## UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF MARYLAND BALTIMORE DIVISION

)
)
)
) Civil Action No.
)
) COMPLAINT
JURY TRIAL DEMAND
)
)
) )

### NATURE OF THE ACTION

This is an action under Title I and Title V of the Americans with Disabilities Act ("the ADA") of 1990, as amended through the ADA Amendments of 2008, and Title I of the Civil Rights Act of 1991 to correct unlawful employment practices and to provide appropriate relief to Deborah Ropiski ("Ropiski"), who was adversely affected by such practices.

As alleged with greater particularity in the Statement of Claims below, Defendant Upper Chesapeake Health System, Inc. ("Defendant") unlawfully discriminated against Ropiski when it failed to reassign her to a vacant position as a reasonable accommodation for her disability, Usher's Syndrome, resulting in her discharge, and failed to rehire her into a vacant position for which she was qualified. The EEOC also alleges that Defendant took adverse employment

actions against Ropiski in retaliation for requesting accommodations and for filing EEOC Charges.

#### JURISDICTION AND VENUE

- 1. Jurisdiction of this Court is invoked pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §§ 451, 1331, 1337, 1343, and 1345. This action is authorized and instituted pursuant to Section 107 (a) of the ADA, 42 U.S.C. § 12117(a), which incorporates by reference Section 706(f)(1) and (3) of Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 ("Title VII"), 42 U.S.C. § 2000e-5(f)(1) and (3), and pursuant to Section 102 of the Civil Rights Act of 1991, 42 U.S.C. § 1981A.
- 2. The employment practices alleged to be unlawful were committed within the jurisdiction of the United States District Court for the District of Maryland.

#### **PARTIES**

- 3. Plaintiff, the United States Equal Employment Opportunity Commission, is an agency of the United States of America charged with the administration, interpretation, and enforcement of Title I and Title V of the ADA and is expressly authorized to bring this action by Section 107(a) of the ADA, 42 U.S.C. § 12117(a), which incorporates by reference Section 706(f)(1) of Title VII, 42 U.S.C. § 2000e-5(f)(1).
- 4. At all relevant times, Defendant has been a Maryland corporation doing business in the State of Maryland, and has continuously had at least 15 employees.
- 5. At all relevant times, Defendant has continuously been an employer engaged in an industry affecting commerce within the meaning of Section 101(7) of the ADA, 42 U.S.C. § 12111(7), which incorporates by reference Sections 701 (g) and (h) of Title VII, 42 U.S.C. § 2000e(g) and (h).

6. At all relevant times, Defendant has been a covered entity under Section 101(2) of the ADA, 42 U.S.C. § 12111(2).

#### STATEMENT OF CLAIMS

- 7. More than thirty days prior to the institution of this lawsuit, Ropiski filed charges with the Commission alleging violations of Title I and Title V of the ADA by Defendant. All conditions precedent to the institution of this lawsuit have been fulfilled.
- 8. Ropiski has Usher's Syndrome, a rare genetic disorder which substantially limits one or more of her major life activities and bodily functions, including but not limited to seeing and hearing, and the functioning of her special sense organs (eyes and ears).
- 9. Ropiski is an individual with a disability within the meaning of the ADA who, at all relevant times, could perform the essential functions of several jobs with Defendant with or without a reasonable accommodation.
- 10. Ropiski began her employment with Defendant as a Registered Respiratory Therapist ("RRT") in 1989. In or about 2003, Ropiski began working as a Pulmonary Function Technologist at Defendant's Pulmonary Function Lab at Defendant's Upper Chesapeake Medical Center, performing among other tasks, diagnostic testing on patients.
- 11. Ropiski received positive performance reviews during her tenure with Defendant, In her last 2008 performance review, Defendant scored her a 8.7 out of 10, and rated Charging Party "stellar" for "accountab[ility]," "team work," "effectiveness," "dependability," and "service excellence." Defendant noted that Ropiski "received many patient compliments in 2008 regarding her professionalism, knowledge, compassion, courtesy, friendliness, making the patient feel comfortable, and educating the patients to all the aspects of testing."

- 12. In January 2009, Defendant removed Ropiski from her position as a Pulmonary Function Technologist position due to its belief that her disability interfered with the safe performance of her job. Defendant placed Ropiski on leave and did not return her back to active employment.
- 13. On or about February 5, 2009 and February 18, 2009, Ropiski requested a reasonable accommodation to reduce and/or eliminate any alleged safety concerns about her performance as a Pulmonary Function Technologist.
- 14. In or about June 2009, the Maryland Division of Rehabilitation Services (DORS) recommended to Defendant numerous accommodations to reduce and/or eliminate any alleged safety concerns about Ropiski remaining in the position of Pulmonary Function Technologist.
- 15. Defendant refused to provide Ropiski reasonable accommodations to reduce and/or eliminate any alleged safety risk posed by Ropiski in her position as a Pulmonary Function Technologist.
- 16. Defendant advised Ropiski that it would search for other job opportunities that matched her qualifications and experience. Defendant notified her of only one such opening, that of Verification/Authorization Coordinator. Ropiski could perform the essential functions of the Verification/Authorization Coordinator position with or without a reasonable accommodation.
- 17. In or around September 2009, Defendant failed to reassign Ropiski to the vacant Verification/Authorization Coordinator position for which she was qualified.
- 18. Defendant did not refer or reassign Ropiski to any other vacant positions within Defendant's organization.
- 19. Defendant's refusal to reassign Ropiski to the Verification/Authorization Coordinator position or to any other positions for which she was qualified constitutes an

unlawful employment practice in violation of Sections 102(b)(5)(A) of Title I of the ADA, 42 U.S.C. § 12112(b)(5)(A).

- 20. In the alternative, Defendant's refused to reassign Ropiski to the Verification/Authorization Coordinator position or to any other positions for which she qualified, because she engaged in protected activities, including but not limited to, requesting reasonable accommodations so that she could return to her Pulmonary Function Technologist position, seeking alternative accommodations so that she could remain employed by Defendant, and filing a Charge of Discrimination. This action by Defendant constitutes an unlawful employment practice in violation of Title V of the ADA, Section 503(a), 42 U.S.C. § 12203(a).
  - 21. Defendant terminated Ropiski's employment effective August 15, 2009.
  - 22. Defendant terminated Ropiski because of her disability.
- 23. Defendant's termination of Ropiski because of her disability constitutes an unlawful employment practice in violation of Section 102(a) of Title I of the ADA, 42 U.S.C. § 12112(a).
- 24. In the alternative, Defendant terminated Ropiski because she engaged in protected activities, including but not limited to requesting reasonable accommodations so that she could return to her Pulmonary Function Technologist position, seeking alternative accommodations so that she could remain employed by Defendant, and filing a Charge of Discrimination. This action by Defendant constitutes an unlawful employment practice in violation of Title V of the ADA, Section 503(a), 42 U.S.C. § 12203(a).
- 25. In or about February 2010, the EEOC served Defendant with a Charge of Discrimination filed against it by Ropiski in January 2010.

- 26. On July 27, 2010, Ropiski applied for Defendant's Navigator, Comprehensive Lung Program position, a position which does not provide direct or indirect medical treatment or perform any testing.
- 27. Ropiski possessed the requisite qualifications for the Navigator position and could perform the essential functions of this position with or without reasonable accommodations.
- 28. Despite Ropiski's qualifications for the Navigator position, Defendant refused to re-hire her, claiming that her vision and hearing impairments rendered her unqualified for the position..
- 29. Defendant refused to rehire Ropiski into the Navigator position because of her disability.
- 30. Defendant's refusal to rehire Ropiski into the Navigator position constitutes an unlawful employment practice in violation of Section 102(a) of Title I of the ADA, 42 U.S.C. § 12112(a).
- 31. In the alternative, Defendant's refusal to hire Ropiski for the Navigator position constitutes continuing retaliation against Ropiski because she engaged in protected activities, including but not limited to filing EEOC charges against Defendant. Defendant's action is an unlawful employment practice in violation of Title V of the ADA, Section 503(a), 42 U.S.C. § 12203(a).
- 32. The effect of the practices complained of above in Paragraphs 12-31 has been to deprive Ropiski, who was at all times a qualified individual under the ADA, of equal employment opportunities and otherwise adversely affect her rights under the ADA resulting lost wages and other pecuniary losses, emotional pain, suffering, inconvenience, mental anguish, embarrassment, frustration, humiliation, and loss of enjoyment of life.

- 33. The unlawful employment practices complained of above were intentional.
- 34. The unlawful employment practices complained of above were done with malice or with reckless indifference to the federally protected rights of Ropiski.

#### PRAYER FOR RELIEF

Wherefore, the Commission respectfully requests that this Court:

- A. Grant a permanent injunction enjoining Defendant, its officers, successors, assigns and all persons in active concert or participation with them, from engaging in any employment practice that discriminates on the bases of disability or constitutes retaliation;
- B. Order Defendant to institute and carry out policies, practices, and programs that provide equal employment opportunities for qualified individuals with disabilities and eradicate the effects of its past and present unlawful employment practices, and prevent retaliation from occurring in the future;
- C. Order Defendant to make whole Ropiski by providing appropriate backpay with prejudgment interest, in amounts to be determined at trial, and other affirmative relief necessary to eradicate the effects of its unlawful employment practices, including but not limited to reinstatement or front pay in lieu of reinstatement;
- D. Order Defendant to make whole Ropiski by providing compensation for past and future pecuniary losses resulting from the unlawful employment practices described in Paragraphs 12-31, above;
- E. Order Defendant to make whole Ropiski by providing compensation for past and future non-pecuniary losses including emotional pain, suffering, inconvenience, mental anguish, loss of enjoyment of life, embarrassment, frustration, and humiliation, in an amount to be proven at trial;

- F. Order Defendant to pay Ropiski punitive damages for its callous indifference to her federally protected right to be free from discrimination based on disability and retaliation for having engaged in protected activity in the workplace;
- G. Grant such further relief as the Court deems necessary and proper in the public interest; and
  - H. Award the Commission its costs in this action.

#### JURY TRIAL DEMAND

The Commission requests a jury trial on all questions of fact raised by its complaint.

Respectfully submitted,

P. DAVID LOPEZ General Counsel

JAMES L. LEE Deputy General Counsel

GWENDOLYN YOUNG REAMS

Associate General Counsel

DEBRA M. LAWRENCE

Regional Attorney Bar. No. 04312

(signed by Jennifer Hope with permission of

D. Lawrence)

MARIA L. MORÓCCO

Supervisory Trial Attorney

(signed by Jennifer Hope with permission of

Maria Morocco)

EQUAL EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITY

COMMISSION

Baltimore Field Office

10 S. Howard Street, 3<sup>rd</sup> Floor

Baltimore, MD 21201

# Case 1:13-cv-02846-ELH Document 1 Filed 09/27/13 Page 9 of 9

Trial Attorney

EQUAL EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITY

COMMISSION

Philadelphia District Office 801 Market Street, Suite 1300 Philadelphia, PA 19107

# Case 1:13-cv-02846-ELH Document 1-1 Filed 09/27/13 Page 1 of 1 CIVIL COVER SHEET

SJS 44 (Rev. 11/04)

The JS 44 civil cover sheet and the information contained herein neither replace nor supplement the filing and service of pleadings or other papers as required by law, except as provided by local rules of court. This form, approved by the Judicial Conference of the United States in September 1974, is required for the use of the Clerk of Court for the purpose of initiating the civil docket sheet. (SEE INSTRUCTIONS ON THE REVERSE OF THE FORM.)

I. (a) PLAINTIFFS			DEFENDANTS			
Equal Employment Oppor	tunity Commission		Upper Chesapeake Health System, Inc.			
` '	of First Listed Plaintiff KCEPT IN U.S. PLAINTIFF CASES)		NOTE: IN LANI	f First Listed Defendant (IN U.S. PLAINTIFF CASES OF CONDEMNATION CASES, US	•	
Jennifer L. Hope, EEOC	Address, and Telephone Number)		Attorneys (If Known) Kraig B. Long, Sha	we & Rosenthal LLP		
801 Market Street, Suite 1300, Philadelphia, PA 19107 (215) 440-2847 20 South Charles Street, 11th Floor, Baltimore, MD 21201						
II. BASIS OF JURISDICTION (Place an "X" in One Box Only)  III. CITIZENSHIP OF PRINCIPAL PARTIES(Place an "X" in One Box for Plainti (For Diversity Cases Only)  and One Box for Defendant)						
U.S. Government		rty) Citiz	zen of This State		PTF DEF	
U.S. Government Defendant	5 4 Diversity (Indicate Citizenship of Part		zen of Another State	2		
***			zen or Subject of a  oreign Country	3 🗇 3 Foreign Nation	□ 6 □ 6	
IV. NATURE OF SUIT	(Place an "X" in One Box Only) TORTS	LEO	RFEITURE/PENALTY	BANKRUPTCY	OTHER STATUTES	
□ 110 Insurance □ 120 Marine □ 130 Miller Act □ 140 Negotiable Instrument □ 150 Recovery of Overpayment ∞ Enforcement of Judgment □ 151 Medicare Act □ 152 Recovery of Defaulted Student Loans (Excl. Veterans) □ 153 Recovery of Overpayment of Veteran's Benefits □ 160 Stockholders' Suits □ 190 Other Contract □ 195 Contract Product Liability □ 196 Franchise ■ REAL PROPERTY □ 210 Land Condemnation □ 220 Foreclosure □ 230 Rent Lease & Ejectment □ 240 Torts to Land □ 245 Tort Product Liability □ 290 All Other Real Property	PERSONAL INJURY   PEE	RSONAL INJURY 2 Personal Injury - Med. Malpractice 5 Personal Injury - Product Liability B Asbestos Personal Injury Product Liability ONAL PROPERTY Other Fraud Truth in Lending Other Personal Property Damage Froperty Damage Product Liability ONER PETITIONS ONER PETITIONS	610 Agriculture 620 Other Food & Drug 625 Drug Related Seizure of Property 21 USC 881 630 Liquor Laws 640 R.R. & Truck 650 Airline Regs. 660 Occupational Safety/Health 690 Other LABOR 710 Fair Labor Standards Act 720 Labor/Mgmt. Relations 730 Labor/Mgmt. Reporting & Disclosure Act 740 Railway Labor Act 790 Other Labor Litigation 791 Empl. Ret. Inc. Security Act	□ 422 Appeal 28 USC 158 □ 423 Withdrawal 28 USC 157  PROPERTY RIGHTS □ 820 Copyrights □ 830 Patent □ 840 Trademark  SOCIAL SECURITY □ 861 HIA (1395ff) □ 862 Black Lung (923) □ 863 DIWC/DIWW (405(g)) □ 864 SSID Title XVI □ 865 RSI (405(g))  FEDERAL TAX SUITS □ 870 Taxes (U.S. Plaintiff or Defendant) □ 871 IRS—Third Party 26 USC 7609	□ 400 State Reapportionment □ 410 Antitrust □ 430 Banks and Banking □ 450 Commerce □ 460 Deportation □ 470 Racketeer Influenced and	
V. ORIGIN  State Court  Proceeding  (Place an "X" in One Box Only)  Remanded from Appellate Court  Appeal to District Reinstated or Reopened  Appellate Court  Transferred from another district (specify)  Multidistrict Litigation  Appeal to District Multidistrict (specify)						
VI. CAUSE OF ACTION  Cite the U.S. Civil Statute under which you are filing (Do not cite jurisdictional statutes unless diversity):  42 U.S.C. § 12101, et seq.  Brief description of cause:						
Failure to accommodate; Termination; Failure to rehire; Retaliation						
VII. REQUESTED IN ☐ CHECK IF THIS IS A CLASS ACTION DEMAND \$ CHECK YES only if demanded in complaint:  COMPLAINT: UNDER F.R.C.P. 23 JURY DEMAND: ☑ Yes ☐ No						
VIII. RELATED CASE(S) IF ANY  (See instructions): JUDGE DOCKET NUMBER						
DATE 9/24/13	Sig	SNATURE OF ATTORNEY	OF RECORD			
FOR OFFICE USE ONLY						
RECEIPT # A	MOUNT A	.PPLYING IFP	JUDGE	MAG. JUI	OGE	