

Agencies Drag Feet in Providing Reasonable Accommodations for Fed Employees

Federal agencies are notorious for dragging their feet. Unfortunately, many disabled federal employees are all too familiar with agencies' reluctance, especially when it comes to providing them with reasonable accommodations that would help them do their jobs.

One physically disabled, long-time U.S. Postal Service worker recently received a favorable decision against her former employer in a lawsuit in which she charged the agency with years of feet dragging in regard to providing her with reasonable accommodations.

In *Brown v. Potter*

, the 9th

U.S. Circuit Court of Appeals reversed a district court's ruling to dismiss Carol Brown's lawsuit in which she charged the agency with unlawfully discriminating against her because of her disability, failing to provide her with required accommodations, and retaliating

against her for filing Equal Employment Opportunity (EEO)

complaints. The 9th Circuit also remanded the case and reassigned it to a different judge.

Brown's case is not precedential, but it raises many of the disability discrimination

issues federal employees commonly raise. According to Equal Employment Opportunity Commission

statistics

, federal employees in the 2010 fiscal year filed 1,174 disability discrimination

complaints (277 mental, 897 physical) in response to disciplinary actions

, such as demotion, reprimand, suspension, and removal.

Brown suffers from a condition in which she constantly experiences pain and is limited in her ability to perform various physical activities, such as standing and sitting for long periods and walking. Nevertheless, for 19 years, she managed to work at the Marina del Ray Processing Station with accommodations. Brown's problems began shortly after she started working at the Bellflower Post Office, where she worked as a window clerk, a position that required hours of standing and active use of her hands, legs and back.

Brown claimed her supervisors at Bellflower ignored her requests for accommodations ordered by her doctor, such as work restrictions and a specialized chair. In 2007, she was reassigned to a distant facility and later returned to Bellflower only to work in isolation and with fewer responsibilities. She was removed from active duty in 2009.

The Postal Service argued it underwent four years of negotiations on how it could accommodate Brown and it ultimately decided she could not perform her position's essential functions. The 9th

Circuit, however, found that there were genuine questions of fact regarding the reasonableness of the Postal Service's interactive process with Brown, and the possibility that she could have performed the job's essential functions had she been reasonably accommodated. Noting how the Postal Service stopped looking for reasonable accommodations and instead removed Brown, the court said there was a "general issue for trial as to whether it thereby discriminated against her." The court also found that there was an issue for trial as to whether the agency's actions qualified as retaliation for her six EEO complaints or lawsuits against the agency.

What federal employees need to know:

While the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990 protects private sector employees from disability discrimination

, the Rehabilitation Act of 1973 provides such protections for federal employees.

Under the Rehabilitation Act, employers cannot merely dismiss disabled employees or candidates because they cannot perform the essential functions of a job without accommodations.

"Great Customer Service" – C.R.

"Great customer service, thoroughly explained all aspects of my case. Thank you." - C.R.

"Cannot Thank You Enough" – R.S. and C.S.

"I cannot thank you enough for all that you did for us." - R.S. and C.S.

"Great Service"; E.S.

I want to thank you all for the great service rendered [to] myself and family. - E.S. on Client Relations Attorney Derrick Hogan

Legal Disclaimer

The results of all client matters depend on a variety of factors unique to each matter. Past successes do not predict or guarantee future successes.

"High Regard" – R.E.M.

"Your firm held my best interests with high regard... I thank you for your efforts." - R.E.M.

“Prompt and Efficient” – K.B.

“Prompt and efficient in processing claim, all correspondence handled in prompt and efficient manner.” – K.B.

“Impressed” – W.W.

“As a retired heavy user of attorneys, I’m impressed with your concerns and your efforts to stay in touch with your clients. Its damned good management aligned with top notch expertise.” – W.W.

“Excellent Service” – J.R.

“Excellent service, very professional, and understanding and considerate of clients needs. Attorney was very approachable and there was a very good comfort level.” – J.R.

“Professional & Informative” – J.H.

“Professional & informative... I was pleased with the handling of the case. I was treated as a person, and kept abreast of all aspects of the case. Thank you all.” – J.H.

“Thanks So Much” – J.D.

“Without your Firm, I would not have known of my claim. Thanks so much!” – J.D.

“Gets Results” – F.P.

“Most certainly – The firm gets results!” – F.P.

“Quite Satisfied” – R.W.

“I am quite satisfied with the services your office has provided.” – R.W.

“Exceptional Legal Services” – A.S.

“Your firm, Tully Rinckey, has provided and continues to provide me with prompt, keen, exceptional legal services. After the initial consult, I felt relieved that I had the representation from Tully Rinckey... I have found a new found hope with Tully Rinckey...” – A.S.

“Absolute Best” – R.H.

“My attorney was the absolute best I could ever have hoped for. A pure professional in every sense of the word. She was very mindful of my financial expenditure and still was able to represent me very well in my court case.” – R.H.

“Outstanding Service” – A.R.

“Outstanding service, true professional.” – A.R.

“Top Notch” – V.W.

“My attorney was top notch. Very pleasant and helpful.” – V.W.

“Ideal Choice” – D.H.

“My attorney knew exactly the approach to take and was the ideal choice. She was extremely responsive. She was clear, balanced, and open to our views and feelings. She made it clear she was there for us and ready to answer questions.” – D.H.

“Very Satisfied” – D.D.

“I was very satisfied with the services provided which were completed in a very timely and professional manner.” – D.D.

“Excellent” – B.M.

“Your Firm provides excellent & free service to federal workers and NG/USAR members.” – B.M.