RECENT LAWSUIT TESTS MINISTERIAL EXCEPTION

Generally, the "ministerial exception" allows religious employers to avoid liability for discrimination claims when making employment decisions concerning employees who qualify as "ministers." The exception is rooted in religious freedom principles found in the U.S. Constitution. Specifically, the First Amendment of the U.S. Constitution provides that "Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof." The first part of this amendment is known more commonly as the "Establishment Clause" and the second part is commonly known as the "Free Exercise Clause." The U.S. Supreme Court has held that a church's selection of its leaders is grounded in the Free Exercise Clause. The Free Exercise Clause recognizes that "perpetuation of a church's existence may depend upon those whom it selects to preach its values, teach its message, and interpret its doctrines both to its own membership and to the world at large."

More than one year ago, the U.S. Supreme Court confirmed that claims involving the employment relationship between a religious institution and its ministers exempt employers from liability under Title VII pursuant to the "ministerial exception" founded upon an employer's First Amendment rights. In Hosanna-Tabor Evangelical Lutheran Church and School v. EEOC, the Supreme Court held that:

Generally, the "ministerial exception" allows religious employers to avoid liability for discrimination claims when making employment decisions concerning employees who qualify as "ministers." The exception is rooted in religious freedom principles found in the U.S. Constitution. Specifically, the First Amendment of the U.S. Constitution provides that "Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof." The first part of this amendment is known more commonly as the "Establishment Clause" and the second part is commonly known as the "Free Exercise Clause." The U.S. Supreme Court has held that a church's selection of its leaders is grounded in the Free Exercise Clause. The Free Exercise Clause recognizes that "perpetuation of a church's existence may depend upon those whom it selects to preach its values, teach its message, and interpret its doctrines both to its own membership and to the world at large."

More than one year ago, the U.S. Supreme Court confirmed that claims involving the employment relationship between a religious institution and its ministers exempt employers from liability under Title VII pursuant to the "ministerial exception" founded upon an employer's First Amendment rights. In *Hosanna-Tabor Evangelical Lutheran Church and School v. EEOC*, the Supreme Court held that:

"Requiring a church to accept or retain an unwanted minister, or punishing a church for failing to do so, intrudes upon more than a mere employment decision. Such an action

interferes with the internal governance of the church, depriving the church of control over the selection of those who will personify its beliefs. By imposing an unwanted minister, the state infringes the Free Exercise Clause, which protects a religious group's right to shape its own faith and mission through its appointments."

The Supreme Court in *Hosanna-Tabor* refused to adopt a rigid formula for deciding when an employee qualifies as a minister. So, one of the primary questions that remains after the Supreme Court's decision in *Hosanna-Tabor* has been how broadly the courts will interpret "minister" and which employees will be covered by the ministerial exception.

One of the first opportunities to test the Supreme Court's ruling in *Hosanna-Tabor* presented itself in *Dias v. Archdiocese of Cincinnati*, a case coming out of the U.S. District Court for the Southern District of Ohio. On June 4, 2013, a jury returned a verdict for Crista Dias, a former technology coordinator for two Catholic schools in the Cincinnati area. Dias filed a complaint against the Archdiocese alleging the Archdiocese terminated her for being pregnant and unmarried in violation of Title VII's ban on sex and pregnancy discrimination.

The Archdiocese moved to dismiss Dias' complaint by invoking the "ministerial exception," but the district court denied the motion. The court found that Dias was not a minister for purposes of the ministerial exception to Title VII because Dias taught computer classes and because she was a non-Catholic who was not permitted under church rules to teach religion to her elementary school students. If the Ohio Archdiocese appeals the jury's verdict, it will have an opportunity to pursue defense of the claim under the ministerial exception at the federal appellate court level, which will give the appellate court a chance to develop the standard for determining when an employee qualifies as a minister.

Religious-based employers should closely follow the developing case law of the ministerial exception for guidance as to which employees will be considered "ministers" within the meaning of the exception.

RECORD RETENTION POLICY: A START TO BEING LITIGATION-READY

Almost 99% of today's information created by businesses is generated and stored electronically. The ability to easily and conveniently store large amounts of data has created a hidden liability that did not exist in the age of when companies maintained its information primarily in paper format. The effect of this hidden liability is twofold. First, companies create more information then they know what to do with. Second, companies sometimes

delete or destroy data and information that they actually do need.

For the unwary, these hidden liabilities may become exposed when your company is faced with a lawsuit. In today's litigation, the age of electronic data has generated a paradigm shift away from traditional paper documents to digital information. This shift has changed the discovery process in litigation by changing what attorneys are looking for; how they are looking; and where they are looking for relevant information. Companies can expect in today's litigation that the way it stores and preserves electronic information will be a central topic during the discovery process that will involve not only your record custodians, but also your information technology department. How well a company manages and preserves its electronic information may be an outcome determinative factor for it in litigation.

Today, companies that find themselves involved in a lawsuit oftentimes are faced with attacks through the discovery process as to how they typically store and delete electronic information. The purpose of this inquiry is to set the expectation as to what electronic information, such as e-mails, the company should or should not reasonably have at its disposal for discovery purposes. Companies that do not have a well-drafted record retention plan that addresses electronic information and which incorporates a comprehensive litigation hold policy may find themselves at a significant disadvantage in trying to defend what might otherwise be a winning case. That is why it is more important than ever for all companies, both large and small, to effectively manage their electronic information. This means that **companies must be litigation-ready** by taking affirmative actions that allow the company to effectively manage and retain electronic information. It is simply too late to start thinking about the manner and method of retention and destruction of electronic data after you have been served with a lawsuit.

The best tools to avoid these hidden liabilities is a **record retention policy** that addresses electronic information as well as a **litigation hold policy** that is designed to preserve electronic data once litigation is reasonably anticipated. A record retention policy should be designed so that your company does not destroy information that it is obligated to maintain and at the same time the policy should be designed to destroy or delete information that the company no longer needs and/or is no longer mandated to maintain. Most companies have some sort of document retention policy. These retention policies were originally implemented to manage the volume and space occupied by paper documents. Companies have been less diligent, however, in applying their retention policies to the electronic information that they store on their servers and individual computer hard drives. This lack of diligence in managing electronic data has created a treasure trove for plaintiffs' lawyers looking for the proverbial "smoking gun," such as that e-mail that explains exactly what motivated the company's decision to terminate that troublesome employee.

A litigation hold policy has long been an important concept in litigation. In simple terms, it means that once you are sued, you have to stop destroying documents. It is an easy concept

to understand when applied to paper documents, but it becomes a much more complicated task when dealing with electronic information. Electronic evidence can easily disappear, be altered or destroyed if not properly preserved. For example, some companies' computer systems provide for automatic deletion of e-mails and documents, so stopping that process takes an affirmative effort on behalf of management. When implementing a legal hold, a company needs to approach the hold requirement with a coordinated team effort. Business units, IT, records management and custodial personnel, and either in-house or outside counsel need to be involved and work together in the process of implementing the hold.

The failure to have a properly drafted record retention policy as well as a litigation hold policy may result in serious and adverse consequences for your company and may compromise your company's ability to defend itself in a lawsuit. For example, failure to have these policies in place can result in court-imposed sanctions, adverse jury instructions and significant monetary awards.

For example, a federal district court in Illinois recently agreed to permit the jury to be instructed that it can assume computer data destroyed by an employer would be unfavorable to its defense in an employee's lawsuit under the Americans with Disabilities Act when the employer permitted a software program to automatically overwrite computer data relevant to the claims in the case. It made no difference that the employer did not act intentionally in deleting the information, rather, the district court found that the employer's failure to prevent the automatic deletion made it "at fault" relative to its duty to preserve evidence that was discoverable pursuant to the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure. Consequently, thinking ahead and addressing the hidden liabilities created by your electronic information can save your company time and money, and, more importantly, potentially prevent your company from having to incur an unfavorable judgment as the result of electronic information being inadvertently deleted.

DOES YOUR "AT-WILL" EMPLOYMENT STATEMENT VIOLATE THE NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS ACT?

To maintain its relevancy and expand the scope of its authority, the NLRB continues its attack upon non-union employers' policies. This time the NLRB has positioned its cross-hairs upon employers' "at-will" employment policies or statements. Most non-union employers include within their employee handbook a statement that employees' employment is "at-will," meaning either the employee or the employer may end the employment relationship at any

time, for any reason, either with or without notice. Most “at-will” statements further provide that no agent or representative of the employer may enter into any agreement to the contrary unless done so in writing and signed by the president or CEO of the company. These types of statements reflect nothing more than the reality of the legal relationship between the employer and the employee.

The NLRB, however, has recently taken a different viewpoint, finding that such “at-will” statements have a chilling effect upon employees’ Section 7 rights. In American Red Cross Arizona Blood Services Region, an administrative law judge found that the employer had violated Section 8(a)(1) by maintaining the following language in a form that employees were required to sign acknowledging their at-will employment status: “I further agree that the at-will employment relationship cannot be amended, modified or altered in any way.” The NLRB found this language to essentially constitute a waiver by the employee of his/her Section 7 rights to “advocate concertedly … to change his/her at-will status.”

The NLRB applies a two-step inquiry to determine if a work rule would “reasonably tend to chill employees in the exercise of their Section 7 rights.” First, a rule is unlawful if it explicitly restricts Section 7 activities. Second, if the rule does not explicitly restricted protected activities, it will nonetheless be found to violate the National Labor Relations Act upon a showing that: (1) employees would reasonable construe the language to prohibit Section 7 activity; (2) the rule was promulgated in response to union activity; or (3) the rule has been applied to restrict the exercise of Section 7 rights.

Due to a significant uproar from employers, the NLRB issued two sets of advice memoranda on October 31, 2012 and February 4, 2013, back-pedaling on its position with regard to “at-will” employment statements. In these advice memoranda, the NLRB now takes the position that an “at-will” statement will not be considered to interfere with employees’ Section 7 rights if the statement (1) does not explicitly restrict Section 7 rights, or (2) was promulgated in response to union or other protected activity, or (3) that the policy had been applied to restrict protected activity.

While most employers’ at-will statements will pass the NLRB’s scrutiny relative to employees’ Section 7 rights, this does not mean that all “at-will” statements, especially those that imply that there can never be any other employment relationship between the employee and employer, will be considered lawful under the National Labor Relations Act. To be prudent, employers should review their “at-will” employment statements in their employee handbooks to make sure that such statements do not foreclose to its employees the possibility of a potential modification of the at-will relationship.