

25th Annual Labor and Employment Law Conference

**May 10-11, 2018
Austin, Texas**

**Developments in
Disability Discrimination Law
2017 - 2018**

**JAMES H. KIZZIAR, JR.
Bracewell LLP**

**James H. Kizzia r, Jr.
Brace well LLP
San Antonio, Texas**

**Jim .Kizzia r@bra ce well.c om
210-299-3526**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
I. Introduction	1
II. Administrative and Legislative Developments	1
A. Strategic Enforcement Plan.....	1
B. EEOC Litigation Trends	2
C. Department of Labor Issues FLSA Opinion Letter on Compensation for Short Breaks Due to Employee’s Medical Condition	4
D. EEOC Rule Sets Numeric Affirmative Action Goals for Federal Agencies	5
III. The EEOC Regulations Implementing the ADAAA	5
A. Construction	5
B. Definition of Disability	5
C. Definition of Physical or Mental Impairment	6
D. Definition of Major Life Activities	6
E. Definition of “Substantially Limits”	6
F. Definition of Has a Record of an Impairment.....	8
G. Definition of Is Regarded as Having an Impairment	8
H. Definition of Qualified Person	9
I. Reasonable Accommodations	9
J. Prohibitions Against Reverse Discrimination	9
K. Qualification Standards, Tests, and Other Selection Criteria	9
L. Defenses	9
M. Other Issues.....	10
N. Interpretive Guidance.....	10
IV. The Ministerial Exception and the ADA.....	10
A. Supreme Court Holds that Ministerial Exception Applies to ADA Claims of Teacher Working for Ecclesiastical Corporation.....	10
V. Impairments Under the ADA	11
A. Conditions Considered Impairments.....	11
B. Impairments Excluded from the ADA	11
1. Physical Characteristics	11
2. Personality Characteristics.....	12
3. Pregnancy.....	12
4. Illegal Use of Drugs	13
5. Sexual Conditions	13
6. Social Conditions	14
7. Obesity	14
8. Stress	15
9. Miscellaneous	16
C. Court Decisions on Impairments.....	16
1. Failure to Allege How Impairment Limited Major Life Activities Defeats Employee’s Claims.....	16

TABLE OF CONTENTS
(Continued)

	<u>Page</u>
VI. The Three-Part Definition of Disability	17
A. Physical or Mental Impairment that Substantially Limits One or More Major Life Activities	17
B. Record of an Impairment	18
C. Regarded as Having an Impairment.....	18
VII. Consideration of Mitigating Measures	19
VIII. Major Life Activities	20
A. Developments in Major Life Activities	20
B. Post-Amendment Standard for the Major Life Activity of Working.....	20
C. Recent Court Decisions on Major Life Activities.....	20
1. Inability to Perform a Specific Job is Not a Substantial Limitation on the Major Life Activity of Working	20
IX. Substantial Limitations.....	21
A. Recent Court Decisions on the Substantial Limitation Standard.....	21
1. Employee Performance Deficiencies in Meeting Quality Control Standards Did Not Substantially Limit His Major Life Activities	21
X. Qualified Individual	22
A. Definition	22
B. Recent Court Decisions on the Qualified Individual Standard	23
1. Employee Not Qualified Where She Admitted that She Would Have Rejected Potential Reasonable Accommodation	23
2. Failure to Meet Federal Regulation Standards Renders Employee Not Qualified	24
XI. Essential Job Functions	25
A. Recent Court Decisions on Essential Functions.....	25
1. Conflicting Testimony and Old Job Description Sufficient for Jury to Determine that In-Person Work was Not an Essential Function	25
2. Higher-Level Position Could Include Essential Function of Being Able to Perform All Essential Functions of Lower-Level Positions	26
3. Newly Added Essential Job Function of Providing Immunizations Rendered Trypanophobic Pharmacist Unable to Perform the Essential Functions of His Position.....	27

TABLE OF CONTENTS
(Continued)

	<u>Page</u>
XII. Disability Discrimination	28
A. Failure to Notify Employee of Performance Deficiencies was Discriminatory Where Non-Disabled Employees were Counseled and Given the Opportunity to Improve	28
XIII. Regarding Individuals as Disabled.....	28
A. Post-Amendment Standard for Regarding Person as Disabled.....	28
B. Discrimination Claims under “Regarded As” Prong Require an ADA- Qualifying Physical Impairment	29
C. Accommodations Not Required For “Regarded As” Disability	30
XIV. Mental and Emotional Disabilities	30
A. Mental Impairment Must Substantially Limit a Major Life Activity	30
B. Individuals With Mental Impairment Must Be Otherwise Qualified.....	31
C. Regarding Employees with Mental Impairments as Disabled	31
D. Employees with Mental Impairments May - or May Not - be Required to Request Reasonable Accommodation.....	31
E. Recent Court Decisions.....	31
1. Employer Lawfully Terminated Employee for Harassing Behavior, Even Though Conduct was “Compelled by his Mental Illness”.....	31
2. No Breach of ADA Confidentiality Requirements Occurred Where Employee’s Actions and Statements Led to Supervisor Comment that Employee had PTSD	32
XV. Misconduct and Disabilities	33
A. Court Decisions.....	35
1. Employee Lawfully Terminated for Insubordination based on Belligerent Cursing and Grabbing Supervisor in Response to Request for Medical Documentation	35
XVI. Direct Threat to Health or Safety	36
A. Introduction.....	36
B. Court Decisions.....	37
1. Physical Therapist Job Site Analysis Determining Employee could not Perform Essential Functions of Position Sufficient to Support Employer Action Based on Direct Threat Assessment.....	37
2. Employers May Rely on Objectively Reasonable Opinions to Determine Direct Threat, Even if Incorrect	37
XVII. The Interactive Process	39
A. Key Elements of an Employer Policy on the Interactive Process.....	40
B. Engaging in the Interactive Process	41
1. No Separate Cause of Action Exists for Failure to Engage in the Interactive Process	41
2. Employee Responsible for Clarifying Restrictions in Doctor’s Certification During Interactive Process.....	41
3. Unnecessary Delay in Providing Reasonable Accommodation Results in Disability Discrimination.....	42
XVIII. Reasonable Accommodation.....	43
A. Transfer to a Vacant Position as a Reasonable Accommodation.....	44
1. Conflict Continues in the Circuit Courts	44
2. Court Decisions on Transfer to a Vacant Position.....	46

TABLE OF CONTENTS
(Continued)

	<u>Page</u>
B. Use of Service Animals as an Accommodation.....	52
1. Animal Need Not be Formally Trained as a Service Animal for Presence in the Workplace to be a Reasonable Accommodation	55
2. Bringing a Pet to Work May Be a Reasonable Accommodation.....	56
C. Court Decisions on Reasonable Accommodation.....	57
1. Accommodation Not Required Where “Minor Effort” by Employee Would Enable Her to Perform Essential Functions of Position.....	57
2. Employee Carelessness and Inattention Prevents Failure to Accommodate Claim	58
3. Compare and Contrast: Accommodation of Allergic Reactions.....	59
D. Requests For Accommodation Found to be Unreasonable/Undue Hardship.....	61
1. Presence of Spouse for Employee to “Feel Safe” was Unreasonable Request.....	61
2. Employee’s Request for “Calm, Fair, Non-Confrontational Treatment” Was Unreasonable	62
3. Retroactive Leniency in Discipline is Not a Reasonable Accommodation.....	62
4. No ADA Obligation to Create Permanent Light-Duty Positions.....	63
E. Leave of Absence As a Reasonable Accommodation.....	64
1. Multiple Extensions May Be Reasonable Accommodations.....	64
2. A Prolonged Leave of Absence May Be an Undue Hardship	65
3. An Indefinite Leave of Absence Is Not a Reasonable Accommodation	66
4. Must An Employer Provide "Reinstatement Rights" During an Extension of Leave As a Reasonable Accommodation?	68
5. Intermittent Leave as a Reasonable Accommodation.....	69
F. Court Decisions on Extension of Leave as Reasonable Accommodation	71
1. Seventh and Eleventh Circuits Hold That “Multi-month” Leaves are Not a Reasonable Accommodation.....	71
2. Length of Extended Leave and Employee’s Retirement Application Rendered Leave Unreasonable	74
3. History of Repeatedly Extensive Periods of Leave and Failing to Return to Work on the Estimated Return-to-Work Dates Made Future Leave Requests Indefinite.....	74
4. Policy for Not Providing Leave Beyond FMLA Entitlement Violated ADA.....	75
XIX. Hostile Work Environment	76
A. Analysis.....	76
XX. Interference Claims	77
A. Court Decisions.....	77
1. Seventh Circuit Sets Elements of ADA Interference Claim.....	77

TABLE OF CONTENTS
(Continued)

	<u>Page</u>
XXI. Medical Examinations and Inquiries	78
A. Pre-Offer Medical Examinations and Inquiries	78
B. Post-Offer Medical Examinations and Inquiries	79
C. Medical Examinations and Inquiries for Employees	79
D. Fitness for Duty Examinations	79
E. Periodic Medical Testing	80
F. Court Decisions	81
1. Actions Perceived as Threatening to Co-Workers Support Employer's Reasonable Belief to Require Psychiatric Evaluation	81
2. Employer Need Not Consider Individual Characteristics for Class-Based Medical Inquiry Requirements	82
G. Doctor's Work Restrictions	83
1. Doctor's Comment that Accommodation would "Be More Suitable" Did Not Require that Accommodation Where Doctor's Note Also Stated Another Accommodation Was in Employee's "Best Interest"	83
2. Individuals Are Bound by Their Doctor's Restrictions	84
XXII. Failure to Hire	84
A. Rescinding Job Offer "Almost Immediately" After Learning of Impairment Resulted in Triable Discrimination Claim	84
XXIII. Discrimination Due to a Relationship or Association With a Disabled Person	86
A. Court Decisions	86
1. Employee Failed to Show that Employer "Embarrassment" at Disabled Daughter Resulted in ADA Associational Discrimination	86
XXIV. Coverage of Independent Contractors	87
A. Independent Contractors Covered by Rehabilitation Act	87
XXV. Procedural and Litigation Issues	88
A. EEOC Intake Questionnaire May Be Considered With Charge to Determine Whether Claim Was Administratively Exhausted	88
B. Sincere Belief, Even if Inaccurate, is Legally Permissible Basis for Adverse Employment Action	89
XXVI. Wellness Programs	89
A. EEOC Court Challenge to Employer Wellness Programs	91
1. EEOC Settles Challenge to Orion Energy Systems, Inc. Wellness Program	91

APPENDICES

- APPENDIX A: ADA Charges Filed with EEOC FY 2017
- APPENDIX B: Types of Impairments in ADA Charges, FY 2017
- APPENDIX C: Mental Health Issues in ADA Charges
- APPENDIX D: Resolution of ADA Charges filed with EEOC FY 2017
- APPENDIX E: Map Regarding Federal Circuit Courts Positions on Preference for Reassignment Accommodation

**THIS OUTLINE IS INTENDED TO ASSIST PARTICIPANTS WITH A
GENERAL UNDERSTANDING OF CURRENT DEVELOPMENTS IN THE LAW.
IT IS NOT TO BE CONSIDERED LEGAL ADVICE.**

The author gratefully acknowledges the assistance of Associates Amber Dodds, Lauren West, Christopher Jaynes, and Director of Knowledge Resources Natalie Lira with Bracewell LLP in the preparation of these materials.

University of Texas School of Law Employment Law Conferences

1993 – 2018

Disability Law Development outlines have been prepared for University of Texas Law School Annual Labor and Employment Law Conference for twenty-five years. The author acknowledges the significant contributions to these outlines made by the following attorneys and paralegals during the past quarter century:

Thanks to these legal professionals who have contributed to twenty-five years of information on disability law developments

Attorneys	Years
Laura Merritt	1996
Sandra White	1998 - 2012
Kelly Killian Satel	1997 – 1998
Stanley Pietrusiak	1999 - 2002
Nora Hinojosa	2000
Jennifer Knapp	2000
Jonathon Larabee	2000
James Parker	2001
Elizabeth Fruin Smith	2002
Natalie Rougeux	2004 – 2005
Isabel Andrade	2006
Stephen Barrera	2006
George Hinchney	2008
Amber Dodds	2013 - 2018

Paralegals	Years
Penny Robinson	2000 - 2011
Debra Crosby	1998
Andrea DiSalvatore	2008
Donna Lipsey	2008
Evelyn Oefinger	2012

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

	Page(s)
Cases	
<i>Abouhamad v. Bank of Am., Corp.</i> , 2012 WL 4023579 (D. Mass. 2012).....	40
<i>Aka v. Washington Hosp. Ctr.</i> , 156 F.3d 1284 (D.C. Cir. 1998)	46
<i>Alamillo v. BNSF Ry. Co.</i> , 869 F.3d 916 (9th Cir. 2017).....	59
<i>Albertson’s, Inc. v. Kirkingburg</i> , 527 U.S. 555 (1999)	25
<i>Anderson v. JPMorgan Chase & Co.</i> , 418 Fed. Appx. 881 (11th Cir. 2011)	60
<i>Arias v. McHugh</i> , No. 2:09-690 WBS GGH, 2010 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 60814 (E.D. Cal. 2010).....	16
<i>Arrieta-Colon v. Wal-Mart Puerto Rico Inc.</i> , 434 F.3d 75 (1st Cir. 2006)	79
<i>Assaturian v. Hertz Corp.</i> , No. 13-00299 (D. Haw. 2014).....	57
<i>Barbara Church v. Sears Holding Corp.</i> , 605 Fed. App’x 119 (3d. Cir. 2015) (unpublished).....	62
<i>Barlow v. Walgreen Co.</i> , 2012 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 34026 (M.D. Fla. 2012).....	18
<i>Battle v. Mineta</i> , 387 F. Supp. 2d 4 (D.D.C. 2005)	6
<i>Billups v. Emerald Coast Utilities Authority</i> , 714 Fed. Appx. 929 (11th Cir. Oct. 26, 2017) (unpublished)	75
<i>Black v. Wayne Center</i> , 225 F.3d 658 (6th Cir. 2000).....	62
<i>Blatt v. Cabela’s Retail, Inc.</i> , No. 5:14-cv-04822 (E.D. Pa. May 18, 2017)	14
<i>BNSF Railway Co. v. Feit</i> , 663 Fed. App’x 504 (9th Cir. 2016).....	15, 16

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

(Continued)

	<u>Page(s)</u>
<i>Brown v. Milwaukee Board of School Directors</i> , 855 F.3d 818 (7th Cir. May 4, 2017)	43
<i>Budde v. Kane Cnty. Forest Pres.</i> , 597 F.3d 860 (7th Cir. 2010).....	34
<i>Bunn v. Khoury Enters., Inc.</i> , 753 F.3d 676 (7th Cir. 2014).....	42
<i>Caldwell v. KHOU-TV et al.</i> , 850 F.3d 237 (5th Cir. Mar. 6, 2017)	29
<i>Campbell v. Wal-Mart Stores, Inc.</i> , 272 F. Supp. 2d 1276 (N.D. Okla. 2003)	45
<i>Cannon v. Jacobs Field Servs. N. Am., Inc.</i> , 813 F.3d 586 (5th Cir. 2016).....	86
<i>Cisneros v. Wilson</i> , 226 F.3d 1113 (10th Cir. 2000), <i>overruled on other grounds by Bd. of Trustees of</i> <i>Univ. of Ala. v. Garrett</i> , 531 U.S. 356 (2001)	69
<i>Colonna v. UPMC Hamot</i> , No. 1:16-CV-0053 (BJR), 2017 WL 4235937 (W.D. Pa. Sept. 25, 2017)	58
<i>Cook v. R.I. Dep’t of Mental Health</i> , 10 F.3d 17 (1st Cir. 1993)	15
<i>Cooley v. E. Tenn. Human Resource Agency, Inc.</i> , 2017 WL 6547387 (6th Cir. Dec. 22, 2017)	24
<i>Core v. Champaign County Board of Commissioners</i> , No. 3:11-cv-166, 2012 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 149120 (S.D. Ohio 2012).....	61
<i>D’Angelo v. Conagra Foods</i> , 422 F.3d 1200 (11th Cir. 2005).....	31
<i>Daugherty v. City of El Paso</i> , 56 F.3d 695 (5th Cir. 1995).....	46
<i>Davis v. NYC Dept. of Educ.</i> , 2012 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 5633 (E.D.N.Y. 2012)	29
<i>Dewitt v. Sw. Bell Tel. Co.</i> , 845 F.3d 1299 (10th Cir. Jan. 18, 2017)	64
<i>Dube v. Texas Health and Human Services Comm’n</i> , 2011 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 99680 (W.D. Tex. 2011)	29

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES
(Continued)

	<u>Page(s)</u>
<i>Duckett v. Dunlop Tire Corp.</i> , 120 F.3d 1222 (11th Cir. 1997).....	67
<i>Dunderdale v. United Airlines, Inc.</i> , No. 14-2911 (7th Cir. 2015).....	52
<i>EEOC v. Allsup’s Convenience Stores, Inc.</i> , 1:15-cv-00863 (D.N.M. filed Sept. 28, 2015).....	2
<i>EEOC v. American Airlines, Inc. and Envoy Air Inc.</i> , 2:17-cv-04059 (D.Ariz. filed Nov. 3, 2017)	3
<i>EEOC v. The Cheesecake Factory, Inc. and The Cheesecake Factory Restaurants, Inc.</i> , 2:16-CV-1942 (W.D. Wash. filed Dec. 20, 2016)	4
<i>EEOC v. Chevron Phillips Chem. Co.</i> , 570 F.3d 606 (5th Cir. 2009).....	40
<i>EEOC v. Consol Edison Co. of N.Y.</i> , No. 1:17-cv-07390 (S.D.N.Y. Nov. 7, 2017).....	2
<i>EEOC v. Health Care Servs. Corp.</i> , No. 3:17-cv-02626 (N.D. Tex. Sept. 26, 2017).....	2
<i>EEOC v. Hester Foods, Inc. d/b/a Kentucky Fried Chicken</i> , 3:17-cv-000340 (S.D. Ga. filed Jan. 30, 2018)	3
<i>EEOC v. Hosanna-Tabor Evangelical Lutheran Church & Sch.</i> , 132 S. Ct. 694 (Jan. 11, 2012).....	10
<i>EEOC v. Humiston-Keeling, Inc.</i> 227 F.3d 1024 (7th Cir. 2000).....	47
<i>EEOC v. Lowe’s Companies, Inc.</i> , 4:17-CV-02589 (N.D. Tex. 2017).....	4
<i>EEOC v. Methodist Hosps. of Dall.</i> , No. 3:15-cv-03104, 2016 WL 6565949 (N.D. Tex. Nov. 4, 2016).....	51
<i>EEOC v. Methodist Hosps. of Dall.</i> , No. 3:15-cv-03104 (N.D. Tex. Mar. 2017)	46
<i>EEOC v. Sara Lee Corp.</i> , 237 F.3d 349 (4th Cir. 2001).....	46
<i>EEOC v. St. Joseph’s Hosp. Inc.</i> , No. 15-14551 (11th Cir. Dec. 7, 2016)	46

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

(Continued)

	<u>Page(s)</u>
<i>EEOC v. St. Joseph’s Hospital, Inc.</i> , 842 F.3d 1333 (11th Cir. Dec. 7, 2016)	48
<i>EEOC v. U.S. Steel Corp.</i> , 2013 WL 625315 (W.D. Pa. 2013)	82, 83
<i>EEOC v. United Airlines, Inc.</i> , 693 F.3d 760 (7th Cir. 2012), cert. den’d, 133 S.Ct. 2734 (May 28, 2013).....	46, 47
<i>EEOC v. Watkins Motor Lines</i> , 463 F.3d 436 (6th Cir. 2006).....	14
<i>Flowers v. So. Reg’l Physician Serv.</i> , 247 F.3d 229 (5th Cir. 2001).....	78
<i>Flynn v. Distinctive Home Care, Inc.</i> , 812 F.3d 422 (5th Cir. 2016).....	89
<i>Fox v. Gen. Motors Corp.</i> , 247 F.3d 169 (4th Cir. 2001).....	78, 79
<i>Francis v. City of Meriden</i> , 129 F.3d 281 (2d Cir. 1997).....	14, 30
<i>Frankes v. Peoria School District No. 150</i> , No. 15-3091 (7th Cir. Sept. 26, 2017).....	79
<i>Frazier-White v. Gee</i> , 818 F.3d 1249 (11th Cir., Apr. 7, 2016) cert den’d 137 S.Ct. 592 (Dec. 12, 2016)	49
<i>Fricke v. E.I. Dupont Co.</i> , No. 05-6521, 2007 U.S. App. LEXIS 2425 (6th Cir. 2007)	16
<i>Fulp v. Columbiana Hi Tech, LLC</i> , No. 116-1169, 2018 WL 1027159 (M.D.N.C. Feb. 21, 2018).....	22
<i>Funmilayo Adetimehin v. Healix Infusion Therapy, Inc.</i> , No. 4:14-cv-00334 (S.D. Tex. 2015)	21
<i>Gambini v. Total Renal Care</i> , 486 F.3d 1087 (9th Cir. 2007).....	34
<i>Garner v. Chevron Phillips Chem. Co. L.P.</i> , 834 F.Supp.2d 528 (S.D. Tex. 2011)	41
<i>Gaul v. Lucent Tech., Inc.</i> , 134 F.3d 576 (3d Cir. 1998).....	16

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

(Continued)

	<u>Page(s)</u>
<i>Gogos v. AMS Mech. Sys., Inc.</i> , No. 153603 (7th Cir., Feb. 3, 2017)	35
<i>Golden v. Indianapolis Housing Agency</i> , 698 Fed. Appx. 835 (7th Cir. Oct. 17, 2017) (unpublished)	74
<i>Graves v. Finch Pruyn</i> , 18 AD Cas. (BNA) 193, 196 (2d Cir. 2006)	70
<i>Hargett v. Fl. Atlantic Univ. Bd. of Trustees</i> , No. 15-cv-80349 (S.D. Fla. 2016).....	16, 63
<i>Harrison v. Proctor & Gamble Distributing, LLC</i> , No. 1:15-cv-00514 (S.D. Ohio, Nov. 17, 2017).....	47
<i>Harty v. City of Sanford</i> , 2012 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 111121 (M.D. Fla. 2012).....	20
<i>Haschmann v. Time Warner Entm't</i> , 151 F.3d 591 (7th Cir. 1998).....	66
<i>Hedrick v. W. Reserve Care Sys.</i> , 355 F.3d 444 (6th Cir. 2004).....	47
<i>Hernandez-Gil v. Dental Dreams, LLC</i> , No. 13-1141 (D. N.M. Mar. 28, 2018).....	56
<i>Hohn v. BNSF Railway Co.</i> , 707 F.3d 995 (8th Cir. 2013).....	86
<i>Horn v. Knight Facilities Mgmt-GM, Inc.</i> , No. 12-2688 (6th Cir. 2014).....	86
<i>Huber v. Wal-Mart Stores</i> , 486 F.3d 480 (8th Cir. 2007).....	47
<i>Hudson v. MCI Telecomm. Corp.</i> , 87 F.3d 1167 (10th Cir. 1996).....	67, 68
<i>Hummel v. County of Saginaw</i> , 118 F. Supp. 2d 811 (E.D. Mich. 2000), <i>aff'd</i> , 2002 U.S. App. LEXIS 14684 (6th Cir. 2002)	69
<i>Humphrey v. Memorial Hospital Association</i> . 239 F.3d 1128 (9th Cir. 2001).....	60
<i>Johnson v. N.Y. State Office of Alcoholism & Substance Abuse Servs.</i> , No. 16-9769, 2018 BL 86496 (S.D.NY. Mar. 13, 2018)	17

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES
(Continued)

	<u>Page(s)</u>
<i>Katz v. Adecco USA, Inc.</i> , 845 F.Supp.2d 539 (S.D.N.Y. 2012)	18
<i>Lanman v. Johnson Cnty.</i> , 393 F.3d 1151 (10th Cir. 2004)	78
<i>Lester v. City of Lafayette</i> , No. 13-cv-01997 (D. Colo. 2015)	88
<i>Maddox v. University of Tenn.</i> , 62 F.3d 843 (6th Cir. 1995)	34
<i>Maggio v. Konica-Minolta Bus. Solutions</i> , 578 F. Supp. 2d 969 (N.D. Ill. 2008)	79
<i>Mauerhan v. Wagner Corp.</i> , No. 09-4179, 2011 U.S. App. LEXIS 7952 (10th Cir. 2011)	13
<i>Mayorga v. Alorica, Inc.</i> , 2012 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 103766 (S.D. Fla. 2012)	12
<i>McDonnell Douglas Corp. v. Green</i> , 411 US 792 (1973)	28, 33, 60, 68
<i>McLane v. Sch. City of Mishawaka.</i> , No. 3:15-cv-00119 (N.D. Ind., Feb. 1, 2017)	38
<i>McNelis v. Pennsylvania Power & Light Co.</i> , 867 F.3d 411 (3d Cir. 2017)	25
<i>Meade v. AT&T Corp.</i> , No. 15-6362 (6th Cir. 2016) (unpublished)	65
<i>Micari v. Trans World Airlines</i> , 43 F. Supp. 2d 275 (E.D.N.Y. 1999), <i>aff'd mem.</i> , 205 F.3d 1323 (2d Cir. 1999)	67
<i>Michael v. City of Troy Police Dept.</i> , No. 14-2478 (6th Cir. 2015)	38
<i>Michelle G. v. Department of Treasury (Internal Revenue Service)</i> , 2016 EEOCPUB LEXIS 1247 (EEOC 2016)	43
<i>Molina v. DSI Renal, Inc.</i> , 840 F. Supp. 2d 984 (W.D. Tex. 2012)	18
<i>Montenez-Denman v. Slater</i> , 208 F.3d 214 (6th Cir. 2000)	62

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES
(Continued)

	<u>Page(s)</u>
<i>Morriss v. BNSF Railway Co.</i> , 817 F.3d 1104 (8th Cir. 2016), <i>cert. den'd</i> 137 S.Ct. 256 (Oct. 3, 2016)	15
<i>Mosby-Meachem v. Memphis Light, Gas & Water Division</i> , 883 F.3d 595 (6th Cir. Feb. 21, 2018)	26
<i>Moss v. Harris Cty. Constable Precinct One</i> , 851 F.3d 413 (5th Cir. Mar. 15, 2017)	76
<i>Mundo v. Sanus Health Plan</i> , 966 F. Supp. 171 (E.D.N.Y. 1997)	16
<i>Myers v. Hose</i> , 50 F.3d 278 (4th Cir. 1995)	68
<i>Norton v. Assisted Living Concepts, Inc.</i> , 786 F. Supp. 2d 1173 (E.D. Tex. 2011)	18
<i>Nowak v. St. Rita High Sch.</i> , 142 F.3d 999 (7th Cir. 1998)	67
<i>Ostrofsky v. Department of Rehabilitation</i> , No. CIV S-07-0987 EFB PS, 2009 WL 3011578 (E.D. Cal. 2009)	79
<i>Ostrowski v. Con-Way Freight, Inc.</i> , No. 12-3800 (3d Cir. 2013) (unpublished)	71
<i>Painter v. Ill. Dep't of Transp.</i> , No. 16-3187, 2017 BL 435456 (7th Cir. Dec. 6, 2017)	83
<i>Paolino v. US Airways, Inc.</i> , CV-14-01672 (D. Ariz. 2016)	91
<i>Parker v. Columbia Pictures</i> , 204 F.3d 326 (2d Cir. 2000)	70
<i>Parker v. Crete Carrier Corp.</i> , 158 F.Supp.3d 813 (D. Neb. 2016)	82
<i>Parker v. Crete Carrier Corp.</i> , 839 F.3d 717 (8th Cir. Oct. 12, 2016), <i>cert. den'd</i> , 2017 WL 661743 (April 3, 2017)	15, 83, 84
<i>Patton v. Jacobs Eng'g Grp., Inc.</i> , 863 F.3d 419, 422 (5th Cir.), <i>opinion withdrawn and superseded on denial of reh'g</i> , 874 F.3d 437 (5th Cir. 2017)	90
<i>Perez v. Denver Fire Dep't</i> , No. 17-1128, 2018 BL 40952 (10th Cir. Feb. 7, 2018)	33

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES (Continued)

	<u>Page(s)</u>
<i>Provenzano v. Thomas Jefferson Univ. Hosp.</i> , 115 AD Cas. (BNA) 1112 (E.D. Pa. 2004)	70
<i>Pugliese v. Ariz.</i> , No. 98 16448, 1999 U.S. App. LEXIS 38031 (9th Cir. 1999) (unpublished).....	45
<i>Punt v. Kelly Servs.</i> , 862 F.3d 1040 (10th Cir. 2017)	68
<i>Rascon v. US West Comms.</i> , 143 F.3d 1324 (10th Cir. 1998)	66
<i>Richardson v. Chi. Transit Auth.</i> , No. 1:16-cv-03027 (N.D. Ill. 2017).....	15, 30
<i>Riley v. Fry</i> , No. 98 C 7584, 2000 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 14541 (N.D. Ill. 2000) (unpublished)	69
<i>Saley v. Caney Fork, LLC</i> , 2012 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 112862 (M.D. Tenn. 2012)	2, 3, 29
<i>Sch. Bd. of Nassau Cnty. v. Arline</i> , 480 U.S. 273 (1987)	31
<i>Schmidt v. Safeway, Inc.</i> , 864 F. Supp. 991 (D. Or. 1994).....	45
<i>Sechler v. Modular Space Corp.</i> , 2012 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 54478 (S.D. Tex. 2012)	18
<i>Severson v. Heartland Woodcraft, Inc.</i> , 872 F.3d 476 (7th Cir. Sept. 20, 2017).....	73
<i>Shaver v. Indep. Stave Co.</i> , 350 F.3d 716 (8th Cir. 2003)	78
<i>Shell v. Smith</i> , No. 14-2958 (7th Cir. 2015).....	23
<i>Smith v. Ameritech</i> , 129 F.3d 857 (6th Cir. 1997)	62
<i>Smith v. Flying J</i> , No. 09-433, 2010 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 131393 (D.N.M. 2010).....	6
<i>Smith v. Midland Brake, Inc.</i> , 180 F.3d 1154 (10th Cir. 1999)	46

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

(Continued)

	<u>Page(s)</u>
<i>Smith v. Valley Radiologists, Ltd.</i> , 2012 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 112057 (D. Ariz. 2012)	20
<i>Soledad v. U.S. Dept. of Treasury</i> , 304 F.3d 500 (5th Cir. 2002)	90
<i>Stevens v. Rite Aid Corp.</i> , No. 15-277 (2d Cir. March 21, 2017)	27
<i>Sutton v. United Airlines, Inc.</i> , 527 U.S. 471, 119 S. Ct. 2139 (1999)	19, 20
<i>Szuskiewicz v. JPMorgan Chase Bank</i> , 257 F.Supp.3d 319 (E.D.N.Y. 2017)	32
<i>Taylor v. Pepsi Cola Co.</i> , 196 F.3d 1106 (10th Cir. 1999)	67
<i>Terrell v. USAir</i> , 132 F.3d 621 (11th Cir. 1998)	46
<i>Toyota Motor Mfg. v. Williams</i> , 534 U.S. 184 (2002)	17
<i>US Airways, Inc. v. Barnett</i> , 535 U.S. 391 (2002)	49, 53, 54
<i>Waggoner v. Olin Corp.</i> , 169 F.3d 481 (7th Cir. 1999)	67
<i>Walker v. NF Chipola</i> , No. 4:14-cv-00375 (N.D. Fla. 2016)	77
<i>Walsh v. United Conveyor Corp.</i> , No. 01 C 2279, 2002 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 4387 (N.D. Ill. 2002) (unpublished)	66, 68
<i>Walsh v. United Parcel Serv.</i> , 201 F.3d 718 (6th Cir. 2000)	66
<i>Wenc v. New London Board of Education</i> , 702 Fed. App'x 27 (2d Cir. 2017) (unpublished)	85
<i>Wernick v. Fed. Reserve Bank</i> , 91 F.3d 379 (2d Cir. 1995)	46
<i>Wickware v. Johns Manville</i> , No. 15-6028 (10th Cir. Jan. 17, 2017)	27

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES
(Continued)

	<u>Page(s)</u>
<i>Williams v. AT&T Mobility Servs. LLC</i> , 847 F.3d 384 (6th Cir. Jan. 27, 2017)	76
<i>Williams v. United Parcel Services, Inc.</i> , 2012 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 23080 (D.S.C. 2012)	24, 26
<i>Wulff v. Sentara Healthcare, Inc.</i> , 513 Fed. App'x. 267 (4th Cir. 2013)	86
<i>Zenor v. El Paso Healthcare Sys.</i> , 176 F.3d 847 (5th Cir. 1999)	13
 EEOC Guidance	
<i>EEOC Enforcement Guidance on Disability-Related Inquiries and Medical Examinations of Employees under the Americans with Disabilities Act</i> (July 27, 2000)	80
<i>EEOC Enforcement Guidance: Reasonable Accommodation and Undue Hardship Under the Americans with Disabilities Act</i> , (March 1, 1999)	32
<i>EEOC Enforcement Guidance: Reasonable Accommodation and Undue Hardship Under the Americans with Disabilities Act</i> (Oct. 17, 2002)	69, 71
<i>Employer-Provided Leave and the Americans with Disabilities Act</i> , available at: https://www.eeoc.gov/eeoc/publications/ada-leave.cfm	13

I. INTRODUCTION

The Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990 (the “Act” or the “ADA”) protects individuals with disabilities from discrimination in employment, access to facilities, and access to services. Title I of the ADA prohibits covered employers from discriminating against qualified individuals with disabilities (“QID’s”) in job application procedures, hiring, advancement, discharge, compensation, training, and other terms, conditions, and privileges of employment.

On September 25, 2008, President Bush signed the ADA Amendments Act (“ADAAA”). The ADAAA reversed various Supreme Court decisions interpreting Title I of the ADA and required a broader application of the ADA. Among other things, the ADAAA bans lawsuits by non-disabled individuals for reverse disability discrimination, clarifies the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission’s authority under the ADA to develop and implement binding regulations, and amends the definition of disability for claims under the Rehabilitation Act. The amendments, which significantly change the ADA, became effective on January 1, 2009. The principle impact of ADAAA is that it will make it easier for an employee to establish coverage under the ADA.

In September 2009, the EEOC issued proposed regulations implementing the ADAAA. On March 25, 2011, the EEOC published final regulations in the Federal Register. The regulations became effective on May 24, 2011.

The ADAAA’s broad coverage mandate, the expanded definition of “major life activity,” the virtual elimination of mitigating measures and the easing of the burden of plaintiffs to meet the “regarded as disabled” standard, have contributed to a surge in disability discrimination claims filed with the EEOC and the courts. See [Appendix A](#), which illustrates that in U. S. governmental fiscal years 2015 to 2017 claims filed have remained at their highest levels since the EEOC began enforcing Title I in 1992. Claims filed reached the highest number thus far in fiscal year 2016 (28,073) and hovered near that number in fiscal years 2015 (26,968) and 2017 (26,838).

Because of the extensive changes wrought by the amendments and the subsequently issued regulations, this outline includes only post-amendment decisions in sections where the ADAAA has resulted in significant changes. For ADA issues that were not affected by the ADA Amendments, this outline summarizes both pre-and post-amendment decisions.

II. ADMINISTRATIVE AND LEGISLATIVE DEVELOPMENTS

A. Strategic Enforcement Plan

The EEOC’s Strategic Enforcement Plan for Fiscal Year 2017 – 2021 (“SEP”) establishes “substantive area priorities” that set the focus of staff and coordinate enforcement / guidance on issues. The EEOC set the following substantive area priorities in its current SEP: (1) Eliminating Barriers in Recruitment and Hiring; (2) Protecting Vulnerable Workers, Including Immigrant and Migrant Workers, and Underserved Communities from Discrimination; (3) Address Selected Emerging and Developing Issues; (4) Ensuring Equal Pay Protections for All Workers; (5) Preserving Access to the Legal System; and (6) Preventing Systemic Harassment.

Notable for ADA enforcement, the emerging issues priority includes focus on “[q]ualification standards and inflexible leave policies that discriminate against individuals with disabilities” and “[a]ccommodating pregnancy-related limitations under the . . . ADAAA and the Pregnancy Discrimination Act.”

These issues, particularly hiring and return-to-work/leave policies, are prominent in the EEOC's recent litigation proceedings.

B. EEOC Litigation Trends

In fiscal year 2017, the EEOC filed 184 merit-based cases. While over half alleged Title VII violations, 77 of these filings alleged ADA violations. Many focused on hiring; for example:

EEOC v. Health Care Servs. Corp., N.D. Tex., No. 3:17-cv-02626 (Sept. 26, 2017)

In September 2017, the EEOC filed a complaint against Blue Cross/Blue Shield of Texas ("BCBS") claiming that the company's failure to provide reasonable accommodations during its hiring process violated the ADA. The charging party, a deaf individual applying for a Claims Examiner position, was unable to complete the audio-only portion of BCBS's online assessment. The applicant claims she requested reasonable accommodations, such as captions, but BCBS ceased email communications without resolving the issue. The EEOC is seeking damages on behalf of the applicant and a change to BCBS's institutional policies and practices.

EEOC v. Dolgencorp, LLC, N.D. Ala., No. 2:17-cv-01649 (Sept. 25, 2017)

On September 25, 2017, the EEOC sued Dolgencorp, LLC ("Dollar General"), claiming Dollar General's post-offer medical examination screened out candidates who were otherwise qualified to perform the essential functions of warehouse work, specifically those without 20/50 vision in both eyes and candidates with high blood pressure. The EEOC sued on behalf of Vincent Jackson, a Dollar General applicant rejected because of his monocular vision. The complaint also argued Dollar General's medical exams sought family medical history in violation of the Genetic Information Nondiscrimination Act ("GINA"). The EEOC is seeking institutional changes to Dollar General's hiring practices, and damages on behalf of Jackson and the entire classes of applicants impacted by Dollar General's alleged ADA and GINA violations.

EEOC v. Consol Edison Co. of N.Y., S.D.N.Y., No. 1:17-cv-07390 (Nov. 7, 2017)

In November of 2017, the EEOC entered into a consent decree with Consolidated Edison Company of New York ("Con Ed"), resolving charges of disability discrimination and Genetic Information Nondiscrimination Act ("GINA") violations in Con Ed's hiring practices. The EEOC claimed that Con Ed conducted medical examinations on applicants without first extending conditional offers of employment, failed to hire applicants because of real or perceived disabilities discovered during the medical examinations, discriminated against existing employees because of medical conditions, and conditioned employment on disclosure of genetic information in violation of GINA. Under the consent decree, Con Ed agreed to pay \$800,000 to impacted applicants and employees and change its hiring practices.

Other EEOC priorities can be ascertained from settlements and consent decrees:

Pregnancy Accommodation

Case: *EEOC v. Allsup's Convenience Stores, Inc.*, 1:15-cv-00863, U.S. District Court for the District of New Mexico.

In September of 2017, the EEOC settled charges of pregnancy and disability discrimination against Allsup's Convenience Stores, Inc. for a sum of \$950,000 distributed between 28 former female employees. Allsup's operates over 300 convenience stores across New Mexico and Texas. In its

Also available as part of the eCourse

[2018 Labor and Employment Law eConference](#)

First appeared as part of the conference materials for the
25th Annual Labor and Employment Law Conference session
"Developments in Disability Discrimination Law"