Welcome to the New Law.com. Click here to register and get started

Sign Out | My Account



Day FREE

Home

The Legal Intelligencer

Contact

Legal Web

NSS RSS

Twitter

Facebook **Public Notices**

Verdicts

Advertise

Subscribe

Home > Sex-Based Profanity, Even if Directed at Others, Can Create Hostile Workplace

Employment Law

News

Judges

Sex-Based Profanity, Even if Directed at Others, Can Create **Hostile Workplace**

Jeffrey Campolongo Contact All Articles The Legal Intelligencer | January 29, 2010

Print

Share

Email

Firms & Lawyers

Reprints & Permissions

Write to the Editor

Surveys/Lists



Jeffrey Campolongo

For years, courts have grappled with what type of conduct constitutes a hostile work environment. Most courts have consistently held that Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, 42 U.S.C. § 2000e-2(a)(1), does not create a workplace code of civility. A recent 11th U.S. Circuit Court of Appeals decision, however, has added a wrinkle to the way courts should interpret Title VII claims.

While the 11th Circuit is not the first court to find offensive language in the workplace to be actionable, the recent landmark decision and corresponding opinion in Reeves v. C.H. Robinson Worldwide Inc. can be read as a strongly worded warning to employers who allow or ignore gender slurs and inappropriate conduct. The en banc decision unanimously reverses a finding of summary judgment for the employer and

RELATED ITEMS

- Navigating the Maze of Offers of Judgment in Fee-Shifting Cases
- 3rd Circuit Considers Impact of High Court **Decision on ADEA Claims**

holds that a plaintiff may bring a hostile work environment claim based on sex even when the discriminatory conduct and language is not specifically directed at the plaintiff.

The plaintiff in Reeves asserted a claim of hostile work environment under Title VII, which requires a showing that she was discriminated against because of her protected class (in this case, sex) and that the offensive conduct was severe or pervasive such that it

alters the terms or conditions of her employment. Because of these requirements, to some extent, there has been an understanding that the law requires the offensive language or conduct be directly aimed at the plaintiff.

However, Reeves instructs that "a plaintiff can prove a hostile work environment by showing severe or pervasive discrimination directed against her protected group, even if she herself is not individually singled out in the offensive

The court recites, defines and discusses the gender slurs that were allegedly used in Ingrid Reeves' workplace and describes the details of the inappropriate conduct of Reeves' co-workers. The profanity that Reeves allegedly endured is not fit for print in this column.

In sum, Reeves was the only female in a six-cubicle "pod" of transportation sales representatives and there was only one other woman on her floor. One day Reeves' manager got frustrated on a sales call and turned to Reeves and told her to "talk to that stupid b[----] on line 4." as noted in the opinion. She soon learned that this would not be an isolated event, as her manager and co-workers regularly used derogatory and sexual terminology when talking about the women they spoke to on sales calls, Reeves alleged. The men also regularly listened to a radio program during which vulgar sexual acts, masturbation and intimate parts of a woman's body were discussed.

Advertisement



Find similar content

Companies, agencies mentioned

Key categories

Most viewed stories

Same-Sex Marriage Fight at Heart of Cozen O'Connor Benefits Case

E-Discovery Drives \$576K Costs Levied on Plaintiffs

Drinker Biddle's Melinson to Serve as HP's Deputy GC

Prosecutors: Stradley Ronon Shouldn't Represent Archdiocese

The 2011 Lawyers on the Fast Track

Advertisement

The Legal Intelligencer

2011 Pennsylvania

On one occasion, Reeves alleged she observed a co-worker looking at a pornographic image on his computer, as noted in the opinion. She also allegedly heard her male co-workers refer to the only other woman on the floor with gender slurs, as well as comment on her body, the opinion said. The plaintiff alleged that every day of work for almost three years she listened to her male co-workers and branch manager speak about women in a degrading, humiliating manner.

Reeves alleged she made multiple complaints to her co-workers and manager, as early as her first week of work. She was consistently ignored or was given empty promises that language would be monitored more closely. Reeves testified that when she tried changing the radio station during a program laced with profanities that the other employees would soon change the radio back to the offensive program.

After her complaints to company executives allegedly went unheeded, Reeves resigned.

The court noted that this would be "a very different case" if "indiscriminate insults and sexually-laden conversation did not focus on the gender of the victim." However, much of the language and conduct that the plaintiff alleges went on involved epithets that would be particularly offensive to women. The 11th Circuit found no merit in the employer's proffered defense that some of the epithets were also used to talk about men. Examining the meaning behind these words, the court explained that the purpose of using those words toward a man is to insult the man "by comparing him to a woman, and, thereby, could be taken as humiliating to women as a group as well."

The en banc panel of the 11th Circuit also found particular fault with the employer's implicit allowance of this behavior, resolving that a jury could find intentional discrimination when an employer allows the conduct to continue. The tersely worded opinion gave little regard to the employer's defense that this was not discrimination since the language was used prior to Reeves' employment, recognizing that an employee has a right to be free from such a degrading workplace regardless of what it was like before she started working there.

There should be little or no concern about the *Reeves* decision opening the floodgates to litigation over workplace language use, as the court was clear to remind us that "not all profane or sexual language or conduct" is actionable. It is actionable when "members of one sex are exposed to disadvantageous terms or conditions of employment to which members of the other sex are not exposed," the opinion noted, citing *Harris v. Forklift Sys. Inc*. In this case, the alleged actions of watching porn, listening to women masturbating on the radio and using crude language to label co-workers went beyond the scope of what one can expect at work.

The import of this case is that it permits a claim of gender discrimination even if the plaintiff is not an individual victim of attack. "It is enough to hear co-workers on a daily basis refer to female colleagues as 'b[-----],' 'w[-----]' and 'c[----],' to understand that they view women negatively, and in a humiliating or degrading way. The harasser need not close the circle with reference to the plaintiff by specifically saying 'and you are a "b[-----]," too,'" the opinion said, citing *Yuknis v. First Student Inc*. •

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@jcamplaw.com** or 215-592-9293.



TOP JOBS

PH-Sr. Litigation Associate/ Counsel CONFIDENTIAL SEARCH Philadelphia, PA

Associate Attorney Confidential Philadelphia, Pennsylvania

MORE JOBS POST A JOB

Advertisement

Subscribe to The Legal Intelligencer

Print

Share

Email

Reprints & Permissions

Write to the Editor

From the Law.com Network





Calif. Law on Collecting DNA From Arrestees Ruled Unconstitutional

Wells Fargo Sued Over



Bacardi's 'Havana Club' not false advertising

Gov. Rick Scott rejects two sets of JNC nominees

New Tersey Law Iournal



Superior Court Backlogs Swell, in Part Fueled by Steady Rise in Mass Torts

10

...



The 2011 Ele 200

These report industry star determining wintepapers, interviews, and webcasts to improve your discovery process and performance. **Learn More.**

Reverse Mortgages

ABA Panel Suggests Attorney Discipline Be Wrested From District Committees success within law i

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 Small Firms Lists, Surveys & Rankings Legal Blogs Site Map

ALM NATIONAL

The American Lawyer
The Am Law Litigation Daily
Corporate Counsel
Law Technology News
Minority Law Journal
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
New York Lawyer
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

The American Lawyer: Best Lawyers® Annual Guides The National Law Journal Leadership Profiles

BOOKS & NEWSLETTERS

Best-Selling Books Publication E-Alerts Law Journal Newsletters LawCatalog

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

About ALM | About Law.com | Customer Support | Reprints | Privacy Policy | Terms & Conditions Copyright 2011. ALM Media Properties, LLC. All rights reserved.

