

## Index

```
Canny v. Dr. Pepper/Seven-Up Bottling Group,
access to the courts, 14, 19-55
access to justice, 33, 49-54, 164
                                                              Inc., 123
                                                         Celotex Corp. v. Catrett, 47, 48
administrative process, 6-7, 9
                                                         charge filing, EEOC, 6, 7, 16, 17, 44, 59, 65, 66,
affirmative defense, 156-57
aggregate litigation, 13, 66, 148, 151, 158, 160,
                                                              67, 79, 82, 92, 94, 154
                                                         civil claim, 7-10, 27, 30, 31, 43; see also filing a
     161, 162
Amazon Prime Now, 143, 144, 147
                                                              complaint
Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA), 6, 7, 11,
                                                         Civil Rights Act of 1964, 5, 6, 21, 51, 106, 109, 110
     17, 19, 33, 92, 123, 134, 166–68
                                                         Clark County School District v. Breeden, 101-03,
Anderson v. Liberty Lobby, Inc., 47, 48
                                                              105, 162, 165
"any set of facts" standard, 25, 26, 28, 31, 155, 164
                                                         class action, 1, 26, 56-90, 149, 150; see also
arbitration, 13, 56-90, 144, 145, 147, 161-62, 165
                                                              systemic litigation or aggregate litigation
Ashcroft, US Attorney General John, 28, 29
                                                         class-action claim, 4, 119, 134, 138, 140, 142,
                                                              147,\,148,\,151,\,152,\,153,\,157\text{--}61,\,164;\,see
Ashcroft v. Iqbal, 4, 10, 23, 25-29, 35, 36,
                                                              also governmental approach; procedural
     37, 38, 39, 42, 45, 47, 49, 54, 138,
     142, 164, 165
                                                              response; revised relief
AT&T, 26
                                                         classifying workers in the on-demand economy:
AT&T Mobility LLC v. Concepcion, 56, 64,
                                                            Amazon Prime Now, 143, 144, 147
     161, 165
                                                            CrowdFlower, 145-46
                                                            DoorDash, 143
                                                            GrubHub, 143, 147
back pay, 11, 16, 59, 60, 99, 110, 122
Bell Atlantic Corp. v. Twombly, 4, 10, 23, 25-29,
                                                            Handy, 145
     32, 33, 34, 35, 36, 37, 38, 39, 40, 42, 45, 47, 49,
                                                            Homejoy, 146
     54, 138, 142, 164, 165
                                                            Instacart, 144
Bennett, Judge Mark, 48, 49
                                                            Postmates, 145
BMW of North America, Inc. v. Gore, 117, 118, 119,
                                                            Washio, 146-47
     124, 132
                                                            Yelp, 144-45, 147
Breeden, see Clark County School District v.
                                                         Clermont, Kevin, 48
     Breeden
                                                         commonality standard, 56, 57, 58, 59, 60, 61, 62,
Breyer, Justice Stephen, 29, 53, 62, 100
                                                              63, 64, 65, 66, 68, 72, 73, 74, 75, 84, 86, 87,
                                                              88, 89, 90, 138, 143, 147, 148, 149, 150, 151, 152,
Burlington Industries, Inc. v. Ellerth, 44, 134
Burlington Northern & Santa Fe Railway Co. v.
                                                              158, 159, 165
     White, 95, 96, 98, 99, 102, 134
                                                         complaint, 7, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 29, 32, 34, 36, 37,
Bush, President George H.W., 5, 110, 166
                                                              38, 39, 40, 41, 42, 43, 44, 45, 46, 47, 54, 71, 82,
but-for causation, 99, 100, 102, 103, 104,
                                                              91, 92, 94, 95, 97, 99, 101, 102, 103, 104, 105,
     162, 165
                                                              130, 143, 145, 146, 155, 156, 157, 162
```



192

Concepcion, see AT&T Mobility LLC v.
Concepcion
congressional intervention, 4, 15, 17, 45, 64, 81, 98, 153, 154, 155, 163–66, 168
Conley v. Gibson, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 31, 35, 36, 164
consolidation of cases, 70–71, 82, 159
constitutional floor, 84–90
constitutional standard, 88, 89, 115, 118, 132
Cotter v. Lyft, Inc., 141, 142, 143
CrowdFlower, 145–46

damages, 4, 5, 10, 11, 13, 16, 31, 69, 75, 77, 78, 79, 80, 81, 82, 85, 99, 106, 107–10, 111–12, 113, 114, 115, 116, 117, 118, 119, 120, 121, 122, 123, 124, 125, 126, 127, 128, 129, 130, 131, 132, 133, 134, 135, 136, 142, 161, 163, 165; see also relief Day v. Woodworth, 108 disparate impact, 51, 52, 53, 54, 60, 134 disparate treatment, 23, 48, 51, 52, 53, 58, 60, 63, 134 DoorDash, 143

Easterbrook, Judge Frank H., 25, 42, 142
EEOC v. Concentra Health Services, Inc., 34
EEOC v. Heartway, Corp., 122
EEOC v. Siouxland Oral Maxillofacial Surgery
Associates, LLP, 121
EEOC v. Stocks, Inc., 123
Ellerth, see Burlington Industries, Inc. v. Ellerth
empirical studies, 32; see also plausibility standard
employee defined, 139–42

employee v. independent contractor, 148, 137, 138, 142, 143, 145, 150, 151, 153 employer defenses, 111, 112 enforcement of federal antidiscrimination laws, 7, 19–55, 58, 59, 65, 66, 92, 98, 102, 109, 110 Engstrom, David, 33

Equal Employment Opportunity Commission (EEOC), 6–7, 13, 16, 21, 22, 31, 37, 56, 58, 59, 65, 66, 67, 79, 82, 83, 84, 92, 94, 97, 102, 103, 104, 121, 122, 158, 166; see also administrative process; civil claim; relief in discrimination cases; systemic litigation

exemplary relief, see punitive damages

Exxon Shipping Co. v. Baker, 107, 114, 115, 117–21,
124, 131, 132, 133, 134, 135, 136, 163

Faragher v. City of Boca Raton, 134 Faragher-Ellerth, 44 Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, 7, 13, 22, 24–25, 28, 36, 37, 43, 54, 57, 62, 70, 74, 76, 83, 84, 86, 152, 160 filing a civil claim, see civil claim filing a federal complaint, 36, 37
First Amendment issues, 28; see also Wal-Mart
Stores, Inc. v. Dukes
four elements of prima facie case of
discrimination, 155
front pay, 11, 110

Index

gender discrimination, 2, 6, 32, 63 gig sector, 18, 138, 142–43, 147, 151, 152, 153; see also on-demand economy, technology sector Ginsburg, Justice Ruth Bader, 16, 17, 29, 53, 62, 100, 166 governmental approach, 65–67, 81, 83, 158; see also Wal-Mart standard governmental systemic litigation, 13, 56, 58–60, 158 GrubHub, 143, 147

Handy, 145 Hansberry v. Lee, 85 Hart, Melissa, 83 Hazelwood, Joseph, 114 Holmes, Justice Oliver Wendell, 108 Homejoy, 146

indicia of employment test, 147-51

Genay v. Norris, 107

independent contractor, 140, 143, 144, 145, 146, 149, 150; *see also* employee v. independent contractor

the frequency of work performed, 149–50 manner of work performed, 150 the place where work is performed, 149 pricing models, 150 the time that the work occurs, 149 individual litigation v. aggregate litigation, 67, 75, 76, 82; see also aggregate litigation Instacart, 144 International Brotherhood of Teamsters v. United States, 57, 58 Iqbal, see Ashcroft v. Iqbal issue class certification, 76–78, 82, 160

Jacobsen v. Allstate Insurance Co., 87 Jordan v. Alternative Resources Corp., 101 jury trial, 23, 5, 107, 130

issue preclusion, 67, 68, 69, 70

Kagan, Justice Elena, 62, 100 King, Jr., Dr. Martin Luther, 1, 5 Kolstad v. American Dental Association, 106, 111–23, 124, 125, 126, 127, 128, 129, 132, 133, 135, 136, 163



Index 193

Ledbetter, Lilly, 2, 17

Ledbetter v. Goodyear Tire & Rubber Co., Inc., 2, 3, 16–17, 166

legitimate nondiscriminatory reason, 9, 96; see also McDonnell Douglas test

Levine, Beth, 99

Lilly Ledbetter Fair Pay Act of 2009, 17

liquidated damages, 11

Lubin v. Wackenhut, Corp., 87

Lyft, 138, 140, 141, 143; see also Cotter v. Lyft

Malveaux, Suzette, 83
managerial employee, 63, 79, 111, 112, 122, 125–26, 128, 129
Mangum v. Town of Holly Springs, 32, 33, 34
Martin v. Wilks, 85
Matsushita Electric Industrial Co., Ltd. v. Zenith Radio Corp., 47, 48
McDonnell Douglas Corp. v. Green, 9
McDonnell Douglas test, 10, 41, 42
Miller, Arthur, 48
minimum wage, 138, 144, 145, 146
modern economy, 17–18, 138, 139, 147, 151
Mueller, Robert, 28, 29

Nassar, see University of Texas Southwestern Medical Center v. Nassar numerosity, 57

Obama, President Barack, 2, 17, 166 O'Connor v. Uber Technologies, Inc., 140, 141, 142 O'Connor, Justice Sandra Day, 108 on-demand economy, 137–53, 155 opposition clause, 93; see also retaliation Ortiz v. Fibreboard Corp., 85

participation clause, 94, 102; see also retaliation
Philip Morris USA v. Williams, 107, 113, 115,
117–21, 124, 131, 132, 133, 135, 136, 163
plausible claim, 23, 29, 30, 42, 46, 47, 142,
155, 156
plausibility standard, 23, 24, 26, 27, 29, 30, 31, 32,
33, 34, 35, 36, 37, 38, 39–45, 46, 47
pleading discriminatory intent, 155
pleading requirements, 25, 36; see also civil claim
Postmates, 145
pretextual, 9, 96; see also McDonnell Douglas test
prima facie case, 9, 34, 35, 40, 41, 42, 93, 95,
96, 155
procedural approaches to Wal-Mart, 74–76, 160
cabining Wal-Mart, 57, 67, 71, 74, 82, 159

issue class, 76-78, 82, 160 offensive use of collateral estoppel, 67-70, 71, 82, 150 taking Wal-Mart at its word, 74-76, 82, 160 procedures, see civil procedures punitive damages, see damages punitive damages and the law, 107-09 evolution of doctrine in American law, purpose of punitive damages, 108-09 punitive damages in employment-discrimination cases, 11, 13, 78, 80, 81, 106, 109-10, 111-12, 115, 117, 118, 121, 122, 123, 124, 126, 131, 132, 133, 134, 135, 161, 163 legislative history of the Civil Rights Act of 1991, 110

58, 60, 62, 66, 67, 75, 77, 78–81, 82, 84, 95, 102, 106–36, 154, 158, 160–61, 163, 164, 165, 168
remedies, 110, 114
reprehensibility, 113, 114, 117, 119, 120, 131, 133, 163; see also punitive damages
retaliation, 4, 5, 14, 15, 91–105, 120, 134, 154, 162–63, 165
revised relief proposal, 78–81, 84, 160–61
Ricci v. DeStefano, 3, 8, 49–54
Ricci strong basis in evidence standard, 53
Roberts, Chief Justice John, 1, 3, 4, 6, 10, 13, 16, 17–18, 49, 54, 91, 100, 101, 153, 154, 155, 156, 157, 163, 165, 167, 168

relief, 4, 7, 10-13, 14, 15, 24, 26, 34, 36, 39,

Scalia, Justice Antonin, 53, 56 scope of employment, 161, 102, 111, 116, 125, 128, 129, 133 Schwab, Stewart, 48 Shaver v. Independent Stave Co., 95 Sherman Act, 26, 27, 29 Swierkiewicz v. Sorema N.A., 25, 27, 34, 35-36, 40, 41, 42, 155 Sotomayor, Justice Sonia, 3, 62, 100 Souter, Justice David H., 29, 53 State Farm Mutual Automobile Insurance Co. v. Campbell, 117, 118, 124, 132 statutory caps for damages, 4, 81, 99, 110, 132, 134, 165 Stevens, Justice John Paul, 27, 29, 53 summary judgment, 9, 43, 47–49, 51, 53, 54, 140, 141 Sutton v. United Air Lines, Inc., 167, 168

consolidation, 70-71, 82, 159



194

systemic claims, 13, 18, 56-90, 138, 157, 158,

159, 160 systemic litigation, 134, 2, 56, 58, 59–60, 64, 65, 70, 71, 74, 77, 78, 79, 82, 83, 85, 148, 149, 151, 153, 158, 161, 165; see also class action, governmental systemic litigation

Teamsters, see International Brotherhood of Teamsters v. United States

technology sector, 15, 18, 137, 142, 143, 147, 148, 149, 151, 153, 155

theory, 5, 8, 36, 83, 84, 99, 107, 108, 109, 127 Thomas, Suja, 43

Thompson v. North American Stainless, LP, 94 timing of a complaint, 2, 41, 101, 166; see also complaint

Title VII cases, damages & relief, 32, 35, 80, 84, 94, 124, 135

Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, 5, 6, 21, 51, 106, 109, 110; see also Civil Rights Act of 1964

Twiqbal, 30–32, 33, 36, 39, 40, 137, 156, 157 Twombly, see Bell Atlantic v. Twombly typicality, 57, 58, 59, 60 Index

Uber, 138, 140, 141, 143, 149, 150 Uber, see O'Connor v. Uber Technologies, Inc. University of Texas Southwestern Medical Center v. Nassar, 5, 99, 100, 102–03, 105, 162, 165, 166

Urbanski v. Tech Data, 34, 125

Vance v. Ball State University, 5

Wal-Mart analysis, 60–81 Wal-Mart constitutional argument, 84–90 Wal-Mart Stores, Inc. v. Dukes, 1, 3, 4, 56, 57, 64–81, 82, 83, 84–90, 138, 143, 148, 152, 153, 158, 159, 160, 161, 165; see also cabining Wal-Mart, taking Wal-Mart at its word

Washio, 146–47 White, Sheila, 97 Williams v. Ford Motor Co., 34 worker rights, 3, 6, 14, 15, 17, 60, 98, 99, 107, 154, 157

Yelp, 144-45, 147