LCW Liebert Cassidy Whitmore

# Briefing Room

News and developments in employment law and labor relations for California Law Enforcement Management.

February 2019

## INDEX



## LCW NEWS



*Briefing Room* is published monthly for the benefit of the clients of Liebert Cassidy Whitmore. The information in *Briefing Room* should not be acted on without professional advice.

**Los Angeles** | Tel: 310.981.2000
**San Francisco** | Tel: 415.512.3000
**Fresno** | Tel: 559.256.7800
**San Diego** | Tel: 619.481.5900
**Sacramento** | Tel: 916.584.7000



## EXCESSIVE FORCE

### *U.S. Supreme Court Rejects Excessive Force Claim Against Sergeant, Directs Court of Appeal to Reevaluate Claim Against Arresting Officer.*

The U.S. Supreme Court ruled that the Ninth Circuit Court of Appeal erred by allowing an excessive force lawsuit to proceed to trial against a police sergeant who did not actively participate in the incident at issue and by applying the wrong standard in rejecting another officer's qualified immunity defense.

Escondido police officer Robert Craig responded with another officer to a 911 call reporting a possible domestic disturbance at the apartment of Maggie Emmons and Ameteria Douglas. Douglas' mother had placed the call after a phone conversation with her daughter, during which she heard Douglas and Emmons yelling at each other and Douglas screaming for help.

After their arrival, the officers spoke with Emmons through a window, attempting to convince her to open the door to the apartment so that they could conduct a welfare check. During this exchange, Sergeant Kevin Toth and other officers arrived on the scene as backup.

A few minutes later, a man opened the apartment door and came outside. At that point, Officer Craig was standing alone just outside the door. Officer Craig told the man not to close the door, but the man closed the door and tried to brush past Officer Craig. Officer Craig stopped the man, took him quickly to the ground, and handcuffed him. Officer Craig did not hit the man or display any weapon. Video footage of the incident showed that the man was not in any visible or audible pain as a result of the takedown or while on the ground. Within a few minutes, officers helped the man up and arrested him for a misdemeanor offense of resisting and delaying a police officer.

The man, who turned out to be Maggie Emmons' father, Marty Emmons, sued Officer Craig and Sergeant Kuth, claiming they used excessive force during the arrest in violation of the Fourth Amendment.

On appeal, the Ninth Circuit held that the excessive force claims against both Officer Craig and Sergeant Kuth could proceed to trial, reversing a lower court's dismissal of the case on summary judgment and rejecting a qualified immunity defense put forward by Officer Craig.

The Supreme Court disagreed with the Ninth Circuit's assessment of the claims as to both defendants. As to Sergeant Toth, the high court ruled that the excessive force claim could not proceed, and found the Ninth Circuit's reinstatement of the claim "puzzling" since "only Officer Craig was involved in the excessive force claim."

In regards to Officer Craig, the Supreme Court criticized the Ninth Circuit's analysis as too general. Under Supreme Court precedent, "[q]ualified immunity attaches when an official's conduct does not violate clearly established statutory or constitutional rights of which a reasonable person would have known." The clearly established right must be defined with specificity. Here, the high court found that the Ninth Circuit had erred by failing to address how prior case law specifically prohibited Officer Craig's actions. The Supreme Court therefore remanded the case to the Ninth Circuit for further consideration of Officer Craig's qualified immunity defense.

*City of Escondido, Cal. v. Emmons*, 139 S.Ct. 500 (2019).

## EMPLOYEE DISCIPLINE

### *Court of Appeal Overturns Findings Against Battalion Chief, Orders City Council to Reconsider Termination Decision.*

An unpublished case from the California Court of Appeal reinforces the importance of establishing robust personnel policies and ensuring that charges of employee misconduct are defensible.

Scott Toppo, a fire captain with the City of Loma Linda, was involved in an altercation with a mental health patient in an ambulance. The patient was struggling to free himself from restraints and spitting on firefighters and medical personnel. In response, Toppo lifted his hand and punched down onto his other hand that was placed on the patient's head. The same night, Toppo reported the incident to his supervisor, Steve Jones, a battalion chief. Jones did not make a further report up the chain of command.

A few weeks later, a division chief asked Jones if he was aware that Toppo had hit a combative patient. Jones said he recalled Toppo telling him about the patient, but that Toppo did not report striking the patient. An investigation of the incident and Jones' conduct ensued, with the investigator finding that Jones lied when he denied knowing about the violence.

Thereafter, the City served Jones with a notice of termination, charging him with violating City policy and Health and Safety Code section 1798.200, which requires the employer of emergency medical technicians to report certain acts of misconduct. The City alleged that Jones failed to report the incident and then lied about not knowing of Toppo's act of violence. Following an administrative appeal, the City Council upheld the termination and rejected an advisory opinion by a hearing officer recommending that Jones be reinstated. Jones filed a writ petition, which the trial court denied.

On appeal, the Court considered Jones' arguments that the City's findings were not supported by substantial evidence. Partially disagreeing with Jones, the Court held there was substantial evidence that Jones was dishonest when he denied knowing that Toppo struck the patient. In reaching this conclusion, the Court referenced statements made by Toppo during the investigation that contradicted Jones' denial.

However, the Court of Appeal found that the City had not presented substantial evidence that Jones violated a City policy. The Court relied on a concession by the City that there was not a "specific policy" that Jones violated, including a policy requiring Jones to report Toppo's conduct. In addition, the Court held that substantial evidence did not support a finding that Jones violated Health and Safety Code section 1798.200. The Court summarized this statute as "require[ing], among other things, that an employer notify the medical director of the County's EMS agency of a validated allegation of an EMT abusing a patient." The Court could find no evidence in the record showing that Jones was in charge of the City's emergency medical services program at the time the investigation into Toppo's conduct ended, i.e., the allegation was validated. Neither could the court locate evidence that Jones failed to contact the County medical director.

Because the Court rejected some of the City's findings, it directed the City Council to reconsider the matter accordingly and determine the appropriate level of discipline.

*Jones v. City of Loma Linda* (Cal. Ct. App., Feb. 13, 2019, No. E067781) 2019 WL 581119.

***NOTE:***

*Although this was an unpublished (and therefore non-precedential ruling), it serves as a good reminder to regularly review personnel policies, to ensure such policies are specific rather than vague, and to carefully consider whether disciplinary action is defensible.*

## EMPLOYEE RESTRICTIONS

***Court Employer Could Restrict Wearing of Union Insignia and On-Duty Solicitation, But Rule Restricting Distribution of Literature Was Impermissibly Ambiguous.***

Overturning conclusions reached by the Public Employment Relations Board (PERB), the Court of Appeal found that a trial court employer could prohibit employees from wearing union insignia at work or soliciting during work hours. However, the Court of Appeal agreed with PERB that a rule restricting employees from distributing literature in "working areas" at any time was impermissibly ambiguous.

The union-represented employees included over 300 office assistants, judicial assistants, accounting clerks, court reporters and marriage and family counselors. The Personnel Rules in question included restrictions on: (1) wearing clothing or adornments with any writings or images, including pins, lanyards and other accessories; (2) soliciting during work hours for any purpose without prior approval from the employer; and (3) distributing literature during non-work time in working areas.

*Restrictions on wearing any writings or images*

The employer's Personnel Rules imposed restrictions on the nature and type of clothing employees could wear. The relevant provision was specifically challenged under the allegation that it improperly infringed upon employees' rights to wear union regalia at the workplace.

State and federal laws generally provide public employees the right to wear union buttons and other union paraphernalia at work, except in "special circumstances" that justify a prohibition. To decide whether special circumstances exist, PERB and the courts weigh the right of employees to wear union insignia against any legitimate employer interest in

prohibiting this activity. The specific details of the employer's operations, and employee interactions with the public, are relevant to the analysis.

Here, the Court of Appeal noted that the "legitimacy of the Judicial Branch depends on its reputation for impartiality and nonpartisanship," and this necessarily requires the courts to maintain a neutral appearance. Evidence also showed that court employees regularly interacted with the public and were subject to a code of ethics that required them to maintain the appearance of impartiality. Therefore, the employer had a substantial interest in regulating its workforce to ensure that the judicial process appeared impartial. The Court of Appeal found that this justified the broad restrictions on wearing union insignia.

*Prohibition on solicitation during working hours for any purpose*

The Personnel Rules prohibited solicitation during "working hours" and defined "working hours" as "the working time of both the employee doing the soliciting and distributing and the employee to whom the soliciting is being directed." Since the provision unambiguously permitted nondisruptive solicitation during nonworking time, the Court of Appeal found that it was lawful.

*Prohibition on distribution of literature during nonworking time*

The Court of Appeal found that the employer's rule restricting distribution of literature "at any time for any purpose in working areas" was impermissibly ambiguous. The rule did not define the term "working areas," and certain sections of the courthouse were designated as mixed areas for work and non-work use. Under the circumstances, an employee could reasonably interpret the rule to mean that distribution of literature was prohibited in mixed-use areas even during off-duty time.

Under PERB precedent, an ambiguous rule constitutes interference with a protected right if the ambiguity tends to or does result in some harm to employee rights. Here, the Court of Appeal found that the ambiguous rule put employees at risk of discipline for violating the rule and this risk would tend to cause employees to err on the side of caution and forgo exercising the right to distribute literature in mixed-use areas during employee breaks.

*Superior Court of Fresno v. Public Employment Relations Board* (2018) 30 Cal.App.5th 158.

## PUBLIC RECORDS

### *Agencies' Deliberative Process Documents Could Be Withheld Under Freedom of Information Act.*

In a case decided under the Federal Freedom of Information Act (FOIA), the Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals found that documents generated by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFSW) and National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS) were exempt from disclosure under the FOIA's deliberative process privilege.

In 2011, the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) proposed new regulations governing cooling water intake facilities (facilities that draw water from U.S. lakes, streams, and some waterways to be used in private manufacturing). As part of the rule-making process, the EPA consulted with the FWS and NMFS (the Agencies) regarding the potential impact of the new regulations on endangered species. In early November 2014, the Agencies provided the EPA with a summary of what they believed the proposed rule would do, and the EPA responded with corrections. The

Agencies and the EPA exchanged further communications and documents during the rulemaking process. The EPA's final rule was published in March 2014. The Sierra Club then made a FOIA request, asking the Agencies for records generated during the rule-making process. When the Agencies declined, the Sierra Club sued.

The Ninth Circuit ordered disclosure of some documents but found that several items were protected by the "deliberative process privilege." FOIA, like the California Public Records Act, requires broad disclosure of government documents. However, FOIA does not require disclosure of "inter- agency or intra-agency memorandums or letters" that come within the "deliberative process privilege." The privilege protects agency decisions by "ensuring that the frank discussion of legal or policy matters in writing, within the agency, is not inhibited by public disclosure." To qualify for the privilege, documents must: 1) be generated by a government agency prior to the agency's final decision on the issue reflected in the documents; and 2) must be deliberative. Applying this standard, the Ninth Circuit found that two categories of items the Sierra Club sought did not have to be disclosed.

First, the court found that the Agencies' draft opinions that were created in November 2014 could remain secret. After reviewing the EPA's proposed rule, the Agencies concluded that the rule would jeopardize species protected by the Endangered Species Act and their habitats, and proposed reasonable and prudent alternatives (RPAs) in the form of draft opinions. The FWS generated multiple drafts of the RPA draft opinions. The court found that because the FWS RPA documents would reveal the "internal vetting process," and were generated before the Agencies issued a formal opinion on the EPA regulations, they were not subject to disclosure.

Second, the court found that a draft opinion the NMFS created in April 2014 that addressed the impact of a revised version of the EPA's rule, and which was only circulated internally to the NMFS, was also protected from disclosure. The NMFS had prepared a subsequent opinion in May 2014 (also prior to the EPA's final rule). Reading the two opinions could reveal NMFS's deliberations about the proposed rules, the court found.

Thus, the Ninth Circuit reversed the trial court's order to disclose these categories of documents.

*Sierra Club, Inc. v. United States Fish and Wildlife Service* (9th Cir. 2018) 911 F.3d 967, 2018 WL 6713260.

***NOTE:***

*California's Public Record Act utilizes a balancing test to determine whether an agency's withholding of documents that could reveal an agency's deliberative process is appropriate. An agency must show "that on the facts of the particular case the public interest served by not disclosing the record clearly outweighs the public interest served by disclosure of the record." (Gov. Code, section 6255, subd. (a).) Although the* Sierra Club *decision involved the FOIA, courts addressing CPRA matters could find the decision persuasive.*

## CONSORTIUM CALL OF THE MONTH

Members of Liebert Cassidy Whitmore's employment relations consortiums may speak directly to an LCW attorney free of charge regarding questions that are not related to ongoing legal matters that LCW is handling for the agency, or that do not require in-depth research, document review, or written opinions. Consortium call questions run the gamut of topics, from leaves of absence to

employment applications, disciplinary concerns to disability accommodations, labor relations issues and more. This feature describes an interesting consortium call and how the question was answered. We will protect the confidentiality of client communications with LCW attorneys by changing or omitting details.

**Question**: An agency director contacted LCW with a question about the agency's obligation to provide sex harassment prevention training to its supervisors under the Fair Employment and Housing Act (FEHA). The director noted that in October 2018, the agency had provided its supervisors with two hours of training to comply with the requirements of Government Code section 12950.1 (also known as AB 1825). The director wanted to know whether the agency must train those supervisors again in 2019 because of the 2019 amendment of Government Code section 12950.1 in SB 1343.

**Answer**: The attorney noted that the California Legislature proposed clean up legislation (SB 778) on February 26, 2019. SB 778, as currently proposed, would allow employers who gave their employees compliant training after January 1, 2018, to wait until after December 31, 2020 (or calendar year 2021) to train again. The attorney advised the director to hold off on retraining the agency's supervisors who had received compliant training in October 2018 until mid-2019, when SB 778 is expected to be passed in the Legislature. Of course, proposed SB 778 could be further amended before it is passed, or not passed at all. If SB 778 is not passed by mid 2019, the attorney advised that the director should have the supervisors retrained in 2019.

§

The ***Briefing Room*** is available via email. If you would like to be added to the email distribution list or If you know someone who would benefit from this publication, please visit www.lcwlegal.com/subscribe.aspx. **Please note:** By adding your name to the e-mail distribution list, you will no longer receive a hard copy of the ***Briefing Room***.
If you have any questions, call Morgan Favors at 310.981.2000.

# CONGRATULATIONS ON YOUR RETIREMENT, MELANIE POTURICA!

While many individuals spend years contemplating what they want to do with their careers, **Melanie Poturica** knew exactly what she wanted to do at 10 years old – become an attorney. From working tirelessly as a passionate litigator to becoming the firm's first female Managing Partner, Melanie Poturica paved the way for future Liebert Cassidy Whitmore attorneys and staff. A fierce advocate and dedicated leader, Melanie helped grow the firm from six passionate attorneys to nearly 100 trusted advisors and experts in offices across California. Harmonizing an incredibly successful professional career filled with victories on behalf of her clients with the equally rewarding responsibilities associated with motherhood, Melanie's unique ability to create long-lasting relationships with Liebert Cassidy Whitmore attorneys and clients is a major contribution to the firm's continued success.

The San Francisco native's journey as a Liebert Cassidy Whitmore attorney began in 1980. Beginning her career as an associate, Melanie graduated to a partner in 1985. Much of Melanie's early work consisted of litigating lawsuits involving discrimination and harassment. Her love of being in court and researching and writing on legal issues fueled her passion for her litigation practice. While Melanie quickly established herself as a vigorous litigator at the firm, she also balanced her work with motherhood.

Melanie welcomed her first-born, Vincent, and her new responsibility as Partner in the same week in 1985. Although Melanie loved her new role as Partner, she decided to focus on her young family, and began working at the firm part-time in 1987. "While I loved the work, it was torturous to be away from my family," Melanie said. Melanie worked a reduced schedule until 1993, continuing to litigate and handle hearings. During this time, Melanie and her husband welcomed their daughter, Mari.

In 1993, Melanie came back to LCW to work full-time and became a Partner for the second time. Two years later, Melanie became LCW's first female Managing Partner. "Managing the firm was the highlight of my career," she said when asked what her favorite memory as an attorney has been. Melanie thrived on the communication aspects of her work, including human resources and client and business issues. Although Melanie is a brilliant and dedicated attorney, she acknowledges that much of her success is directly related to her supportive family. "I am deeply indebted to my husband [who is also a lawyer] and [my] children for the sacrifices they made on my and the firm's behalf," Melanie said.

As Managing Partner, Melanie regularly travelled throughout the state to visit clients and colleagues. It was during this time that she developed many meaningful, personal relationships with clients and colleagues alike. Melanie explained, "As much as I like litigating, my favorite thing [is] working with clients,"

"Melanie cares deeply about our clients' issues, both on a legal and personal basis," said LCW's current Managing Partner, J. Scott Tiedemann. Fellow Partner, Michael Blacher, echoed Scott's sentiment. "She took the founding partners' vision and turned it into our culture: an unqualified commitment to the client, a passion and purpose in our work, a dedication to one another, and an unwavering devotion to ethical behavior," expressed Michael. Melanie continued as the firm's Managing Partner until 2010. Under her leadership, LCW expanded our statewide consortiums, created our annual conference, and expanded our public sector and non-profit practice to include independent schools.

In 2010, as Scott transitioned to Managing Partner, he and Melanie co-managed the firm. With the torch successfully passed, Melanie wound down her litigation practice and began working part-time in 2014. With plans to spend more time with her family, travel, and continue serving her community, Melanie is now heading in to a new stage in her life – full retirement.

Melanie has made it her duty to establish not only a firm built on integrity and leadership but also family and balance. Her retirement is well earned and much deserved and we send her off with gratitude and love.

# SB1421: WHAT'S HAPPENING NOW?

## WEBINAR

PRESENTED BY:
J. SCOTT TIEDEMANN,
MANAGING PARTNER
LOS ANGELES OFFICE

A CRITICAL UPDATE ON SB 1421 AND ITS EFFECT ON PEACE OFFICER PERSONNEL RECORDS.

MARCH 14, 2019
10:00 A.M. - 11:00 A.M.

REGISTER AT
LCWLEGAL.COM

LCW

MANAGEMENT TRAINING WORKSHOPS

## Firm Activities

**Consortium Training**

Mar. 7 **"Leaves, Leaves and More Leaves"**
Gateway Public ERC | Lakewood | Mark Meyerhoff

Mar. 7 **"Prevention and Control of Absenteeism and Abuse of Leave"** and **"Human Resources Academy I"**
San Joaquin Valley ERC | Stockton | Michael Youril

Mar. 13 **"The Future is Now-Embracing Generational Diversity and Succession Planning"** and **"Issues and Challenges Regarding Drugs and Alcohol in the Workplace"**
Coachella Valley ERC | Palm Desert | Christopher S. Frederick

Mar. 14 **"Nuts & Bolts: Navigating Common Legal Risks for the Front Line Supervisor"** and **"Leaves, Leaves and More Leaves"**
Central Valley ERC | Hanford | Che I. Johnson

Mar. 14 **"Negotiating Modifications to Retirement and Retiree Medical"** and **"Issues and Challenges Regarding Drugs and Alcohol in the Workplace"**
East Inland Empire ERC | Fontana | T. Oliver Yee

Mar. 14 **"Nuts & Bolts: Navigating Common Legal Risks for the Front Line Supervisor"** and **"12 Steps to Avoiding Liability"**
San Diego ERC | Vista | Mark Meyerhoff

Mar. 19 **"An Agency's Guide to Employee Retirement"** and **"Human Resources Academy II"**
North San Diego County ERC | Temecula | Frances Rogers

Mar. 20 **"Unconscious Bias"**
NorCal ERC | Webinar | Suzanne Solomon

Mar. 20 **"Leaves, Leaves and More Leaves"** and **"Public Service: Understanding the Roles and Responsibilities of Public Employees"**
Sonoma/Marin ERC | Rohnert Park | Kelly Tuffo

Mar. 20 **"File That! Best Practices for Document and Record Management"** and **"The Art of Writing the Performance Evaluation"**
Ventura/Santa Barbara ERC | Thousand Oaks | T. Oliver Yee

Mar. 21 **"Workplace Bullying: A Growing Concern"** and **"Nuts & Bolts: Navigating Common Legal Risks for the Front Line Supervisor"**
Orange County ERC | Brea | Danny Y. Yoo

Mar. 21 **"Administering Overlapping Laws Covering Discrimination, Leaves and Retirement"**
San Mateo County ERC | Redwood City | Richard Bolanos & WC Attorney

Mar. 27 **"The Future is Now – Embracing Generational Diversity and Succession Planning"** and **"Nuts and Bolts: Navigating Common Legal Risks for the Front Line Supervisor"**
Bay Area ERC | Santa Clara | Erin Kunze

Mar. 27 **"Managing the Marginal Employee"**
Gold Country ERC | Webinar & Placerville | Kristin D. Lindgren

**Customized Training**

Mar. 5,7,20,27 **"Preventing Workplace Harassment, Discrimination and Retaliation"**
City of Carlsbad | Stephanie J. Lowe

Mar. 5 **"HR for Non-HR Managers"**
ERMA | Tehachapi | James E. Oldendorph

Mar. 6 **"Preventing Workplace Harassment, Discrimination and Retaliation and Mandated Reporting"**
East Bay Regional Park District | Castro Valley | Erin Kunze

Mar. 8 **"Ethics in Public Service"**
County of San Luis Obispo | San Luis Obispo | Christopher S. Frederick

Mar. 12 **"Applied Ethics in Law Enforcement"**
City of Westminster Police Department | J. Scott Tiedemann

Mar. 14 **"Public Service: Understanding the Roles and Responsibilities of Public Employees"**
City of Concord | Heather R. Coffman

Mar. 19 **"Preventing Workplace Harassment, Discrimination and Retaliation"**
Port of Stockton | Stockton | Jack Hughes

Mar. 20 **"Preventing Workplace Harassment, Discrimination and Retaliation"**
City of Stockton | Gage C. Dungy

Mar. 20 **"Legal Issues Update"**
Orange County Probation | Santa Ana | Christopher S. Frederick

Mar. 23 **"Preventing Workplace Harassment, Discrimination and Retaliation"**
City of Newport Beach | Christopher S. Frederick

Mar. 28 **"Preventing Workplace Harassment, Discrimination and Retaliation and Ethics in Public Service"**
City of Rocklin | Kristin D. Lindgren

Mar. 28 **"Bias in the Workplace"**
ERMA | Santa Fe Springs | Danny Y. Yoo

**Speaking Engagements**

Mar. 8 **"Managing (Not So) Confidential Records in a New Era of Transparency: Labor and Management Attorneys Provide Strategic Guidance for Confronting SB 1421 and AB748"**
California Police Chiefs Association (CPCA) Annual Training Symposium | Santa Clara | J. Scott Tiedemann & David Mastagni & Josh Rubenstein

Mar. 9 **"Medical Leaves, Disability Issues and Retirement and the Interactive Process in the Public Safety Environment"**
CPCA Annual Training Symposium | Santa Clara | Geoffrey S. Sheldon & Jennifer Rosner

Mar. 15 **"Minding the Minefield of Gender Pay Equity - Staying Compliant and Being Fair"**
CalGovHR 2019 California State Public Sector HR Conference & Expo | Rohnert Park | Kristin D. Lindgren

Mar. 25 **"Navigating Academic Accommodations for Students with Disabilities in Nursing Programs"**
CSSO Annual Conference | Los Angeles | Alysha Stein-Manes & Laura Schulkind

Mar. 25 **"Free Speech Issues on Campus"**
CSSO Annual Conference | Los Angeles | Pilar Morin & Eileen O'Hare-Anderson

**Seminars/Webinars**

Register Here: https://www.lcwlegal.com/events-and-training

Mar. 6 **"Train the Trainer Refresher: Harassment Prevention"**
Liebert Cassidy Whitmore | Los Angeles | Christopher S. Frederick

Mar. 6, 7 **"2-Day Intensive FLSA Academy"**
Liebert Cassidy Whitmore | Alhambra | Peter J. Brown & Kristi Recchia

Mar. 13 **"Train the Trainer: Harassment Prevention"**
Liebert Cassidy Whitmore | San Francisco | Erin Kunze

Mar. 13 **"Regular Rate of Pay – To Include or Not to Include?"**
Liebert Cassidy Whitmore | Webinar | Richard Bolanos

Mar. 14 **"SB 1421: What's Happening Now? An Update on the Latest Developments"**
Liebert Cassidy Whitmore | Webinar | J. Scott Tiedemann

Mar. 21 **"Communication Counts!"**
Liebert Cassidy Whitmore | Roseville | Jack Hughes & Kristi Recchia

# New to the Firm

**Austin Dieter** joins our San Francisco office where he provides advice and counsel as well as litigation assistance to the firm's public entity clients. Austin is experienced in a full array of employment matters, including wage and hour claims under FLSA, discrimination, harassment and retaliation claims under FEHA and Title VII, and disability discrimination claims under the ADA.
He can be reached at 415.512.3052 or adieter@lcwlegal.com.

**Kaylee Feick** is an Associate in our Los Angeles Office where she provides representation and counsel to clients in all matters pertaining to labor, employment, and education law. She provides support in litigation claims for discrimination, harassment, retaliation, wage and hour disputes, and other employment matters. Kaylee has experience in litigation procedures such as drafting pleadings and discovery. She also has experience in trial preparation, including researching and drafting pretrial motions and preparing witnesses for trial. She can be reached at 310-981-2735 or kfeick@lcwlegal.com.

LCW Liebert Cassidy Whitmore
6033 West Century Blvd., 5th Floor | Los Angeles, CA 90045
CalPublicAgencyLaborEmploymentBlog.com | @lcwlegal



***Briefing Room*** is published monthly for the benefit of the clients of Liebert Cassidy Whitmore.
The information in ***Briefing Room*** should not be acted on without professional advice. To contact us, please call 310.981.2000, 415.512.3000, 559.256.7800, 619.481.5900 or 916.584.7000 or e-mail info@lcwlegal.com.