

**Labor & Employment  
Practice Group**

For further information on the Labor & Employment Group or this update, please contact one of our lawyers:

Frank J. Saibert, Chair  
312.977.4154  
fjsaibert@uhlaw.com

Brian V. Alcalá  
312.977.4366  
bvalcala@uhlaw.com

Nicholas Anaclerio  
312.977.4375  
nanaclerio@uhlaw.com

Regina Worley Calabro  
312.977.4870  
rwcablabro@uhlaw.com

Kamau A. Coar  
312.977.4343  
kacoar@uhlaw.com

Keith E. Edeus, Jr.  
312.977.4394  
keedeus@uhlaw.com

Susan G. Feibus  
312.977.4877  
sgfeibus@uhlaw.com

Samera S. Ludwig  
312.977.4105  
ssludwig@uhlaw.com

Seth A. Horvath  
312.977.4443  
sahorvath@uhlaw.com

Nile Park  
312.977.4125  
npark@uhlaw.com

Jill C. Taylor  
312.977.4414  
jctaylor@uhlaw.com

This **Labor & Employment Update** has been prepared by Ungaretti & Harris LLP for informational purposes and does not constitute legal advice. This information is not intended to create, and receipt of it does not constitute, an attorney-client relationship. Readers should not act upon this information without seeking professional counsel.

**Labor & Employment Update**

**Supreme Court Raises the Bar  
for Age Discrimination Claimants**

*By Nicholas Anaclerio*

By 2010, more than half of U.S. workers will be over 40, thus protected from age discrimination in employment by the federal *Age Discrimination in Employment Act*.<sup>1</sup> As a downwardly spiraling economy and depleted and devalued retirement accounts have forced retirees back to work, many older workers have been compelled to defer retirement, and many others have fallen victim to massive reductions in force. One by-product has been a proliferation of age discrimination claims. But an important 5-4 U.S. Supreme Court ruling this past week made it clear that among the challenges these economically troubled times hold for age discrimination claimants is a heavy burden of proof in court.

The U.S. Supreme Court's June 18 decision in *Gross v. FBL Financial Services Inc.* made it clear that the burden always remains on the claimant/employee to show that age discrimination *alone* motivated a firing or other adverse job action.<sup>2</sup>

Before *Gross*, age discrimination claimants could sue and recover for mixed-motive age discrimination by showing that age was one "motivating factor" or "played a part" in an employer's adverse job action, even if age was not the only reason for that job action. Once such a "mixed motive" plaintiff showed that age bias was at least one factor motivating his employer, the burden shifted to the defendant/employer to prove that its job action would have been identical regardless of the plaintiff's age. But in *Gross*, the Court's majority rejected these burden-shifting principles which had previously been the law in nearly every federal circuit.

Distinguishing the ADEA from Title VII of the *Civil Rights Act of 1964* (the Supreme Court recognized the viability of "mixed motive" Title VII cases in 1989), the *Gross* Court found that the burden never shifts from the plaintiff in an ADEA case. In an ADEA case the plaintiff must always prove that age was more probably than not the reason for the defendant's discharge decision or other adverse job action. The *Gross* Court found that the ADEA's text, which prohibits discrimination "because of" age, is synonymous with a "but-for" causation requirement. Consequently, an ADEA claimant must show that "but for" age, the challenged adverse job action would not have occurred. An ADEA plaintiff's age must be *the reason* for the defendant/employer's action, not merely one reason among others. Proof that an employer acted on a combination of legitimate and unlawful motives (poor performance and age discrimination, for example) is insufficient for an age discrimination claimant to prevail.

Justice Stevens, writing for the *Gross* Court's four dissenting justices, issued an unusually strongly-worded condemnation of the majority's decision, labeling it "inappropriate,"

CHICAGO  
3500 Three First National Plaza  
70 W. Madison Street  
Chicago, IL 60602  
312.977.4400  
312.977.4405 fax

SPRINGFIELD  
400 East Jefferson Street  
Suite 1200  
Springfield, IL 62701  
217.544.7000  
217.544.7950 fax

WASHINGTON  
1500 K Street, NW  
Suite 250  
Washington, DC 20005  
202.639.7500  
202.639.7505 fax

GRAND RAPIDS  
40 Pearl Street, NW  
Suite 430  
Grand Rapids, MI 49503  
616.284.5900  
616.284.5903 fax

### Page 2

“irresponsible,” “unnecessary lawmaking,” and an “utter disregard of our precedent and Congress’ intent.” His dissent also protested that “[t]he most natural reading of [the ADEA’s] statutory text prohibits adverse employment actions motivated in whole or in part by the age of the employee” (emphasis supplied). But while Congress may ultimately agree with the Gross dissenters and legislatively revive the “mixed motive” age discrimination claim, for now, workers who suffer discharges or other job discrimination based partly, but not wholly, on age no longer have winning federal age discrimination claims.<sup>3</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> Ellen Mosner et al., *The Convergence of the Aging Workforce and Accessible Technology*, July 2003, <http://www.microsoft.com/enable/aging/demographics.aspx>.

<sup>2</sup> *Gross v. FBL Financial Services, Inc.*, No. 08-441, 2009 WL 1685684 (U.S. June 18, 2009).

<sup>3</sup> The average age of members of both houses of Congress at the convening of the 111th Congress was 58.2 years. Mildred Amer & Jennifer E. Manning, *Membership of the 111th Congress: A Profile*, CRS REPORT FOR CONGRESS (Cong. Res. Service, Washington, D.C.), Dec. 31, 2008, at 2. The average age of U.S. Supreme Court Justices is 68.2 years. [http://www.usatoday.com/news/washington/2008-07-12-1706900246\\_x.htm](http://www.usatoday.com/news/washington/2008-07-12-1706900246_x.htm)

To receive future editions of the Labor & Employment Update via email please visit <http://www.uhlaw.com/about/contactus/>.

This Labor & Employment Update has been prepared by Ungaretti & Harris LLP solely for informational purposes and does not constitute legal advice. This information is not intended to create, and receipt of it does not constitute, an attorney-client relationship. Readers should not act upon this information without seeking professional counsel.

---

**Ungaretti & Harris’ Labor & Employment Team** provides a full range of labor and employment counseling and litigation services to diverse employers facing an ever-expanding body of federal, state, and local laws affecting their businesses. Our employment claims avoidance services include drafting employment policies, procedures and agreements including arbitration and venue selection mandates, counseling employers on effectively conducting internal investigations, negotiating sensitive terminations and implementing protective separation agreements. We consistently win pretrial dismissals and summary judgments to avoid altogether the risk, business disruption and expense of trial, and we have the jury trial experience to effectively try the most difficult cases where necessary. We provide responsive, insightful and practical advice, and aggressive, winning advocacy.

---

**CHICAGO**  
3500 Three First National Plaza  
70 W. Madison Street  
Chicago, IL 60602  
312.977.4400  
312.977.4405 fax

**SPRINGFIELD**  
400 East Jefferson Street  
Suite 1200  
Springfield, IL 62701  
217.544.7000  
217.544.7950 fax

**WASHINGTON**  
1500 K Street, NW  
Suite 250  
Washington, DC 20005  
202.639.7500  
202.639.7505 fax

**GRAND RAPIDS**  
40 Pearl Street, NW  
Suite 430  
Grand Rapids, MI 49503  
616.284.5900  
616.284.5903 fax