

or and get started.

[Sign Out](#) | [My Account](#)

The Legal Intelligencer's
Library of Pennsylvania Family Law Forms
 To order, click here or call 877-256-2472

Includes full access to the new digital version of the book!

30 Day FREE Web Trial

The Legal Intelligencer
THE OLDEST LAW JOURNAL IN THE UNITED STATES

This Site | [Law.com Network](#)
[Legal Web](#)

Contact Facebook RSS Twitter

[Home](#) [News](#) [Firms & Lawyers](#) [Courts](#) [Judges](#) [Surveys/Lists](#) [Columns](#) [Verdicts](#) [Public Notices](#) [Advertise](#) [Subscribe](#)

Home > Office Politics, Not Political Discrimination

Commentary

Font Size: [+](#) [-](#)

Office Politics, Not Political Discrimination

Preferential Treatment for 'Politically Connected' Employees Not Unconstitutional

Jeffrey Campolongo [Contact](#) [All Articles](#)

The Legal Intelligencer | December 20, 2011



[Print](#) [Email](#) [Reprints & Permissions](#) [Post a Comment](#)



Jeffrey Campolongo

Employment law attorneys often get calls about workplace favoritism and nepotism. As unfair as the circumstances can sometimes be, there is usually nothing unlawful about the employer's actions.

Nepotism in the workplace — employers treating relatives with more favoritism than other employees — is not unlawful discrimination in Pennsylvania. There are certain limits on the types of preference employers can have, however, and one of those is political nepotism by a public employer.

A recent 1st U.S. Circuit Court of Appeals decision explains that while there are constitutional protections against political favoritism in public employment, preferential treatment to "politically connected" employees is not a constitutional violation.

In the Nov. 22 case of *Barry v. Moran*, the 1st Circuit affirmed that allegedly rampant political nepotism within the Boston Fire Department (BFD) was not unlawful discrimination. The court determined that the plaintiffs were not able to show that the preferential treatment other employees received was due to anything more than personal preferences and relationships.

As we all know, the First Amendment protects freedom of speech and association, which also includes protections for political speech and association. "Constitutional protection extends to the decision not to associate with a political party of faction," the *Barry* court noted.

To show political discrimination, a public employee must show that he or she engaged in constitutionally protected activity that was a substantial or motivating factor for an adverse employment action, the court said. The employer may then present evidence that it would have reached the same decision in the absence of the protected activity.

In *Barry*, eight BFD employees sued the department after years of allegedly being passed over for promotions, job transfers and public benefits in favor of outside individuals with less experience and fewer qualifications but with connections to higher-ups in the BFD or in the Boston political scene. According to the opinion, the employees presented a long history of not receiving opportunities and observing favoritism for those with "political" connections.

For instance, one employee was alleged to have applied for 11 positions she was qualified for during a six-year period. Other employees were discouraged from applying for new positions.

Upon complaint about preferential treatment to certain well-connected employees, the court goes on to say, a supervisor responded to one of the plaintiffs, "If you're not into politics, little girl, then you're not into a position here."

Making a Business Case for the Anti-SOPA Blackouts
 Click Here for the Results
 CORPORATE COUNSEL

Advertisement

The Legal Intelligencer
Allegheny & Westmoreland County Court Rules

Click Here to Order
 Or Call 800-722-7670 x2453

RELATED ITEMS

- [Deputy's Right to Privacy Determined to Outweigh Gov't Interest](#)
- [ABA Opinions Clarify Ethical Obligations in E-Mail Interception](#)

Find similar content

Companies, agencies mentioned

Key categories

Most viewed stories

FJD Paid Another \$1.79 Mil. for Family Court Expenses

Democrats See 'Unique' Opportunity in AG Race

Dechert Takes Another Stab at Frankfurt Office

Baldwin Ready to Hand Over Reins as Penn State GC

Comments at Attorney Meeting Privileged; Slander Case Tossed

Advertisement

Successful applicants for open position often came from persons affiliated with the "Hyde Park Group" and the "South Boston Group," informal groups that the plaintiffs claimed held the "power" in the BFD. The plaintiffs also pointed to favoritism toward employees who were friends with the mayor's wife, who had worked for the city previously, who were related to city employees, and who were neighbors of the BFD chief.

The 1st Circuit did not consider these circumstances to be evidence of unlawful discrimination but instead considered them to be a matter of office politics and traditional nepotism or cronyism. According to the decision, there was not any clear evidence of disparity in treatment due to political affinity. The two groups "in power" were merely social and familial networks that did not hold any political significance. Favoritism toward those with connections to city officials or higher-ups within the BFD was not deemed political nepotism.

The court was looking for evidence that linked the BFD's decision-making to political affiliation, such as that the plaintiffs were "members of a rival political party, that a divisive political issue created a rift between appellees and themselves, or that they were asked for campaign contributions or to engage in other political activity." The case emphasizes that "there is an important distinction between a public official who chooses to hire friends, relatives, neighbors or college buddies, and one who refuses to hire those who failed to make campaign contributions, join her political party or attend political rallies."

Office politics, even within a governmental entity, are not the same thing as political activity. *Barry* evidences how limited the circumstances are in which workplace nepotism arises to unlawful activity.

"However unsavory it may be, preferential treatment in public employment decisions unrelated to protected speech or association does not infringe upon freedoms secured by the First Amendment," the court said. •

Jeffrey Campolongo is the founder of the Law Office of Jeffrey Campolongo, a boutique firm focusing on employee rights and counseling aspiring and established entertainers. He can be reached at jcamp@camplaw.com

[Subscribe to The Legal Intelligencer](#)

[Print](#) [Email](#) [Reprints & Permissions](#) [Post a Comment](#)

THE 2012 LEGAL DIRECTORY
Philadelphia/Montgomery/Delaware/Chester/Bucks
PHILADELPHIA BAR ASSOCIATION The Legal Intelligencer
Click Here to Order!
Or Call 215-557-2453

TOP JOBS

Senior Fellow and Associate Dean, Legal Writing and Communication Skills
University of Pennsylvania Law School
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania

ASSOCIATE
CONFIDENTIAL SEARCH
Jenkintown, PA

MORE JOBS
POST A JOB

Advertisement

The Legal Intelligencer
The 2012 PENNSYLVANIA TAX HANDBOOK is Here!
Click Here to Order
Call 800-722-7670 x2453

From the Law.com Network

LITN LAW TECHNOLOGY NEWS



Guidance Revamps Decade-Old Evidence File Format

RPost Patent Survives Invalidation Claim in Pyrrhic Victory

THE RECORDER



High Court to Revisit Medical Marijuana Cases

Big Asbestos Trial Under Way in San Francisco

dbr DAILY BUSINESS REVIEW.COM



Jury Finds TD Bank Liable for \$67 Million in Rothstein Scam

3rd DCA sends foreclosure case back to trial despite lost note

New Jersey Law Journal



Spectator Injured by Topples Teen at N.J. Nets Game Loses Damages Case

Restraint Held Too Broad To Prevent Father Attending Child's Soccer Game

ALM LEGAL INTEL



The 2011 Electron 200

These reports have industry standard for determining benchmark success within law:

THE LEGAL INTELLIGENCER

HELP & INFORMATION CENTER [Customer Service](#) | [Submit An Article](#) | [Submit A Verdict](#) | [Letters to the Editor](#) | [PICS Order Form](#)

THE LEGAL INTELLIGENCER.COM [About Us](#) | [Contact Us](#) | [Privacy Policy](#) | [Terms & Conditions](#)

SUBSCRIBE [Click Here For Subscription Options](#)

ADVERTISE [Place An Ad](#) | [View Jobs](#) | [View Real Estate Listings](#) | [View Experts](#) | [Professional Announcements](#) | [Editorial Calendar](#)

OTHER RESOURCES [Events](#) | [Reprints & Permissions](#) | [Legal Products](#) | [Retail Marketplace](#) | [Public Notices](#) | [RSS Feed](#)

the LAW.COM network

LAW.COM

[Newswire](#)
[Special Reports](#)
[International News](#)
[Lists, Surveys & Rankings](#)
[Legal Blogs](#)
[Site Map](#)

ALM NATIONAL

[The American Lawyer](#)
[The Am Law Litigation Daily](#)
[Corporate Counsel](#)
[Law Technology News](#)
[The National Law Journal](#)

ALM REGIONAL

[Connecticut Law Tribune](#)
[Daily Business Review \(FL\)](#)
[Delaware Law Weekly](#)
[Daily Report \(GA\)](#)
[The Legal Intelligencer \(PA\)](#)
[New Jersey Law Journal](#)
[New York Law Journal](#)
[GC New York](#)
[The Recorder \(CA\)](#)
[Texas Lawyer](#)

DIRECTORIES

[ALM Experts](#)
[LegalTech® Directory](#)
[In-House Law Departments at the Top 500 Companies](#)
[New York's Women Leaders in the Law](#)
[Corporate Counsel: Best Lawyers® Annual Guides](#)
[The American Lawyer: Best Lawyers® Annual Guides](#)
[The National Law Journal Leadership Profiles](#)
[National Directory of Minority Attorneys](#)

BOOKS & NEWSLETTERS

[Best-Selling Books](#)
[Publication E-Alerts](#)
[Law Journal Newsletters](#)
[LawCatalog Store](#)
[Law Journal Press Online](#)

RESEARCH

[ALM Legal Intelligence](#)
[Court Reporters](#)
[MA 3000](#)
[Verdict Search](#)
[ALM Experts](#)
[Legal Dictionary](#)
[Smart Litigator](#)

EVENTS & CONFERENCES

[ALM Events](#)
[LegalTech®](#)
[Virtual LegalTech®](#)
[Virtual Events](#)
[Webinars & Online Events](#)
[Insight Information](#)

REPRINTS

[Reprints](#)

ONLINE CLE

[CLE Center](#)

CAREER

[Lawjobs](#)