



## Labor &amp; Employment Litigation | Alert

May 2017

## Has the Second Circuit Lowered the Bar for Plaintiffs to Advance a Hostile Work Environment Claim under Title VII?

In a pair of recent decisions that may spur even more litigation for employers, the Second Circuit Court of Appeals reversed summary judgment dismissing hostile work environment claims under Title VII. *Daniel v. T&M Protection Resources, LLC*, 15-cv-560; *Ahmed v. Astoria Bank*, 16-cv-1389. In *Daniel*, the Court raised substantial doubts about long-established authorities when it ruled that even a single racial slur, if “sufficiently severe,” may be enough to create a hostile work environment under Title VII. In *Ahmed*, the Court ruled that “several” allegedly demeaning comments were sufficient to defeat summary judgment. After *Daniel* and *Ahmed*, employers may find that the already-high hurdle to obtain summary judgment dismissing hostile work environment claims under Title VII has been elevated even further.

Daniel claimed that his supervisor, on one occasion, called him “you f----- n----.” In reversing summary judgment for the employer, the Second Circuit acknowledged that its prior jurisprudence instructed that to create a hostile work environment, “there must be a steady barrage of opprobrious racial comments.” Yet, the Court reasoned that this did not foreclose the possibility that a single slur could be enough. The Second Circuit made little effort to explain how the district court misconstrued precedent requiring “a steady barrage of opprobrious racial comments” in the plural. Instead, in evaluating the severity of the one-time slur at issue, the Court asserted that “perhaps no single act can more quickly alter the conditions of employment and create an abusive working environment than the use of an unambiguously racial epithet . . . by a supervisor in the presence of his subordinates.”

Ahmed claimed that she suffered a hostile work environment as an Egyptian and Muslim. At deposition, she “testified to only two instances” where her supervisor made comments about her hijab. However, she was permitted to amplify this testimony through a sworn affirmation submitted in opposition to summary judgment. Thus, citing evidence that her supervisors “demeaned [her] race, ethnicity, and religion ‘[o]n several occasions,’” the Second Circuit reversed summary judgment.

Notably, neither *Daniel* nor *Ahmed* addressed the level of authority required for a supervisor's one-time comment to impose liability on the employer, nor the availability of the *Farragher/Ellerth* defense, *i.e.*, whether an employer who takes prompt remedial action can defeat liability notwithstanding the supervisor's remark(s). What does seem clear, however, is that "a steady barrage" of multiple slurs may no longer be required for a plaintiff to advance a hostile work environment claim to trial.

*Daniel* and *Ahmed* provide a stark reminder that employers face an increasingly uphill battle in seeking summary judgment. It is important for employers to continue to vigorously reinforce in anti-harassment training that all employees, particularly supervisors, must be vigilant about the words they use in the workplace – and those to avoid. All alleged utterances that violate company policy (even if made only once) should be promptly investigated and the rules prohibiting the use of words and phrases that could be considered discriminatory or insensitive should be enforced. Such utterances may also form the basis for swift discipline, including the possibility of immediate termination of the offending employee.

This *GT Alert* was prepared by **Michael J. Slocum** and **Noel A. Lesica**. Questions about this information can be directed to:

- > [Michael J. Slocum](#) | +1 973.443.3509 | [slocumm@gtlaw.com](mailto:slocumm@gtlaw.com)
- > [Noel A. Lesica](#) | +1 973.443.3248 | [lesican@gtlaw.com](mailto:lesican@gtlaw.com)
- > Or your [Greenberg Traurig](#) attorney

<b>Amsterdam</b> + 31 20 301 7300	<b>Denver</b> +1 303.572.6500	<b>Northern Virginia</b> +1 703.749.1300	<b>Tallahassee</b> +1 850.222.6891
<b>Atlanta</b> +1 678.553.2100	<b>Fort Lauderdale</b> +1 954.765.0500	<b>Orange County</b> +1 949.732.6500	<b>Tampa</b> +1 813.318.5700
<b>Austin</b> +1 512.320.7200	<b>Houston</b> +1 713.374.3500	<b>Orlando</b> +1 407.420.1000	<b>Tel Aviv^</b> +03.636.6000
<b>Berlin~</b> +49 (0) 30 700 171 100	<b>Las Vegas</b> +1 702.792.3773	<b>Philadelphia</b> +1 215.988.7800	<b>Tokyo¤</b> +81 (0)3 4510 2200
<b>Berlin-GT Restructuring^</b> +49 (0) 30 700 171 100	<b>London*</b> +44 (0)203 349 8700	<b>Phoenix</b> +1 602.445.8000	<b>Warsaw~</b> +48 22 690 6100
<b>Boca Raton</b> +1 561.955.7600	<b>Los Angeles</b> +1 310.586.7700	<b>Sacramento</b> +1 916.442.1111	<b>Washington, D.C.</b> +1 202.331.3100
<b>Boston</b> +1 617.310.6000	<b>Mexico City+</b> +52 55 5029.0000	<b>San Francisco</b> +1 415.655.1300	<b>Westchester County</b> +1 914.286.2900
<b>Chicago</b> +1 312.456.8400	<b>Miami</b> +1 305.579.0500	<b>Seoul¤¤</b> +82 (0) 2.369.1000	<b>West Palm Beach</b> +1 561.650.7900
<b>Dallas</b> +1 214.665.3600	<b>New Jersey</b> +1 973.360.7900	<b>Shanghai</b> +86 (0) 21.6391.6633	

This Greenberg Traurig Alert is issued for informational purposes only and is not intended to be construed or used as general legal advice nor as a solicitation of any type. Please contact the author(s) or your Greenberg Traurig contact if you have questions regarding the currency of this information. The hiring of a lawyer is an important decision. Before you decide, ask for written information about the lawyer's legal qualifications and experience. Greenberg Traurig is a service mark and trade name of Greenberg Traurig, LLP and Greenberg Traurig, P.A. ~Greenberg Traurig's Berlin office is operated by Greenberg Traurig Germany, an affiliate of Greenberg Traurig, P.A. and Greenberg Traurig, LLP. ^ Berlin - GT Restructuring is operated by Köhler-Ma Geiser Partnerschaft Rechtsanwälte, Insolvenzverwalter. \*Operates as a separate UK registered legal entity. \*\*Greenberg Traurig is not responsible for any legal or other services rendered by attorneys employed by the strategic alliance firms. +Greenberg Traurig's Mexico City office is operated by Greenberg Traurig, S.C., an affiliate of Greenberg Traurig, P.A. and Greenberg Traurig, LLP. ¤Operates as Greenberg Traurig LLP Foreign Legal Consultant Office. ^Greenberg Traurig's Tel Aviv office is a branch of Greenberg Traurig, P.A., Florida, USA. ¤¤Greenberg Traurig Tokyo Law Offices are operated by GT Tokyo Horitsu Jimusho, an affiliate of Greenberg Traurig, P.A. and Greenberg Traurig, LLP. ~Greenberg Traurig's Warsaw office is operated by Greenberg Traurig Grzesiak sp.k., an affiliate of Greenberg Traurig, P.A. and Greenberg Traurig, LLP. Certain partners in Greenberg Traurig Grzesiak sp.k. are also shareholders in Greenberg Traurig, P.A. Images in this advertisement do not depict Greenberg Traurig attorneys, clients, staff or facilities. No aspect of this advertisement has been approved by the Supreme Court of New Jersey. ©2017 Greenberg Traurig, LLP. All rights reserved.