IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF WISCONSIN

)))

))))

EQUAL EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITY COMMISSION,					
Plaintiff,					
V.					
ORION ENERGY SYSTEMS, INC.					
Defendant.					

Civil Action No. 1:14-cv-1019

<u>COMPLAINT</u> (Jury Trial Demand)

NATURE OF THE ACTION

This is an action under Title I of the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990, as amended by the Americans with Disabilities Amendments Act of 2008 to correct unlawful employment practices and to provide appropriate relief to Wendy Schobert ("Schobert") who was adversely affected by such practices. Plaintiff Equal Employment Opportunity Commission ("EEOC" or "Commission") alleges that Orion Energy Systems, Inc. ("Orion") instituted a purported wellness program through which it required Schobert, then a current employee, to submit to medical examinations and inquiries that were not job-related or consistent with business necessity in violation of Section 102(d)(4)(A). The EEOC further alleges Orion terminated Schobert because of her objections to the wellness program, in violation of Section 503(a) of the ADA, 42 U.S.C. § 12203(a), and it interfered, coerced and intimidated Schobert on account of her enjoyment and exercise of the ADA protected right to not be subject to unlawful disability-related inquiries and medical exams, in violation of 503(b) of the ADA, 42 U.S.C. § 12203(b).

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 Section 706(f)(1) and (3)of Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, 42 U.S.C. §§ 2000e-5(f)(1) and (3).

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

PARTIES

3. Plaintiff EEOC is the 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 Section 107(a) of the ADA, 42 U.S.C. § 12117(a), 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, Defendant Orion has continuously been a Wisconsin corporation doing business in the State of Wisconsin and the City of Manitowoc and has continuously had at least 15 employees.

5. At all relevant times, Defendant Orion 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).

At all relevant times, Defendant Orion 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 days prior to the institution of this lawsuit, Wendy Schobert filed a charge with the Commission alleging violations of Title I of the ADA by Defendant Orion. All conditions precedent to the institution of this lawsuit have been fulfilled.

8. Prior to institution of this lawsuit, the EEOC's representatives attempted to eliminate the unlawful employment practices alleged below and to effect voluntary compliance with the ADA through informal methods of conciliation, conference and persuasion within the meaning of § 107 of the ADA, 42 U.S.C. §12117, which incorporates by reference §§ 706(f)(1) and (3) of Title VII, 42 U.S.C. §§ 2000e-5(f)(1) and (3):

- a. On April 11, 2012, the EEOC invited Defendant to engage in informal conciliation efforts to eliminate the practices the EEOC found unlawful.
- b. On August 28, 2012, the EEOC determined that it was unable to obtain an agreement acceptable to the EEOC by informal methods of conciliation, conference, and persuasion, and so advised Defendant.

 From at least March through May 2009, Defendant Orion engaged in unlawful employment practices at its facility in Manitowoc, WI, in violation of Sections 503, 42
 U.S.C. § 12203 of the ADA.

10. In March 2009, Orion began to implement a wellness program. As part of the wellness program, employees were required to complete a health risk assessment. The wellness program included a fitness component under which employees were required to use a Range of Motion Machine (or ROM) in Orion's physical fitness room.

11. Orion's wellness program included disability-related inquiries and medical examinations within the meaning of the Americans With Disabilities Act. The health risk assessment required that employees self-disclose their medical history and have blood work performed on them. In order to use the ROM located in the Orion fitness room, the employees also had to fill out a medical history form.

12. The medical exam and disability-related inquiries which were part of Orion's wellness program were not job-related and consistent with business necessity.

13. Schobert objected to participation in the wellness program. Specifically, she questioned whether the health risk assessment was voluntary and whether medical information obtained in connection with it was going to be maintained as confidential.

14. After Schobert raised her objections, she was called into a meeting with Orion's personnel director and her supervisor. During that meeting, Schobert was told that she was not to express any opinions about the wellness program to her coworkers. She was further told that the purpose of the meeting was to quash any potential "attitude" issue of hers relating to the wellness program.

15. On or about April 2, 2009, Schobert declined to participate in the wellness program. She signed a form opting out of the health risk assessment on April 24.

16. If Schobert had agreed to participate in the so-called "voluntary" wellness program, Orion would have covered the entire amount of Schobert's health care costs. Because Schobert declined participation, she was required to pay the entire premium cost for single coverage for her health benefit.

17. Because she declined to participate in the so-called "voluntary" wellness program, Schobert had to pay \$413.43 per month so that Orion would continue to cover her

⁴

health benefits for single coverage to the same extent as other employees. Under its program, Orion also assessed a penalty of \$50 a month upon Schobert because she declined to participate in the fitness component of the wellness program.

18. Employees who carried limited family coverage who declined to participate in the health risk assessment would have had to pay \$744.16 each month. Employees who carried family coverage who declined to participate in the health risk assessment would have had to contribute \$1,130.82 each month.

19. Schobert was the only employee who declined to participate in the health risk assessment.

20. On May 22, 2009, Orion terminated Schobert.

21. Orion terminated Schobert because she objected to and declined to participate in the wellness program.

22. Orion's other expressed reasons for terminating Schobert are pretextual.

Count 1: Unlawful Medical Examinations and Inquiries

23. Paragraphs 1-22 are realleged and incorporated by reference herein.

24. Orion required that Schobert participate in medical examinations and inquiries that were not job-related or consistent with business necessity in violation of Section 102(d)(4)(A), 42 U.S.C. § 12112(d)(4)(A) of the ADA.

25. The medical examinations and disability-related inquiries which were part of the wellness program were not voluntary and therefore were not permitted by Section 102(d)(4)(B), 42 U.S.C. § 12112(d)(4)(B) because Schobert was subjected to a financial penalty and subsequently fired for not participating in the program.

26. The effect of the practices complained above, has been to deprive Schobert of equal employment opportunities and otherwise adversely affect her status as an employee because she declined to undergo unlawful medical examinations and inquiries.

27. Orion's acts were intentional.

28. Orion's acts as described above were done with malice or reckless disregard of Schobert's federally protected rights.

Count 2: Retaliation

29. Paragraphs 1-22 are realleged and incorporated by reference herein.

30. Orion retaliated against Schobert because of her good faith objections and decision not to participate in Orion's wellness program by terminating her in violation of Section 503(a), 42 U.S.C. § 12203(a).

31. The effect of the practices complained above, has been to deprive Schobert of equal employment opportunities and otherwise adversely affect her status as an employee because she opposed matters made unlawful by the statute and objected to be subjected to unlawful medical examinations and inquiries.

32. Orion's acts were intentional.

Count 3: Interference, Coercion and Intimidation

33. Paragraphs 1-22 are realleged and incorporated by reference herein.

34. Orion interfered, coerced, and intimidated Schobert for exercising her right under the ADA to not be subject to unlawful disability-related inquiries and medical exams, in violation of Section 503(b), 42 U.S.C. § 12203(b).

35. The effect of the practices complained above, has been to deprive Schobert of equal employment opportunities and otherwise adversely affect her status as an employee because she exercised and enjoyed rights protected by the ADA.

36. Orion's acts were intentional.

JURY TRIAL DEMAND

Plaintiff hereby requests a trial by jury on all issues triable by jury.

PRAYER FOR RELIEF

Wherefore, the Commission respectfully requests that this Court:

A. Grant a permanent injunction enjoining Defendant Orion, its officers, agents, servants, employees, attorneys, and all persons in active concert or participation with it, from the following:

- Requiring employees to undergo unlawful medical examinations or answer unlawful disability-related inquiries.
- Retaliating against employees because of their objections to its wellness program or any other protected activity under the Americans With Disabilities Act; and
- Interfering, coercing or intimidating employees in the enjoyment or exercise of their right to not be subject to unlawful medical examinations or disability-related inquiries.

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

C. Order Defendant Orion to make whole Wendy Schobert by providing appropriate back pay with prejudgment interest, in amounts to be determined at trial, reinstatement, front pay in lieu of reinstatement, and other affirmative relief necessary to eradicate the effects of its unlawful employment practices, including but not limited to rightful place reinstatement or front pay in lieu of reinstatement.

D. Order Defendant Orion to make whole Wendy Schobert by providing compensation for past and future pecuniary losses resulting from the unlawful employment practices described above, including medical expenses, and retirement or pension contributions not covered by Defendant's employee benefit plan, in amounts to be determined at trial.

E. Order Defendant Orion to make whole Schobert by providing compensation for past and future nonpecuniary losses resulting from the unlawful practices complained of in paragraphs 7-28 above, including, but not limited to, emotional pain, suffering, inconvenience and mental anguish, in amounts to be determined at trial.

F. Order Defendant to pay Schobert punitive damages for its malicious and reckless conduct, as described in paragraphs 7-28 above, in amounts to be determined at trial.

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

H. Award the EEOC its costs of this action.

EQUAL EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITY COMMISSION

P. DAVID LOPEZ General Counsel

JAMES LEE Deputy General Counsel

GWENDOLYN YOUNG REAMS Associate General Counsel

131 M STREET, N.E. 5TH FLOOR WASHINGTON, D.C. 20507

John C. Hendrickson Regional Attorney

Jean P. Kamp Associate Regional Attorney

Chicago District Office 500 West Madison Street, Suite 2000 Chicago, Illinois 60661 Telephone: (312) 869-8116 Facsimile: (312) 869-8124 jean.kamp@eeoc.gov

<u>s:/Laurie A. Vasichek</u> Laurie A. Vasichek (171438) Trial Attorney

Minneapolis Area Office 330 Second Avenue South, Suite 720 Minneapolis, Minnesota 55401 Telephone: (612) 335-4047 Facsimile: (612) 335-4044 <u>laurie.vasichek@eeoc.gov</u>

WIED-JS 44 (Rev. 12/12) **CIVIL COVER SHEET** The JS 44 civil cover sheet and the information contained herein neither replace nor supplement the filing and service of pleadings or other papers as required by law, except as provided by local rules of court. This form, approved by the Judicial Conference of the United States in September 1974, is required for the use of the Clerk of Court for the purpose of initiating the civil docket sheet. (SEE INSTRUCTIONS ON NEXT PAGE OF THIS FORM.)

Place an "X" in the appropri	ate box (required):	Green Bay Division	n 🗌	Milwaukee Division			
I. (a) PLAINTIFFS				DEFENDANTS			
 (b) County of Residence of (EX) (c) Attorneys (Firm Name, A) 	CEPT IN U.S. PLAINTIFF CA			County of Residence of NOTE: Attorneys (If Known)	of First Listed Defendant (IN U.S. PLAINTIFF CASES O IN LAND CONDEMNATION C THE TRACT OF LAND INVOL	ASES, USE THE LOCATION OF	
II. BASIS OF JURISDI	CTION (Place an "X" in	One Box Only)	III. C	ITIZENSHIP OF PRI	NCIPAL PARTIES (Pla	ace an "X" in One Box for Plaintiff	
1 U.S. Government Plaintiff	3 Federal Question (U.S. Government Not	a Party)		(For Diversity Cases Only) PT Citizen of This State	F DEF	and One Box for Defendant) PTF DEF incipal Place 4 4	
2 U.S. Government Defendant	4 Diversity (Indicate Citizenship o	f Parties in Item III)		Citizen of Another State	of Business In A	Another State	
IV. NATURE OF SUIT				Citizen or Subject of a Foreign Country	3 3 Foreign Nation		
CONTRACT		nly) RTS		FORFEITURE/PENALTY	BANKRUPTCY	OTHER STATUTES	
CONTRACT 110 Insurance 120 Marine 130 Miller Act 140 Negotiable Instrument 150 Recovery of Overpayment & Enforcement of Judgment 151 Medicare Act 152 Recovery of Defaulted Student Loans (Excludes Veterans) 153 Recovery of Overpayment of Veteran's Benefits 160 Stockholders' Suits 190 Other Contract 195 Contract Product Liability 196 Franchise REAL PROPERTY 210 Land Condemnation 220 Foreclosure 230 Rent Lease & Ejectment 240 Torts to Land 245 Tort Product Liability 290 All Other Real Property	IO PERSONAL INJURY 310 Airplane 315 Airplane Product Liability 320 Assault, Libel & Slander 330 Federal Employers' Liability 340 Marine 345 Marine Product Liability 350 Motor Vehicle 9355 Motor Vehicle Product Liability 360 Other Personal Injury 362 Personal Injury - Medical Malpractice CIVIL RIGHTS 440 Other Civil Rights 441 Voting 442 Employment 443 Housing/ Accommodations 445 Amer. w/Disabilities Other employment 448 Education	PERSONAL INJ Bergen Schuler S	ry - ility al y tity conal ct PERTY ling al age age lity TONS re acate	FORFETTURE/PENALTY 625 Drug Related Seizure of Property 21 USC 881 690 Other 710 Fair Labor Standards Act 720 Labor/Management Relations 740 Railway Labor Act 751 Family and Medical Leave Act 790 Other Labor Litigation 791 Employee Retirement Income Security Act 462 Naturalization Application Actions	BANKRUPTCY 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 Lung (923) 863 DIWC/DIWW (405(g)) 864 SSID Title XVI 865 RSI (405(g)) FEDERAL TAX SUITS 870 Taxes (U.S. Plaintiff or Defendant) 871 IRS—Third Party 26 USC 7609	OTHER STATUTES OTHER STATUTES 400 State Reapportionment 410 Antitrust 430 Banks and Banking 450 Commerce 460 Deportation 470 Racketeer Influenced and Corrupt Organizations 480 Consumer Credit 490 Cable/Sat TV 850 Securities/Commodities/ Exchange 890 Other Statutory Actions 891 Agricultural Acts 895 Freedom of Information Act 896 Arbitration 899 Administrative Procedure Act/Review or Appeal of Agency Decision 950 Constitutionality of State Statutes	
	noved from 🗖 3 Rem	anded from ellate Court		Reinstated or 5 Trans Reopened 5 Trans Anoth (specij	ferred from 6 Multidi ner District Litigati		
VI. CAUSE OF	Cite the U.S. Civil Statu	te under which you	are filing	(Do not cite jurisdictional statut	es unless diversity):		
ACTION	Brief description of caus	e:					
VII. REQUESTED IN COMPLAINT:	CHECK IF THIS IS UNDER RULE 23,		DN	DEMAND \$	CHECK YES only JURY DEMAND:	if demanded in complaint:	
VIII. RELATED CASE IF ANY	E(S) (See instructions):	JUDGE			DOCKET NUMBER		
DATE		SIGNATURE OF AT	TORNEY	OF RECORD			
FOR OFFICE USE ONLY							

INSTRUCTIONS FOR ATTORNEYS COMPLETING CIVIL COVER SHEET FORM JS 44

Authority For Civil Cover Sheet

The JS 44 civil cover sheet and the information contained herein neither replaces nor supplements the filings and service of pleading or other papers as required by law, except as provided by local rules of court. This form, approved by the Judicial Conference of the United States in September 1974, is required for the use of the Clerk of Court for the purpose of initiating the civil docket sheet. Consequently, a civil cover sheet is submitted to the Clerk of Court for each civil complaint filed. The attorney filing a case should complete the form as follows:

- **I.(a) Plaintiffs-Defendants.** Enter names (last, first, middle initial) of plaintiff and defendant. If the plaintiff or defendant is a government agency, use only the full name or standard abbreviations. If the plaintiff or defendant is an official within a government agency, identify first the agency and then the official, giving both name and title.
- (b) County of Residence. For each civil case filed, except U.S. plaintiff cases, enter the name of the county where the first listed plaintiff resides at the time of filing. In U.S. plaintiff cases, enter the name of the county in which the first listed defendant resides at the time of filing. (NOTE: In land condemnation cases, the county of residence of the "defendant" is the location of the tract of land involved.)
- (c) Attorneys. Enter the firm name, address, telephone number, and attorney of record. If there are several attorneys, list them on an attachment, noting in this section "(see attachment)".

II. Jurisdiction. The basis of jurisdiction is set forth under Rule 8(a), F.R.Cv.P., which requires that jurisdictions be shown in pleadings. Place an "X" in one of the boxes. If there is more than one basis of jurisdiction, precedence is given in the order shown below. United States plaintiff. (1) Jurisdiction based on 28 U.S.C. 1345 and 1348. Suits by agencies and officers of the United States are included here. United States defendant. (2) When the plaintiff is suing the United States, its officers or agencies, place an "X" in this box.

Federal question. (3) This refers to suits under 28 U.S.C. 1331, where jurisdiction arises under the Constitution of the United States, an amendment to the Constitution, an act of Congress or a treaty of the United States. In cases where the U.S. is a party, the U.S. plaintiff or defendant code takes precedence, and box 1 or 2 should be marked.

Diversity of citizenship. (4) This refers to suits under 28 U.S.C. 1332, where parties are citizens of different states. When Box 4 is checked, the citizenship of the different parties must be checked. (See Section III below; **NOTE: federal question actions take precedence over diversity cases.**)

- **III. Residence (citizenship) of Principal Parties.** This section of the JS 44 is to be completed if diversity of citizenship was indicated above. Mark this section for each principal party.
- **IV.** Nature of Suit. Place an "X" in the appropriate box. If the nature of suit cannot be determined, be sure the cause of action, in Section VI below, is sufficient to enable the deputy clerk or the statistical clerk(s) in the Administrative Office to determine the nature of suit. If the cause fits more than one nature of suit, select the most definitive.
- V. Origin. Place an "X" in one of the six boxes.

Original Proceedings. (1) Cases which originate in the United States district courts.

Removed from State Court. (2) Proceedings initiated in state courts may be removed to the district courts under Title 28 U.S.C., Section 1441. When the petition for removal is granted, check this box.

Remanded from Appellate Court. (3) Check this box for cases remanded to the district court for further action. Use the date of remand as the filing date.

Reinstated or Reopened. (4) Check this box for cases reinstated or reopened in the district court. Use the reopening date as the filing date. Transferred from Another District. (5) For cases transferred under Title 28 U.S.C. Section 1404(a). Do not use this for within district transfers or multidistrict litigation transfers.

Multidistrict Litigation. (6) Check this box when a multidistrict case is transferred into the district under authority of Title 28 U.S.C. Section 1407. When this box is checked, do not check (5) above.

- VI. Cause of Action. Report the civil statute directly related to the cause of action and give a brief description of the cause. Do not cite jurisdictional statutes unless diversity. Example: U.S. Civil Statute: 47 USC 553 Brief Description: Unauthorized reception of cable service
- VII. Requested in Complaint. Class Action. Place an "X" in this box if you are filing a class action under Rule 23, F.R.Cv.P. Demand. In this space enter the actual dollar amount being demanded or indicate other demand, such as a preliminary injunction. Jury Demand. Check the appropriate box to indicate whether or not a jury is being demanded.
- VIII. Related Cases. This section of the JS 44 is used to reference related pending cases, if any. If there are related pending cases, insert the docket numbers and the corresponding judge names for such cases.

Date and Attorney Signature. Date and sign the civil cover sheet.

NOTICE OF LAWSUIT AND REQUEST FOR WAIVER OF SERVICE OF SUMMONS

TO: (A) _____

as (B) _____ (C) ____

A lawsuit has been commenced against you (or the entity on whose behalf you are addressed.) A copy of the complaint is attached to this notice. It has been filed in the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Wisconsin and has been assigned docket number (E)

This is not a formal summons or notification from the court, but rather my request that you sign and return the enclosed waiver of service in order to save the cost of serving you with a judicial summons and an additional copy of the complaint. The cost of services will be avoided if I receive a signed copy of the waiver within (F)_____ days after the date designated below as the date on which this Notice and Request is sent. I enclose a stamped and addressed envelope (or other means of cost-free return) for your use. An extra copy of the waiver is also attached for your records.

If you comply with this request and return the signed waiver, it will be filed with the court and no summons will be served on you. The action will then proceed as if you had been served on the date the waiver is filed, except that you will not be obligated to answer the complaint before 60 days from the date designated below as the date on which this notice is sent (or before 90 days from that date if your address is not in any judicial district of the United States.)

If you do not return the signed waiver within the time indicated, I will take appropriate steps to effect formal service in a manner authorized by the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure and will then, to the extent authorized by those Rules, ask the court to require you (or the party on whose behalf you are addressed) to pay the full costs of such service. In that connection, please read the statement concerning the duty of parties to waive the service of the summons, which is set forth at the foot of the waiver form.

If affirm that this request is being sent to you on behalf of the plaintiff, this <u>20th</u> day of <u>August</u>, <u>2014</u>.

s:/Laurie A. Vasichek

Signature of Plaintiff's Attorney or Unrepresented Plaintiff

A - Name of individual defendant (or name of officer or agent of corporate defendant)

B - Title, or other relationship of individual to corporate defendant

C - Name of corporate defendant, if any

D - District

E - Docket number of action

F - Addressee must be given at least 30 days (60 days if located in foreign country) in which to return waiver.

AO 399 (Rev. 10/95)

WAIVER OF SERVICE OF SUMMONS

То:						
(NAME OF PLAINTIFF'S ATTORNEY OR UNREPRESENTED PLAINTIFF)						
I	, acknowledge receipt of your request					
(DEFENDANT NAME)	,					
that I waive service of summons in the action of						
	(CAPTION OF ACTION)					
which is case number	in the United States District Court					
(DOCKET NUMBER)						

for the Eastern District of Wisconsin.

I have also received a copy of the complaint in the action, two copies of this instrument, and a means by which I can return the signed waiver to you without cost to me.

I agree to save the cost of service of a summons and an additional copy of the complaint in this lawsuit by not requiring that I (or the entity on whose behalf I am acting) be served with judicial process in the manner provided by Rule 4.

I (or the entity on whose behalf I am acting) will retain all defenses or objections to the lawsuit or to the jurisdiction or venue of the court except for objections based on a defect in the summons or in the service of the summons.

or within 90 days after that date if the request was sent outside the United States.

(DATE)		(SIGNATURE)						
	Printed/Typed Name:							
	A c	of						
	(TITLE)	01	(CORPORATE DEFENDANT)					

Duty to Avoid Unnecessary Costs of Service of Summons

Rule 4 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure requires certain parties to cooperate in saving unnecessary costs of service of the summons and complaint. A defendant located in the United States who, after being notified of an action and asked by a plaintiff located in the United States to waive service of summons, fails to do so will be required to bear the cost of such service unless good cause be shown for its failure to sign and return the waiver.

It is not good cause for a failure to waive service that a party believes that the complaint is unfounded, or that the action has been brought in an improper place or in a court that lacks jurisdiction over the subject matter of the action or over its person or property. A party who waives service of the summons retains all defenses and objections (except any relating to the summons or to the service of the summons), and may later object to the jurisdiction of the court or to the place where the action has been brought.