

Ill-fated love at centrex electronics



**ASSIGN
BUSTER**

In the case it is stated the policy of is “ Employees performing Jobs where they have access to sensitive or confidential information which could benefit competitors are prohibited from being married to or from having a romantic relationship with individuals employed by competing organizations” while the CEO stated “ employees are responsible for their own off-the-Job behavior. We are concerned with an employee’s off-the-Job conduct only when it reduces the employee’s ability to perform normal Job assignments. These two statements contradict each other with the Coos acting as an implied policy. The attorney could have used the implied contract exception to the employment-at-will policy. 2. The policy had in place is understandable in highly competitive industries, but in this case the execution of the policy was not handled correct which lead to the wrongful termination suite. It seems that if had given Miller-Canton a time table to make her decision or be terminated it would have given enough conversion regardless of the results for a correct decision to me made.

If Miller-Canton had decided to end the relationship with Mike she would have continued working, if she decided on the relationship she could have resigned, and if she couldn’t make a decision it would have been clear why she was terminated. 3. There is no single definition to “ romantic relationship” and depending on one experiences it could equate to dating. Likewise, there is no definitive definition of dating that would be equally be shared by everyone.