

- **EEOC v. Rite Aid Corp.**

No. 1: CV 05-1896 (M.D. Pa. March 8, 2006)

The Philadelphia District Office filed this Title VII case alleging that Rite Aid, a leading national drug store chain, disciplined and then discharged charging party, an attorney at defendant's corporate headquarters in Camp Hill, Pennsylvania, in retaliation for complaining about sex discrimination. CP worked as an associate counsel in defendant's Real Estate Department from 1997 until she was discharged in September 2002. During a 1999-2000 reduction-in-force defendant retained only 6 out of 15 attorneys in the Real Estate Department, including CP. In August 2001, CP complained to the deputy general counsel that the vice president of real estate law was affording a male coworker more favorable pay and assignments than she received, based on sex. On the heels of CP's complaint, the VP began criticizing her, humiliating her in front of colleagues, and monitoring her attendance and lunch breaks. In September 2001, he issued a disciplinary notice regarding her performance, to which she responded with a letter stating that she believed the discipline was retaliatory. In January 2002 the VP gave CP her first-ever written performance review in 5 years with Rite Aid, citing deficient performance; placed her on probation for 6 months; denied her a pay raise; and denied her the 3% cost of living adjustment that all Rite Aid employees received. On April 24, 2002, Rite Aid told CP it had concluded that her sex discrimination claims were unfounded. Defendant gave CP a second negative written performance review later the same day and a third one in June 2002. The CP reiterated her belief that the performance reviews were retaliatory and said she intended to file a charge with the EEOC. She was discharged in September 2002 a few days after defendant learned she was preparing materials to send to the EEOC. The 2- year consent decree resolving this case provides CP with \$93,000 in monetary relief.