **Document Preservation**

For the duration of the Decree, defendant agrees to maintain such records as are necessary
to demonstrate their compliance with this Decree, including but not limited to the documents
specifically identified below, and to verify that the reports submitted are accurate.

. L

1	2	Reports	
2		Initial Rej	porting: Within one-hundred twenty (120) days of the Effective Date of
3	this Decree, defendant shall provide the EEOC with the following:		
4		a. It'	s anti-disability discrimination, non-retaliation and reasonable
5		ac	commodation policy;
6		b. Pr	oposed disability discrimination training programs for all human
7		re	sources and management employees, including the identities of the
8		pe	ersons and/or organizations proposed to conduct the trainings; and
9		c. Pr	ocedure for tracking complaints of disability discrimination, identifying
10		th	e need for reasonable accomodation and processes by which potential
11		ac	commodations are considered; and
12	Subsequent Reports: On a semi-annual basis for term of the Decree, defendant		
13	shall provide the EEOC with a report of the foregoing. The closing period for the first report		
14	shall be six (6) months after the Effective Date of this Decree. The report shall set forth the		
15	following:		
16		a. Al	ll complaints of disability discrimination tracked by date, the identity of
17		the	e person who handled the complaint, and resolution of the complaint;
18		b. Al	I considerations regarding reasonable accommodation, whether initiated
19		by	request of the employee or at the instigation of the employer, tracked by
20		da	te that the need $$ . Temcor's attention, the
21		iđe	entity of the person(s) who explored potential accommodations, all
22		ac	commodations suggested by the employee, all accommodations
23		co	nsidered by Temcor, reasons any potential accommodation was rejected,
24			, if any, and the dates of each interaction set
25		for	rth above;
26		c. Tr	aining conducted or attended by the defendant on anti-discrimination
27		lav	ws and requirements under the ADA;
28		d. Cł	nange in designation of the EEO consultant, if any;

2

#### X

#### MONETARY RELIEF

3 In settlement of all monetary claims of the Individually Named Intervenor, other than 4 attorneys' fees and costs, defendant shall pay \$135,000.00 to Plaintiff Intervenor Fred Robison, 14% of which constitutes backpay and 86% of which constitutes compensation for physical 5 iniury. The parties agree that the Intervenor suffered physical injury within the meaning of 26 6 7 U.S.C. Section 104(a)(2), in the form of an infection and attendant physical disabilities suffered as a result of the cochlear implant surgery which Robison contends Temcor required him to 8 9 undergo in order to keep his employment with Temcor. Defendant shall pay to Mr. Robison fifty 10 thousand dollars (\$50,000.00) within 15 days of the parties signing this Consent Decree, of which seven thousand dollars (\$7,000.00) constitutes backpay and forty-three thousand dollars 11 12 (\$43,000.00) constitutes damages for physical injury. Defendant shall pay the balance of eighty-13 five thousand dollars (\$85,000.00) to Mr. Robison in January of 2003, of which eleven thousand nine hundred dollars (\$11,900.00) constitutes backpay and seventy-three thousand one hundred 14 15 dollars (\$73,100.00) constitutes damages for physical injury. FICA and federal and state 16 withholding taxes shall be deducted from the backpay amount only. Temcor shall issue Form 17 1099s to Mr. Robison for those amounts which constitute compensation for physical injury. 18 Defendant shall pay the employer's share of FUTA and FICA on the backpay amount and shall 19 not deduct it from the settlement amount.

Within ten (10) days of making each payment to Mr. Robison, a copy of the checks and
documentation showing FICA/FUTA deductions shall be submitted to the Regional Attorney,
Equal Employment Opportunity Commission, Los Angeles District Office, 255 East Temple
Street, 4<sup>th</sup> Floor, Los Angeles, California 90012.

# 24

25

### XI

#### **ATTORNEYS' FEES AND COSTS**

26The Plaintiff Intervenor is the prevailing party for purposes of an award of attorneys' fees27and costs.

28 ///

The parties agree that under Local Rule 54-12, within 30 days of the Court's execution of
 this Decree, plaintiff intervenor's counsel shall move this Court for an award of attorney's fees
 and costs. The Court's decision as to the amount of attorney's fees and costs shall be binding
 upon the parties and shall not be appealable. Defendant, Temcor, shall not raise its financial
 condition in connection with plaintiff intervenor's counsel's motion for an award of attorney's
 fees and costs.

7 Defendant shall pay one third (1/3) of the awarded attorney's fees and costs within 15
8 days of the Court's order awarded such fees and costs. Defendant shall pay the balance in
9 January of 2003.

The parties agree that fees and costs to compensate the intervenor's counsel belong solely to the plaintiff intervenor's counsel, Litt & Associates, as provided by California law, and shall be paid separately and directly to it. A 1099 shall be issued to Litt & Associates for the amount of the fees, and none shall be issued to the Intervenor directly.

Defendant shall bear all costs associated with its administration and implementation ofthis Decree.

16

17

#### MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS

XII

The defendant will provide any potential successor with a copy of this Decree within a
reasonable time of not less than thirty (30) days prior to the execution of any document providing
for acquisition or assumption of control of the defendant, or any other material change in
corporate structure, and shall simultaneously inform the Commission of the same.

The defendant and its successors shall assure that, during the term of this Decree, all of
its officers, managers, and supervisors are aware of any of the terms of this Decree which relate to
their job duties.

25 ///

26 ///

27 ///

28 ///

1	XIII			
2	FACSIMILED SIGNATURE			
3	The parties agree that facsimiled signatures to this Decree have the same force and effect			
4	as signatures penned in ink.			
5				
6	ORDER			
7	The provisions of the foregoing Consent Decree are hereby approved and compliance with			
8	all provisions thereof is HEREBY ORDERED.			
9 10	Dated: Junie 10, 2012 6. Marchen Brand			
11	Judge United States District Court			
12				
13	EQUAL EMPLOYMENT			
14	OPPORTUNITY COMMISSION ANNA Y. PARK DANA C. JOHNSON			
15				
16	Date: June 4, 2002 By: ANNA Y. PARK			
17	Attorneys for Plaintiff			
18				
19	Date: June, 2002 TEMCOR, INC.			
20				
21	By: C.A. Tourville			
22	President, TEMCOR, INC.			
23				
24	Date: June, 2002 PLAINTIFF/INTERVENOR			
25				
26	Fred Robison			
27				
28				

ient By: LiCase 2:01-cv-08351-Wi	MB-RNB 1 2000000 em926	Filedr06/11/2000 Jun 5 2 13	27AM Page 13 of algae :22 P.02	2/3
FROM : TEMCOR	FAX NO. : 9127546728	· · · · ·		
Kant Ry- I LEF; My-W-IE (FIGHD FrankEM, VIIT	1 £18 800 4983; 218-05		2/2 Fage ¥/2	

2     PACEDINILIKI SEGNATIONE       3     The purious ages likes facoinsiled signatures to this Decree have the same factor and affect       4     As signatures pursed in lak.       5     ORDER       6     ORDER       7     The provisions of the facegoing Constat Decree up hereby approved and compliance with       8     NI provisions thereof is EXEMPLENY ORDERIED.       9     Detect:     Judge United Summ Division Court						
4 as signatures paramet in the. 6 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7						
GRDER The provisions of the Surgeing Constant Derme we havery approved and compliance with all provisions thereof is EIEBERY COUNTREED. Detect:						
GRDER The provisions of the Surgeing Constant Derme we havery approved and compliance with all provisions thereof is EIEBERY COUNTREED. Detect:						
ORDER     The provisions of the foregoing Constat Decase we havery approved and compliance with     nil provisions thereof is ESERENY CONDERED.     Detect:						
all provisions thereof in EIEBERY CHORERED.      Denot:	ORDER					
all provisions thereof in EIEBERY CHORERED.      Denot:	The provisions of the foreming Consist Decre up hereby sporoved and compliance with					
9 10 Detect: Judge United Suma District Court 11						
10 Detect: Judge United Suma Diversi Court						
13 14 14 14 14 14 14 14 14 14 14 14 14 14						
DANA C. JOHRNOUM						
By:	-					
15 Dem: Harr_ 2002 ANNA Y. PARK Allocotys Br Fleistill						
18						
TIMCOR, INC.						
20 21 By: The second se	2					
21 22 President, TEMCOR, INC.						
20						
24 Dats: June 3, 2002 FLAINTERVENOR						
25 F. D. Raham						
To all Constant						
27						
74						

Filedr06/11/2002 AM; Page 14 of at # 3/3 • • • HLDĐ :2133623679 Jun 5 2 13:22 P.03 Page 3/3-Jun-4-02 5:49P4; 1 213 380 4585; ient By: Litt; 213-894-1301 1-688 P.412/007 P-688 18-18-val FIDE-LEGAL MILT 12:00 LITT & ASSOCIATES BARRETT & LITT, ESQ. BRYAN MILLER, ESQ. 1 2 3 By: Date: June 4, 2002 Bryan Miller 4 Anoranys for Plaintiff/Intervenor, FRED ROBISON 5 6 WALLER LANSDEN DORTCH & Date: June 5, 2002 DAVES, LLF E. LEF HORTON, ESQ. THOMAS H. LEF, ESQ. RAYMOND E. HANE HI, ESQ. 7 8 9 10 By: 11 12 Agorneys for Defendant TEMCOR. INC. 13 14 13 16 17 18 . ..... 19 20 21 22 .... 23 24 : 25 ł . t . . ŝ . . . . 26 . .. 27 , · 28 ÷ . 11 11 5 . . . . . . ÷ . ٠. ...... .