

| Case Type             | Case Name                       | Plaintiff(s)     | Defendant(s)    | Venue   | Case No./Charge No.       | Key Facts/Notes   |
|-----------------------|---------------------------------|------------------|-----------------|---|---------------------------|---|
| EEOC Charge           | Exemption 6 /City of Atlanta    | Exemption 6: PII | City of Atlanta | EEOC  | Charge No. Exemption 6    | Exemption 6: PII contends that she was subjected to discrimination and retaliation, in violation of the ADA, when the City failed to engage her in the interactive process and denied her a reasonable accommodation. As a result of the issues regarding her alleged accommodation request, Exemption 6: PII retained legal counsel and filed a grievance with the Director of the Office of Labor and Employee Relations, whom she references in the allegations of her Charge. And she contends that she was denied an accommodation.  |
| Litigation            | Exemption 6 v. City of Atlanta  | Exemption 6: PII | City of Atlanta | Northern District of Georgia                        | Case No. Exemption 6:     | This is an action under the ADA. Exemption 6: PII alleges failure to promote him to the Chief Building Inspector position and after voluntary retirement, for failure to hire him into that position after it was subsequently posted.  |
| Civil Service Hearing | Exemption 6 v. City of Atlanta  | Exemption 6: PII | City of Atlanta | Civil Service Board                                 | Appeal No. Exemptio       | The complainant alleged that she was subject to sexual harassment and a hostile work environment. Core facts are largely disputed. The complainant and appellant took a group trip and engaged in general conversation about marriage. One of the supervisors interjected into the conversation comments of graphic and sexual nature. Complainant alleges that appellant created a hostile and bullying work environment. Complainant also alleges they were treated different from a dispute over a parking space. Appellant took no contemporaneous attempt to intervene and made at least one comment that would be considered to be inappropriate. |
| Litigation            | Exemption 6: v. City of Atlanta | Exemption 6: PII | City of Atlanta | Northern District of Georgia                        | Case No. Exemption 6:     | Exemption 6 communicated desire to be promoted to Chief Building Inspector after Exemption 6: PII resigned. Exemption 6 claims he was qualified for position but did was not considered because of his age and cancer diagnosis. Exemption 6 was told the position went to someone because they were younger and have a long career ahead of them.  |
| EEOC Charge           | Exemption /City of Atlanta      | Exemption 6: PII | City of Atlanta | EEOC  | Charge No. Exempt         | Exemption claimed she was discriminated against based on her disability and/or perceived disability (complex concussion which limited her in major life activities, thinking, and working), denied reasonable accommodation, and subjected to retaliation.  |
| Litigation            | Exemption 6 v. City of Atlanta  | Exemption 6: PII | City of Atlanta | United States Court of Appeals for the 11th Circuit | Case No. Exemption 6: PII | Prior to complaining about race discrimination, Plaintiff was on a fast track to be promoted. Plaintiff claims defendants made race-based decisions that prohibited Exemption 6 from being promoted to ranks of Captain or higher. Plaintiff claims he has had to endure retaliation for exercising First Amendment rights. Plaintiff claims that Defendants instituted and continued a baseless investigation while stripping Plaintiff of flex hours while also recuing compensation and other materially adverse actions.  |

| Case Type  | Case Name   | Plaintiff(s)                     | Defendant(s)    | Venue   | Case No./Charge No.                       | Key Facts/Notes  |
|------------|---|----------------------------------|-----------------|---|---|--|
| Litigation | <a href="#">Exemption 6</a> v. City of Atlanta    | <a href="#">Exemption 6: PII</a> | City of Atlanta | Northern District of Georgia                        | Case No. <a href="#">Exemption 6:</a>     | COA hired <a href="#">Exemption 6</a> in 2005 as an Aviation Security Assistant in the Department of Aviation. He was transferred to an Administrative Assistant position in the C-4 department of the DOA in 2011. While working in the C-4 department, <a href="#">Exemption 6</a> reported to <a href="#">Exemption 6: PII</a> , who was the Director of Emergency Management. Over the years, Plaintiff received raises and other adjustments to his salary consistent with his job title and grade. During the course of his employment, <a href="#">Exemption 6</a> received approved leave. The COA approved intermittent FMLA leave from December 26, 2018, and through to December 26, 2019, for Plaintiff to care for a family member. <a href="#">Exemption 6</a> was on leave from work between October 15, 2020, to November 6, 2020, purportedly due to Covid-19. Pursuant to emergency laws implemented for the pandemic, Defendant offered Plaintiff \$1,590.40 (80 hours x \$19.88) as paid leave, but Plaintiff declined the payment. Plaintiff <a href="#">Exemption 6</a> resigned his employment with the COA effective March 31, 2021, and the last position he held was Administrative Assistant Senior. Plaintiff alleges multiple claims including pay discrimination under the EPA, FMLA, and ADA. |
| Litigation | <a href="#">Exemption 6: P</a> v. City of Atlanta | <a href="#">Exemption 6: PII</a> | City of Atlanta | Northern District of Georgia                        | Case No. <a href="#">Exemption 6: P</a>   | Plaintiff was asked to send "sexy pics" and discussed masturbation with the Executive Director of Constituent Services for COA. Plaintiff complied with defendant's advances in fear of losing her job. HR complaint filed 1/11/2018. Plaintiff was placed on administrative leave until 6/18. Plaintiff filed complaint with EEOC on 3/28/2018. Plaintiff was terminated on 7/9/2018.   |
| Litigation | <a href="#">Exemption 6</a> v. City of Atlanta    | City of Atlanta                  | City of Atlanta | United States Court of Appeals for the 11th Circuit | Case No. <a href="#">Exemption 6: PII</a> | Plaintiff was discriminated against based on gender, disabilities, and because of rejection to supervisors repeated sexual advances. Plaintiff was subject to multiple medical inquiries and her disabilities were not accommodated. Plaintiff was terminated.   |
| Litigation | <a href="#">Exemption 6:</a> v. City of Atlanta   | <a href="#">Exemption 6: PII</a> | City of Atlanta | Northern District of Georgia                        | Case No. <a href="#">Exemption 6:</a>     | Plaintiff was terminated 5/1/19 due to budget cuts and department reorganization. Plaintiff was 40+ and substantially older than employees retained. She alleges that the City terminated her employment based on her age and failed to hire her into subsequent positions in retaliation for complaining to the EEOC.   |
| Litigation | <a href="#">Exemption 6</a> v. City of Atlanta    | <a href="#">Exemption 6: PII</a> | City of Atlanta | Northern District of Georgia                        | Case No. <a href="#">Exemption 6:</a>     | The City terminated Plaintiff's employment on 7/3/2019 due to unauthorized use of the City's systems. She challenges the termination decision and alleges violations of free speech rights under the first and fourteenth amendments and her rights as a public employee under the Georgia Whistleblower Act. Plaintiff alleges that she had to endure abusive behavior from superior, former DHR Commissioner <a href="#">Exemption 6: PII</a> .  |
| Litigation | <a href="#">Exemption 6</a> v. City of Atlanta    | <a href="#">Exemption 6: PII</a> | City of Atlanta | Northern District of Georgia                        | Case No. <a href="#">Exemption 6: P</a>   | <a href="#">Exemption 6</a> initially asserted seven claims involving race discrimination and retaliation. Following multiple rounds of briefing, the race discrimination claims and <a href="#">Exemption 6: PII</a> and <a href="#">Exemption 6: PII</a> were dismissed as defendants. <a href="#">Exemption 6</a> alleges she (i) complained about the disparate pay and (ii) blew the whistle in two ways: (a) writing a memo about APD violating their standard operating procedure and federal law following the Atlanta-area spa murders and (b) informing United Way about how federal law was violated by denying Limited English Proficient residents equal access to a federally funded rental assistance program. She alleges her termination was retaliation.   |
| Litigation | <a href="#">Exemption 6</a> v. City of Atlanta    | <a href="#">Exemption 6: PII</a> | City of Atlanta | Northern District of Georgia                        | Case No. <a href="#">Exemption 6:</a>     | On October 22, 2021, <a href="#">Exemption 6:</a> (former DWM employee) filed her original complaint asserting three claims: Title VII sex discrimination; Title VII retaliation; and FMLA retaliation. Specifically, she claims that the City demoted her from Interim Director to Manager and twice failed to promote her based on her sex and in retaliation for her alleged protected activity.  |
| Litigation | <a href="#">Exemption 6: P</a> v. City of Atlanta | <a href="#">Exemption 6: PII</a> | City of Atlanta | Northern District of Georgia                        | Case No. <a href="#">Exemption 6: PII</a> | <a href="#">Exemption 6:</a> (former DWM Office of Financial Administration Director II) asserts claims under the ADA and FMLA for failure to accommodate, retaliation, and interference. Specifically, <a href="#">Exemption 6:</a> alleges her termination on January 11, 2022 was retaliation and discrimination.   |

| Case Type  | Case Name                           | Plaintiff(s)     | Defendant(s)    | Venue                        | Case No./Charge No.       | Key Facts/Notes  |
|------------|-------------------------------------|------------------|-----------------|------------------------------|---------------------------|--|
| Litigation | Exemption 6: PII v. City of Atlanta | Exemption 6: PII | City of Atlanta | Northern District of Georgia | Case No. Exemption 6: PII | <p>Exemption 6: PII worked for the City in the Public Works Department from April 2013 to April 22, 2021, when she was dismissed for performance issues. Prior to her dismissal, she alleged sexual harassment complaints against coworker Exemption 6: PII. She sued the City in this action on July 2, 2021, alleging sex discrimination, hostile work environment, and retaliation in violation of Title VII and a claim for unpaid overtime under the Fair Labor Standards Act (FLSA).</p> <p>After the court granted the City's partial motion to dismiss, the only claims that remain in this action are the Title VII retaliation and FLSA unpaid overtime claims</p>   |
| Litigation | Exemption 6: PII v. City of Atlanta | Exemption 6: PII | City of Atlanta | Northern District of Georgia | Case No. Exemption 6: PII | <p>Exemption 6: PII is a former City employee, who worked in the Public Works Department until she was terminated in 2021. Prior to her dismissal, she alleged sexual harassment complaints against Exemption 6: PII. She sued the City in this action on July 2, 2021, alleging sex discrimination, hostile work environment, and retaliation in violation of Title VII a claim for unpaid minimum wage and/or overtime wage under the Fair Labor Standards Act (FLSA), a failure to provide COBRA notice, negligent hiring and retention, and intentional infliction of emotional distress.</p> <p>After the court partially granted the City's motion to dismiss, the only claims that remain in this action are the hostile work environment, retaliation, FLSA, and COBRA claims.</p> |



**City of Atlanta  
Human Relations Commission  
Complaint Form**

*Please be advised that this form is affected by the State of Georgia's Open Records Act,  
codified at O.C.G.A. 50-18-70 et seq.*

**PLEASE PRINT**

Date: \_\_\_\_\_ Date of Birth: \_\_\_\_\_

First Name: \_\_\_\_\_ Middle Initial: \_\_\_\_\_ Last Name: \_\_\_\_\_

Address: \_\_\_\_\_

City: \_\_\_\_\_ State: \_\_\_\_\_ Zip: \_\_\_\_\_ County: \_\_\_\_\_

Telephone No. (include area code): Work: \_\_\_\_\_ Home: \_\_\_\_\_

Email: \_\_\_\_\_

**Do you have an attorney representing you in this matter? If yes,**

Name: \_\_\_\_\_

Address: \_\_\_\_\_

City: \_\_\_\_\_ State: \_\_\_\_\_ Zip: \_\_\_\_\_

Telephone No. (include area code): \_\_\_\_\_

**PLEASE PROVIDE THE NAME OF A PERSON AT A DIFFERENT ADDRESS WHOM WE  
CAN CONTACT IF WE ARE UNABLE TO REACH YOU:**

Name: \_\_\_\_\_ Relationship: \_\_\_\_\_

Telephone No. (include area code): \_\_\_\_\_

Address: \_\_\_\_\_ City: \_\_\_\_\_ State: \_\_\_\_\_ Zip: \_\_\_\_\_

**Why do you believe that you were discriminated against (Check all that apply)**

Race ☐ Color ☐ Creed ☐ Religion ☐ Sex ☐ Disability ☐

Domestic Relationship Status ☐ Parental Status ☐ Familial Status ☐ Criminal History ☐

Sexual Orientation ☐ National Origin ☐ Gender Identity ☐ Age ☐

Use of a Trained Dog Guide by a Blind, Deaf or otherwise physically disabled person ☐

**Please read the following information before proceeding:**

**Your Charge of Discrimination must be filed within 180 days after the alleged unlawful practice has occurred.**

Please complete this questionnaire and return to the Mayor's Office of Constituent Services (Suite 1920 in City Hall, 55 Trinity Avenue, SW). You may be interviewed by an investigator to find out if your problem falls within the jurisdiction of the Human Relations Commission.

**THE ENTITY THAT YOU BELIEVE DISCRIMINATED AGAINST YOU:**

Name:

Address:

City:

State:

Zip:

County:

Telephone No. (include area code):

**Have you filed a Complaint with the Human Relations Commission in the past** ☐ **NO** ☐ **YES**  
**(If YES, answer the following):**

Approximate date filed

Organization Charged

Charge No. (if known)

**THE FOLLOWING QUESTIONS CONCERN THE SPECIFIC ACTIONS(S) TAKEN AGAINST YOU. IF YOU NEED ADDITIONAL SPACE, PLEASE ATTACH SEPARATE PAGES AND NUMBER YOUR RESPONSES.**

**1. What action was taken against you that you believe to be discriminatory? What harm was caused to you and/or others in your work situation because of the action?**

**2. What is the date this action first occurred?**

**3. What is the last date?**

**4. Who took this action against you (*if known*)? Name(s) and Job titles(s)**

**5. What reason(s) were you given for the action taken?**

**6. Why do you think the action was discrimination? (Provide the name, job title, and department of employee(s) in the same or similar situation treated more favorable. Explain how they were treated differently.)**

**7. Provide all evidence and information in your possession of discriminatory treatment. The documents that would support what you said in item four, item five or item six (Attach any documents to the form.)**

**8. Provide the name(s), address(es), telephone number(s), and a description of the information that can be provided by your witness(es) who you think can provide evidence in support of your allegations of discrimination:**

| <b>Name</b> | <b>Address</b> | <b>Telephone</b> | <b>Description of Information Witness Can Provide</b> |
|-------------|----------------|------------------|---|
| <b>a.</b>   |                |                  |   |
| <b>b.</b>   |                |                  |   |
| <b>c.</b>   |                |                  |   |
| <b>d.</b>   |                |                  |   |
| <b>e.</b>   |                |                  |   |