Hunter v. Carelock et al Doc. 93

v. ou	Tolook of al		
1	Jenny C. Huang, SBN 223596 Sarita I. Ordóñez, SBN 216047		
2	JUSTICE FIRST LLP 2831 Telegraph Avenue		
3	Oakland, ČA 94609 Telephone: (510) 628-0695		
4	Facsimile: (510) 272-0711		
5	Attorneys for Plaintiff Deborah Hunter		
6	Raymond E. Hane, III, SBN 149960		
7	Kimberly Carter, SBN 221283 BURKE, WILLIAMS & SORENSEN, LLP 444 SOUTH FLOWER STREET, Suite 2400 Los Angeles, CA 90071		
8			
9	Telephone: (213) 236-2719 Facsimile: (213) 236-2700 E-mail: RHane@bwslaw.com KCarter@bwslaw.com		
10			
11			
12	Attorneys for Defendants, INTER-CON SECURITY SYSTEMS, INC.		
13	and CARL CARELOCK		
14	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT		
15	EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA		
16	DEBORAH HUNTER,	) Case No.: 2:08-CV-00370-JAM-GGH	
17	Plaintiff,	ORDER ON PLAINTIFF'S MOTION FOR	
18	vs.	PARTIAL SUMMARY JUDGMENT	
19	CARL CARELOCK,	)	
20	INTER-CON SECURITY SYSTEMS, INC.,	Judge: The Honorable John A. Mendez Date: 9:30am on April 7, 2010 Location: Courtroom 6, 14 <sup>th</sup> Floor	
21	Defendants.		
22			
23	Plaintiff Deborah Hunter brought this action against Defendants Inter-Con Security		
24	Systems, Inc. ("Inter-Con") and Carl Carelock alleging, among other things, sexual harassment		
25	and retaliation in violation of Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 (42 U.S.C. § 2000e et		
26	seq.) and the Fair Employment and Housing Act (Cal. Gov. Code § 12940 et seq.). Inter-Con		
27	asserted in its defense that Ms. Hunter was terminated because she exhausted her medical leave		
28	benefits pursuant to the California Family Right	benefits pursuant to the California Family Rights Act ("CFRA") and the Family Medical Leave	
	HUNTER V. CARELOCK, CASE NO. 2:08-CV-00370 (JAM)(GGH) [PROPOSED] ORDER ON PLAINTIFF'S MOTION FOR PARTIAL SUMMARY JUDGMENT PAGE 1 OF 3		

PDF created with pdfFactory trial version www.pdffactory.com

1 Act ("FMLA"). By motion filed on March 10, 2010, Plaintiff Deborah Hunter moved for partial 2 summary judgment on her claims that Inter-Con interfered with her rights to medical leave by 3 terminating her in violation of the CFRA (Cal. Govt. Code § 12945.2) (Eleventh Cause of 4 Action) and the FMLA (29 U.S.C. § 2615) (Thirteenth Cause of Action). 5 Inter-Con claims that Ms. Hunter was terminated for exhausting her CFRA/FMLA leave, based on the rolling method of calculation. Pursuant to Bachelder v. America West Airlines, 259 6 F.3d 1112, 1129-30 (9<sup>th</sup> Cir. 2001), employers are required to give notice to their employees of 7 8 its selected method used to calculate FMLA leave. In the absence of such notice by the 9 employer, the employee is entitled to use the method of calculation that is most favorable to him 10 or her. Bachelder, supra, 259 F.3d at 1128-29. Inter-Con claims that it gave Ms. Hunter notice 11 of the rolling method by way of its letter to her, dated February 9, 2007. However, the February 12 9, 2007 letter is notably silent as to whether Ms. Hunter's leave of absence taken in 2006 would 13 count against her eligibility for CFRA/FMLA leave in 2007, it does not calculate the amount of 14 CFRA/FMLA days used and/or remaining, and does not include any explicit reference to her 15 exact date of exhaustion. As such, the February 9, 2007 letter improperly kept Ms. Hunter in the 16 dark about the method used by the employer to calculate her CFRA/FMLA leave, in violation of 17 the employer's obligations pursuant to *Bachelder*. 18 Because Inter-Con failed to notify Ms. Hunter in the February 9, 207 letter, or by way of 19 any other document, that it used the rolling method to calculate her CFRA/FMLA leave, Ms. 20 Hunter is entitled, as a matter of law, to use the calendar method to calculate her leave. Under 21 the calendar method, Ms. Hunter had not exhausted her CFRA/FMLA leave at the time of her 22 termination. Because Inter-Con terminated Ms. Hunter for exhausting her CFRA/FMLA leave, 23 this Court finds, as a matter of law, that her termination was improper. // 24 // 25 // 26 27 // 28 //

HUNTER V. CARELOCK, CASE NO. 2:08-CV-00370 (JAM)(GGH)
[PROPOSED] ORDER ON PLAINTIFF'S MOTION FOR PARTIAL SUMMARY JUDGMENT
PAGE 2 OF 3

1	Based upon the oral arguments of counsel at the hearing on April 7, 2010, the papers	
2	submitted in support of and in opposition to Plaintiff's motion, and all other pleadings and paper	
3	filed in this action, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that Plaintiff's motion for partial summary	
4	judgment on her Eleventh and Thirteenth Causes of Action is GRANTED.	
5		
6	Dated: April 15, 2010	
7	/s/ John A. Mendez The Honorable John A. Mendez	
8	United States District Judge	
9		
10		
11		
12		
13		
14		
15		
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		
26		
27		
28		

HUNTER V. CARELOCK, CASE NO. 2:08-CV-00370 (JAM)(GGH)
[PROPOSED] ORDER ON PLAINTIFF'S MOTION FOR PARTIAL SUMMARY JUDGMENT
PAGE 3 OF 3