

# Sexual harrassment

Business



Sobbed requested to be relocated to Clubbers to the Fort Worth district and assigned to work with Jack Miller, a Field Training Officer. In February 2011, she was transferred to Arlington for the 2011 Super Bowl and was assigned to be a “ day agent”. After a short period of time, Sobbed requested to move back to the Clubbers office to once again work with Jack Miller who was soon after displaced. TAB suspended Sobbed for two days without pay after multiple car collisions that happened throughout her employment.

In June of 2011, a charge was filed with the Equal Opportunity Employment Commission for being suspended for two days, placed on “ desk duty’ and not receiving any assignments during her time in Arlington.

In her charge with EEOC she claimed “ I have been discriminated against because of my sex, female and retaliated against for complaining of discrimination in violation of Title VII section 704(a) of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 as amended. ” (EEOC) III. Laws that apply Sobbed filed her suit to be considered sexual harassment under Title VII.

According to the EEOC, sexual harassment is a form of harassment to a person because of that person’s sex, unwelcome sexual advances or offensive remarks about a person’s sex. Sobbed filed under Title VII because she felt as though the reasons for punishments were because of her sex.

V. Final Decision of the Court In order for this suit to be under Title VII, Sobbed needed to exhaust the administrative remedies by filing a charge with the EEOC. TAB was able to produce nonresidential, nondiscriminatory reasons for Cobber’s punishments which resulted in the case against being dismissed. HER Analysis The suit Sobbed v. Texas Alcoholic Beverage

<https://assignbuster.com/sexual-harrassment/>

Commission the employer responded correctly to the events that occurred with the Plaintiff, Leigh Sobbed. In 2009 when Sobbed claimed to be working in a hostile work environment caused by sexual harassment behavior by her supervising sergeant and other agents, TAB took the claims seriously and terminated the agents.

Sobbed then requested to be transferred to another district because of her work environment which was again 1 OFF seriously.

According to the EEOC, an employer can avoid being liable for the employees' actions if the employer can prove that: it is reasonably tried to prevent and promptly correct the harassing behavior; and the employee unreasonably failed to take advantage of any preventive or corrective opportunities provided by the employer. TAB then assigned her and other agents to work a few months in the Arlington office during the Super Bowl. Sobbed was considered a " field agent" but was assigned to desk duty and did not receive assignments.

During the Super Bowl, other agents were assigned the similar work and even asked to stay at home a few days during the icy weather. Cobber's last claim against TAB was for being suspended without pay for two days for testing and driving.

Sobbed believed that this claim was " selectively applied" because other agents were not disciplined for the same reason. TAB had suspended Sobbed for her third vehicle collision in in three years. The consequences for Cobber's suspension I think were justified because she continually wrecked

company property. TAB reacted fairly and took the right actions against Sobbed.

They managed to quickly take care of her hostile work environment by removing the agents causing the harm and following her requests of transferring her. The claims of Sobbed being treated unfairly during her time at the Arlington office were not valid.

The treatment appeared to be equal to all the agents.