UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF MICHIGAN SOUTHERN DIVISION

EQUAL EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITY COMMISSION,

Plaintiff,

ν,

HOSANNA-TABOR EVANGELICAL LUTHERAN CHURCH AND SCHOOL,

Defendant.

Case: 2:07-cv-14124 Assigned To: Duggan, Patrick J Referral Judge: Pepe, Steven D Filed: 09-28-2007 At 03:13 PM CMP: EEOC V. HOSANNA TABOR EVAN LUT HERAN (NH)

COMPLAINT AND JURY TRIAL DEMAND

NATURE OF THE ACTION

This is an action under Title I of the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990 ("ADA") and Title I of the Civil Rights Act of 1991 to correct unlawful employment practices on the basis of retaliation and to make whole Cheryl Perich ("Perich"). The Equal Employment Opportunity Commission ("Commission") alleges that the Defendant, Hosanna-Tabor Evangelical Lutheran Church and School discharged Perich in retaliation for threatening to file an ADA lawsuit.

JURISDICTION AND VENUE

1. Jurisdiction of this Court is invoked pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §§ 451, 1331, 1337, 1343 and 1345. This action is authorized and instituted pursuant to Section 107(a) of the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990 ("ADA"), 42 U.S.C. § 12117(a), which incorporates by reference Sections 706(f)(1) and (3) of Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 ("Title VII"), 42 U.S.C. §§ 2000e-5(f)(1) and (3), and pursuant to Section 102 of the Civil Rights Act of 1991, as amended, 42 U.S.C. § 1981a. 2.07-cv-14124-PJD-SDP Doc # 1 Filed 09/28/07 Pg 2 of 7 Pg ID 2

2. The employment practices alleged to be unlawful were committed within the jurisdiction of the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Michigan, Southern Division.

PARTIES

3. Plaintiff, Equal Employment Opportunity Commission (the "Commission"), is an agency of the United States of America charged with the administration, interpretation, and enforcement of Title I of the ADA and is expressly authorized to bring this action by Sections 107(a) and 503(c) of the ADA, 42 U.S.C. §§ 12117(a) and 12203(c), which incorporates by reference Sections 706(f)(1) and (3) of Title VII, 42 U.S.C. § 2000e-5(f)(1) and (3).

4. At all relevant times, the Defendant Hosanna-Tabor Evangelical Lutheran Church and School (the "Employer") has been a Michigan corporation doing business in the State of Michigan and City of Redford, and has continuously had at least (15) employees.

5. At all relevant times the Defendant Employer has continuously been an employer engaged in an industry affecting commerce under Section 101(5) of the ADA, 42 U.S.C. § 12111(5), and Section 101(7) of the ADA, 42 U.S.C. § 12111(7), which incorporates by reference Sections 701(g) and (h) of Title VII, 42 U.S.C. § 2000e(g) and (h).

6. At all relevant times, the Defendant Employer has been a covered entity under Section
101(2) of the ADA, 42 U.S.C. § 12111(2).

STATEMENT OF CLAIMS

7. More than thirty (30) days prior to the institution of this lawsuit, Perich filed a charge with the Commission alleging violations of Title I of the ADA by the Defendant Employer. All conditions precedent to the institution of this lawsuit have been fulfilled.

2

2.07-cv-14124-PJD-SDP Doc # 1 Filed 09/28/07 Pg 3 of 7 Pg ID 3

8. Since at least February 22, 2005, the Defendant Employer has engaged in unlawful employment practices at its Redford, Michigan facility in violation of Section 503(a) of the ADA, 42 U.S.C. § 12203(a). These practices include terminating Perich's employment in retaliation for threatening to file an ADA lawsuit against Defendant Employer.

9. The effect of the practices complained of in paragraph 8 above has been to deprive Perich of equal employment opportunities and otherwise adversely affect her status as an employee because she asserted her rights under the ADA.

10. The unlawful employment practices complained of in paragraph 8 were intentional.

11. The unlawful employment practices complained of in paragraph 8 were done with malice or with reckless indifference to the federally protected rights of Perich.

PRAYER FOR RELIEF

WHEREFORE, the Commission respectfully requests that this Court:

A. Grant a permanent injunction enjoining Defendant Employer, its officers,

successors, assigns, and all persons in active concert or participation with it from engaging in retaliation and any other employment practice which discriminates on the basis of disability.

B. Order Defendant Employer to institute and carry out policies, practices, and programs which provide equal employment opportunities for qualified individuals with disabilities, and which cradicate the effects of its past and present unlawful employment practices.

C. Order Defendant Employer to make whole Perich by providing her with appropriate lost earnings and benefits, with prejudgement interest, in amounts to be proven at trial, and other affirmative relief necessary to eradicate the effects of its unlawful employment practices including, but not limited to, reinstating Perich to the position from which she was terminated with

07-cv-14124-PJD-SDP Doc # 1 Filed 09/28/07 Pg 4 of 7 Pg ID 4

pay and benefits equal to that which she would have attained had she not been terminated, or providing Perich with appropriate front pay in lieu of reinstatement.

D... Order Defendant to make whole Perich by providing compensation for past and future pecuniary losses resulting from the unlawful employment practices described in paragraph 8 above, in amounts to be determined at trial.

E. Order Defendant Employer to make whole Perich by providing compensation for past and future nonpecuniary losses resulting from the unlawful practices complained of in paragraph 8 above, in amounts to be determined at trial.

F. Order Defendant Employer to pay Perich punitive damages for its malicious and reckless conduct, as described in paragraph 8 above, in amounts to be determined at trial.

G. Grant such further relief as the Court docms necessary and proper in the public interest.

H. Award the Commission its costs of this action.

JURY TRIAL DEMAND

The Commission requests a jury trial on all questions of fact raised by its complaint.

Respectfully submitted

DEBOŘÁH M. BARNO (P44525 Supervisory Trial Attorney

OMAR WEAVER (P58861 Trial Attorney

Dated: September 28, 2007

2.07-cv-14124-PJD-SDP Doc # 1 Filed 09/28/07 Pg 5 of 7 Pg ID 5

EQUAL EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITY COMMISSION

DETROIT FIELD OFFICE Patrick V. McNamara Federal Building 477 Michigan Avenue, Room 865 Detroit, MI 48226 (313) 226-3407

neet ar	:07-CV-141241716-SOPVERS	nor supplement the filing and serv	ice of pleadings or other naper	s as required by law, except as
A Second Content of Co		of the United States in September 19 HE FORM.) DEFENDANTS	74, is required for the use of the	e Clerk of Court for the purpose
(b) County of Residence of First Listed Plaintiff (EXCEPT IN U.S. PLAINTEF CASES)		County of Residence	of First Listed Defendant	Wayne
 (c) Afforncy's (Firm Name, Address, and Telephone Number) Omar Weaver (P58861), Trial Attorney Equal Employment Opportunity Commission 477 Michigan Avenue, Room 865, Detroit, MI 48226 (313) 226-3407 II. BASIS OF JURISDICTION (Select One Box Only) 		Referral Judge Filed: 09-28-20	Duggan, Patrick J : Pepe, Steven D 007 At 03:13 PM : HOSANNA TABOR EV	
N 1 U.S. Government Plaint(ff	 Federal Question (U.S. Government Not a Party) 	Citizen of This State 🗖	TF DEF D Decorporated or Pr of Business In Thi	PTF DÉF incipal Place □ 4 □ 4
2 U.S. Government Defendant	 4 Diversity (Indicate Citizenship of Parties in Item III) 		 D 2 □ 2 Incorporated and 1 of Business In 7 D 3 □ 3 Foreign Nation 	
IV. NATURE OF SUL	T (Select One Box Only)	Foreign Country		
CONTRACT	TORTS	FORFEITURE/PENALTY	BANKRUPTCY	OTHER STATUTES
 110 Insorance 120 Marine 130 Miller Act 130 Miller Act 140 Negotiable Instrument 150 Recovery of Overpayment & EnforcementoEludgment 151 Medicare Act 152 Recovery of Defaulted Student Loans (Excl. Veterans) 153 Recovery of Overpayment of Veteran's Henefits 160 Stockholders' Suits 190 Other Contract 195 Contract Product Liability 196 Franchise 210 Land Condemnation 220 Forcelosure 230 Rent Lease & Ejectment 245 Tort Product Liability 290 All Other Real Property 	350 Motor Vehicle 355 Motor Vehicle 700 June 2010 Ju	 G20 Other Food & Drug G25 Drug Related Seizure of Property 21 USC 881 G30 Liquot Laws G40 R.R. & Truck G50 Artine Regs. G60 Occupational Safety/Health G90 Other T10 Fair Labor Standards Act T20 Labor/Mgmt. Relations T30 Labor/Mgmt. Reporting & Disclosure Act T90 Other Labor Litigation T91 Empl. Ret. Inc. Security Act 	 ☐ 422 Appeal 28 USC 158 ☐ 423 Withdrawal 28 USC 157 PROPERTY RIGHTS ☐ 820 Copyrights ☐ 830 Patent ☐ 840 Trademark SOCIAL SECURITY ☐ 861 HIA (1395ff) ☐ 862 Black Long (923) ☐ 863 DIWC/DIWW (405(g)) ☐ 864 SSID Title XVI ☐ 865 RS1 (405(g)) FEDERAL TAX SUITS ☐ 870 Taxes (U.S. Plaintiff or Defendant) ☐ 871 IRS—Third Party 26 USC 7609 	 400 State Reapportionment 410 Antitust 410 Antitust 410 Banks and Banking 450 Commerce 460 Deportation 470 Racketeer Influenced and Corrupt Organizations 480 Consumer Credit 490 Cable/Sat TV 810 Selective Service 850 Securities/Commodities/ Exchange 875 Customer Challenge 12 USC 3410 890 Other Statutory Actions 891 Agricultural Acts 893 Environmental Matters 894 Energy Allocation Act 895 Freedom of Information Act 900 Appeal of Fee Determination Under Access to Justice 950 Constitutionality of State Statutes
M [−] 1 _{Original} [−] 1 ² _R	ate Court Appellate Court	Representated or Sanoth Representation (specific		
VI. CAUSE OF ACTI	ON First description of cause: To correct unlawful employment practices on	of 1990 and Title of the Civil Righ	al statutes unless diversity): ts Act of 1991	
VII. REQUESTED IN COMPLAINT:			CHECK YES only JURY DEMAND:	if demanded in complaint:
VIII. RELATED CAS IF ANY	E(S) (See instructions): JUDGE		DOCKET NUMBER	
DATE	SIGNATURE OF A	ITORNEY OF RECORD		
September 28, 2007 FOR OFFICE USE ONLY	Uhar	Weaver 1	pl/	
RECEIPT # A	MOUNT APPLYING JFP	JUDGE	 МЛС. JUE	DGE

-cv-14124-PJD-SDP Doc # 1 Filed 09/28/07 Pg 7 of 7 Pg ID 7 LOCAL RULE 83.11

Is this a case that has been previously dismissed? If yes, give the following information: Court: Case No.: Judge:

Other than stated above, are there any pending or previously 2, discontinued or dismissed companion cases in this or any other court, including state court? (Companion cases are matters in which it appears substantially similar evidence will be offered or the same or related parties are present and the cases arise out of the same transaction or occurrence.)

If yes, give the following information:

Court:		

Case No.:	

Judge:

Notes :



Yes No