

John falstafp v revere furniture company essay examples

[Business](#), [Company](#)



The legal doctrines which can be applied in this case of John Falstaff verses Revere Furniture company can be drawn from the physical requirements of the applicants to the position of a store floor manager. For instance, the applicants had to be in a healthy condition in order to meet physical demands of the job. The physical demands of the job included for example the ability of the customer to stand for along without break. Another doctrine can be drawn from the behavior of the plaintiff after he had resumed work from sick leave. The American with Disabilities Act Amendments Act (ADAAA) relate Mr. Falstaff case in that Mr. John Falstaff claimed that the nature of the work at the floor was strenuous to his back which probably caused his back ailment and further leading to his termination of work. This termination he claimed was as a result of an impairment which resulted from his main life activity which was his job as a store floor manager.

Falstaff is not disabled because he was not notably impaired physically or mentally. This is seen when he resumed work with no noticeable impairment and was able to carry on with his activities at his work place. Obesity which he developed later on cannot be categorized as a physical impairment.

Generally he was to ensure that there was good production and effective operations of the store. This job also required Mr. John Falstaff to keep appropriate corporate documents, supervise a sales team and settling customers complains.

Mr. John Falstaff met all the requirements for the job. He qualified both physically and academically for the position and that is why he was hired.

A change in Mr. John Falstaff health is first noticed when he reported back injury to his employer. After medical checkup on this, it was confirmed to just

a slight sprain on his back. Obesity is also another physical change noticed on Mr. John Falstaff's health.

In fact, the company tried to make reasonable accommodations for his health by extending his sick day by one day. However, they wished Mr. John well and even advised him to consider filing a disability insurance claim.

Mr. Falstaff is not responsible for his misconduct in the job. This is because it is the nature of the job which had contributed to his ill health. Medical tests found that he had a mild sprain on his lower back and this could be the possible cause of his misconduct.

Mr. Falstaff cannot do basic job requirements. The nature of his job as a store manager requires one to stand for a long time, to stoop sometimes and to carry furniture of a particular weight. All these activities are not possible with him because he has a back injury.

His termination did not violate the Americans with Disabilities Act Amendments Act (ADAAA) because Mr. John Falstaff did not have any serious impairment which arose from his work place.

GRINDLE V. WATKINS MOTOR LINES

Mr. Grindle is not disabled under the ADAAA law because he did not have any physical impairment that could bar him from going on with his life time activity.

For nearly one year, Mr. Grindle performed his duty of loading the freight in a manner which was not timely. He was put on probation for this. He was likely to lose the job and therefore his job was at risk.

Mr. Grindle's health changed. This is seen in the increase of his weight from

345 to 450 pounds making him to be obese. This health change does not qualify him to ADA accommodations since this is not a physical impairment resulting from a life time activity. His case is the same with Mr. John Falstaff's case as in both cases the plaintiff complains of a wrongful dismissal from the duty. The court would rule that Mr. John Falstaff be compensated since his lower back

injury originated from his line of work.

ADAMS V. SALT RIVER MASTER CARVERS.

Adam is disabled as in the provisions of the statute. The diabetic acquired by Mr. Adams at his work place might have been as a result of interacted eating patterns contributed by nature of his duty. He requested that his program be adjusted so that he can have 4 to 6 hours per day as opposed to eight hour duty shift. In accommodating this request, the company indeed implemented doctor's recommendation on Adam's duty assignments.

The company regarded Adam disabled. This is seen when the manager was concerned with Adam's capability to perform his duties as expected. He also acknowledges that the diabetic condition has reduced his efficiency.

Adam's termination on the ground of labour force reduction is a pretext by the company. This is because Mr. Adam was senior and labour force reduction ought not to have affected him. Secondly, this termination is also coinciding with Mr. Adam's ailment which had been identified by the manager as a hindrance to his performance.

Since this dismissal is on a pretext and the truth is that he was dismissed on the grounds of his decreasing performance as a result of his poor health, Mr.

Adams should be entitled to a relief. This is because his physical health had been impaired from his work place and this might affect his life time activities.

If I was Adam's supervisor, I would allow Adam working conditions to conform to his doctor's recommendations. Not only this, I would also ensure he get motivated in a way that can make him improve on his overall performance in the company.