



**U.S. EQUAL EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITY COMMISSION**

**Office of Federal Operations**

**P.O. Box 77960**

**Washington, DC 20013**

[REDACTED]  
Buck H.,<sup>1</sup>  
Complainant,

v.

Barbara M. Barrett,  
Secretary,  
Department of the Air Force,  
Agency.

Appeal No. 2020003769  
Agency No. 8T0R2000616

**DECISION**

On June 15, 2020, through counsel, Complainant filed a timely appeal with the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission (EEOC or Commission) from a final Agency decision (FAD) dated May 31, 2020, dismissing his complaint of unlawful employment discrimination alleging a violation of Section 501 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973 (Rehabilitation Act), as amended, 29 U.S.C. § 791 et seq.

**BACKGROUND**

At the time of events giving rise to this complaint, Complainant worked for a staffing firm serving the Agency as a Joint Terminal Attack Control Instructor for the Air Force Special Operations Command, 320<sup>th</sup> Special Tactics Squadron at the Kadena Air Base in Okinawa, Japan.

On April 20, 2020, Complainant filed an equal employment opportunity (EEO) complaint alleging that the Agency discriminated against him based on his disability (Post Traumatic Stress Disorder and Traumatic Brain Injury) when:

1. from August 1, 2018 – December 18, 2019, his second line Agency supervisor (S2 – a Lieutenant Colonel and Commander of the 320<sup>th</sup> Special Tactics Squadron) harassed him and made public and derogatory comments about his sons, single father status, personal affiliations and lifestyle;

---

<sup>1</sup> This case has been randomly assigned a pseudonym which will replace Complainant's name when the decision is published to non-parties and the Commission's website.

2. between December 18, 2018 and December 24, 2019, S2 told his staffing firm that he was under criminal investigation when he was not;
3. on or about December 24, 2019, S2 claimed that he was violent and repeatedly requested the Air Force Office of Special Investigations open a criminal investigation on him; and
4. S2 revoked his security clearance and terminated his employment, which was effective December 26, 2019.

The Agency dismissed the complaint for failure to state a claim because Complainant was an employee of the staffing firm, not the Agency. The instant appeal followed.

### ANALYSIS AND FINDINGS

The matter before us is whether the Agency properly dismissed Complainant's complaint for failure to state a claim on the basis that he was not its employee. EEOC Regulation 29 C.F.R. § 1614.103(a) provides that complaints of employment discrimination shall be processed in accordance with Part 1614 of the EEOC regulations. EEOC Regulation 29 C.F.R. § 1614.103(c) provides that within the covered departments, agencies and units, Part 1614 applies to all employees and applicants for employment.

In Serita B. v. Department of the Army, EEOC Appeal No. 0120150846 (November 10, 2016), the Commission reaffirmed its long-standing position on "joint employers" and noted it is found in numerous sources. The sources include EEOC Compliance Manual Section 2, "Threshold Issues," Section 2-III(B)(1)(a)(iii)(b) (May 12, 2000) (Compliance Manual); EEOC Enforcement Guidance: Application of EEO Laws to Contingent Workers Placed by Temporary Employment Agencies and Other Staffing Firms (Dec. 3, 1997) (Enforcement Guidance), "Coverage Issues," Question 2; Ma v. Dep't of Health and Human Servs., EEOC Appeal Nos. 01962389 & 01962390 (May 29, 1998). We reiterate the analysis set forth in those decisions and guidance documents in this decision.

The term "joint employer" refers to two or more employers that each exercises sufficient control of an individual to qualify as the worker's employer. Compliance Manual, Section 2-III(B)(1)(a)(iii)(b). To determine whether the Agency has the right to exercise sufficient control, EEOC considers factors derived from common law principles of agency. See Enforcement Guidance, "Coverage Issues," at Question 2. EEOC considers, *inter alia*, the Agency's right to control when, where, and how the worker performs the job; the right to assign additional projects to the worker; whether the work is performed on Agency premises; whether the Agency provides the tools, material, and equipment to perform the job; the duration of the relationship between the Agency and the worker whether the Agency controls the worker's schedule; and whether the Agency can discharge the worker. EEOC Compliance Manual, Section 2-III(A)(1) (citing Nationwide Mut. Ins. Co. v. Darden, 503 U.S. 318, 323-24 (1992)); EEOC v. Skanska USA Bldg., Inc., 550 F.App'x 253, 256 (6th Cir. 2013) ("Entities are joint employers if they 'share or co-determine those matters governing essential terms and conditions of employment'") (quoting

Carrier Corp. v. NLRB, 768 F.2d 778, 781 (6th Cir. 1985); see also Ma, EEOC Appeal Nos. 01962389 & 01962390.

The language of the contract between the agency and the staffing firm is not dispositive as to whether a joint-employment situation exists. In determining a worker's status, EEOC looks to what actually occurs in the workplace, even if it contradicts the language in the contract between the staffing firm and the agency. Baker v. Dep't of the Army, EEOC Appeal No. 01A45313 (Mar. 16, 2006) (while contract between staffing firm and agency provided that contract personnel were employees of staffing firm under its administrative supervision and control, agency actually retained supervisory authority over the contract workers).

On the factor of the right to control when, where, and how the worker performs the job and to assign additional projects, complete agency control is not required. Rather, the control may be partial or joint and still point to joint employment. Shorter v. Dep't of Homeland Sec., EEOC Appeal No. 0120131148 (June 11, 2013) (where both staffing firm and agency made assignments, this pointed to joint employment); Complainant v. Dep't of the Navy, EEOC Appeal No. 0120143162 (May 20, 2015), request for reconsideration denied, EEOC Request No. 0520150430 (Mar. 11, 2016) (where staffing firm wrote and issued complainant's appraisal with input from agency, this pointed toward joint employment). Likewise, where both the agency and staffing firm provided tools, material, and equipment to perform the job, this pointed to joint employment. Elkin v. Dep't of the Army, EEOC Appeal No. 0120122211, 2012 WL 5818075 (Nov. 8, 2012). Similarly, where a staffing firm terminates a worker after an agency communicates it no longer wants the worker's services, this supports a finding that the agency has joint or de facto power to discharge the worker. See, e.g., Complainants v. Dep't of Justice, EEOC Appeal Nos. 0120141963 & 0120141762 (Jan. 28, 2015); see also Skanska USA Bldg., Inc., 550 Fed. App'x at 254, 256 (where defendant removed staffing firm's workers from job site without challenge from staffing firm, and after such removals staffing firm generally fired worker, this pointed to joint employment); Butler v. Drive Auto. Indus. of America, Inc., 793 F.3d 404, 414-15 (4<sup>th</sup> Cir. 2015). The EEOC considers an entity's right to control the terms and conditions of employment, whether or not it exercises that right, as relevant to joint employer status. Enforcement Guidance, "Coverage Issues," at Question 2, Example 5 (where an entity reserves the right to direct the means and manner of an individual's work, but does not generally exercise that right, the entity may still be found to be a joint employer).

In assessing the right to control, EEOC does not consider any one factor to be decisive and emphasizes that it is not necessary to satisfy a majority of the factors. The fact that an individual performs work pursuant to a contract between the federal government and an outside organization and is paid and provided with benefits by that organization, on its own, is not enough to show that joint employment does not exist. Rather, the analysis is holistic; all the circumstances in the individual's relationship with the agency should be considered to determine if the agency should be deemed the worker's joint employer. Enforcement Guidance, "Coverage Issues," at Qs. 1 and 2. In sum, a federal agency will qualify as a joint employer of an individual if it has the requisite right to control the means and manner of the individual's work, regardless of whether the individual is paid by an outside organization or is on the federal payroll. See id., at Q. 2.

Here, with his EEO complaint, Complainant submitted a memo writing that he worked on Agency premises using Agency equipment to perform his duties, that his Agency first line supervisor (S1, a Section Chief) and S2 assigned him his daily activities, made his weekly schedule, retained the right to require overtime and change his schedule, dictated his travel and training requirements, maintained authority over his security clearance, which was a work requirement, that he had no onsite staffing firm supervision, and the Agency had the final say on his hiring and firing.

Much of this is corroborated by the record. S2 wrote Complainant reported to S1, and S1 reported to him. On December 23, 2019, S2 emailed the Agency Contract Officer Representative (COR) explaining why he requested to remove Complainant from the contract. He recounted that S1 recently came on board and implemented much needed section leadership requiring personal discipline, accountability, and ensuring work hours were equally distributed. S2 wrote all section members responded well except Complainant, who performed the minimum and required follow-up calls so he would come to work on time and was verbally counseled. S2 also recounted that multiple E7 Troop Chiefs told him they were not sending their young troops on travel duty with Complainant because they feared he would be a negative character influence on them since he lacked respect for authority and engaged in sex with minors while on travel duty to the Philippines or Thailand. Regarding sex with minors, S2 indicated he had not counseled Complainant verbally or in writing because he just learned this information and Complainant was off-island on leave.

S2 relayed to the EEO counselor that Complainant was removed because of his affiliation or membership in the Outlaws Motorcycle Club, a designated Department of Justice criminal organization, coupled with conduct that was a corrupting influence on young airman, and he initiated the suspension of his security clearance for the same reasons.

The relevant Performance Work Statement prepared by the Agency states that the staffing firm shall submit candidate resumes and indicates that before serving they are approved by the Agency, that upon boarding they are briefed by the Squadron Duty Officer on their duties and responsibilities, receive an initial evaluation by the Agency and thereafter recurring ones thereby, attend conferences and symposiums as directed by the Agency, that the Agency will provide the workspace with a computer and printer, the Agency provides Battlefield Air Operations training equipment, and work hours are scheduled by the squadron subject to change with less than 24 hours' notice to include offsite locations, weekends, rotating shifts, and longer shifts.

On appeal, the Agency concedes that the former Commander of the 320<sup>th</sup> Special Tactics Squadron and the former Command Master Sergeant "accepted Complainant for the position," that he was tasked by S1 and S2 and supervised by the Agency, that the Agency Contractor Officer could require removal of staffing firm personnel serving on the contract for violations/concerns with their work ethic, job performance, business ethics, security, safety, and health...", that S2 directed the COR to replace Complainant and suspended his security clearance, and he served the Agency for over two years.

The Agency argues that it did not jointly employ Complainant because the Performance Work Statement explicitly states that there is no employer-employee relationship between the Agency and staffing firm employees, and that they must identify themselves as contractors in all meetings and communications related to the contract. It further argues that Complainant was terminated by the staffing firm, not the Agency. Complainant received his salary and benefits from the staffing firm.

This case is not a close call. The evidence is overwhelming that the Agency exercised sufficient control over Complainant's position to be his joint employer. As stated above, the language in the contract between the agency and the staffing firm is not dispositive of whether or not a joint-employment situation exists. While the Performance Work Statement explicitly stated there was no employer-employee relationship, this was not the case under common law. As noted above, the fact that a person is compensated by a staffing firm to serve the Agency is not dispositive. It is true Complainant was terminated by the staffing firm, but it did so only because the Agency suspended his clearance and no longer wanted him to work on the contract.

The FAD is REVERSED and the complaint is REMANDED to the Agency for further processing in accordance with the following Order.

#### ORDER (E0618)

The Agency is ordered to process the remanded claims in accordance with 29 C.F.R. § 1614.108 et seq. The Agency shall acknowledge to the Complainant that it has received the remanded claims **within thirty (30) calendar days** of the date this decision was issued. The Agency shall issue to Complainant a copy of the investigative file and also shall notify Complainant of the appropriate rights **within one hundred fifty (150) calendar days** of the date this decision was issued, unless the matter is otherwise resolved prior to that time. If the Complainant requests a final decision without a hearing, the Agency shall issue a final decision **within sixty (60) days** of receipt of Complainant's request.

As provided in the statement entitled "Implementation of the Commission's Decision," the Agency must send to the Compliance Officer: 1) a copy of the Agency's letter of acknowledgment to Complainant, 2) a copy of the Agency's notice that transmits the investigative file and notice of rights, and 3) either a copy of the complainant's request for a hearing, a copy of complainant's request for a FAD, or a statement from the agency that it did not receive a response from complainant by the end of the election period.

#### IMPLEMENTATION OF THE COMMISSION'S DECISION (K0719)

Under 29 C.F.R. § 1614.405(c) and § 1614.502, compliance with the Commission's corrective action is mandatory. Within seven (7) calendar days of the completion of each ordered corrective action, the Agency shall submit via the Federal Sector EEO Portal (FedSEP) supporting documents in the digital format required by the Commission, referencing the compliance docket number under which compliance was being monitored.

Once all compliance is complete, the Agency shall submit via FedSEP a final compliance report in the digital format required by the Commission. See 29 C.F.R. § 1614.403(g). The Agency's final report must contain supporting documentation when previously not uploaded, and the Agency must send a copy of all submissions to the Complainant and his/her representative.

If the Agency does not comply with the Commission's order, the Complainant may petition the Commission for enforcement of the order. 29 C.F.R. § 1614.503(a). The Complainant also has the right to file a civil action to enforce compliance with the Commission's order prior to or following an administrative petition for enforcement. See 29 C.F.R. §§ 1614.407, 1614.408, and 29 C.F.R. § 1614.503(g). Alternatively, the Complainant has the right to file a civil action on the underlying complaint in accordance with the paragraph below entitled "Right to File a Civil Action." 29 C.F.R. §§ 1614.407 and 1614.408. A civil action for enforcement or a civil action on the underlying complaint is subject to the deadline stated in 42 U.S.C. 2000e-16(c) (1994 & Supp. IV 1999). **If the Complainant files a civil action, the administrative processing of the complaint, including any petition for enforcement, will be terminated.** See 29 C.F.R. § 1614.409.

Failure by an agency to either file a compliance report or implement any of the orders set forth in this decision, without good cause shown, may result in the referral of this matter to the Office of Special Counsel pursuant to 29 C.F.R. § 1614.503(f) for enforcement by that agency.

#### STATEMENT OF RIGHTS - ON APPEAL

##### RECONSIDERATION (M0620)

The Commission may, in its discretion, reconsider this appellate decision if the complainant or the agency submits a written request that contains arguments or evidence that tend to establish that:

1. The appellate decision involved a clearly erroneous interpretation of material fact or law; or
2. The appellate decision will have a substantial impact on the policies, practices, or operations of the agency.

Requests for reconsideration must be filed with EEOC's Office of Federal Operations (OFO) **within thirty (30) calendar days** of receipt of this decision. If the party requesting reconsideration elects to file a statement or brief in support of the request, **that statement or brief must be filed together with the request for reconsideration.** A party shall have **twenty (20) calendar days** from receipt of another party's request for reconsideration within which to submit a brief or statement in opposition. See 29 C.F.R. § 1614.405; Equal Employment Opportunity Management Directive for 29 C.F.R. Part 1614 (EEO MD-110), at Chap. 9 § VII.B (Aug. 5, 2015).

Complainant should submit his or her request for reconsideration, and any statement or brief in support of his or her request, via the EEOC Public Portal, which can be found at <https://publicportal.eeoc.gov/Portal/Login.aspx>.

Alternatively, complainant can submit his or her request and arguments to the Director, Office of Federal Operations, Equal Employment Opportunity Commission, via regular mail addressed to P.O. Box 77960, Washington, DC 20013, or by certified mail addressed to 131 M Street, NE, Washington, DC 20507. In the absence of a legible postmark, complainant's request to reconsider shall be deemed timely filed if OFO receives it by mail within five days of the expiration of the applicable filing period. See 29 C.F.R. § 1614.604.

An agency's request for reconsideration must be submitted in digital format via the EEOC's Federal Sector EEO Portal (FedSEP). See 29 C.F.R. § 1614.403(g). Either party's request and/or statement or brief in opposition must also include proof of service on the other party, unless complainant files his or her request via the EEOC Public Portal, in which case no proof of service is required.

**Failure to file within the 30-day time period will result in dismissal of the party's request for reconsideration as untimely, unless extenuating circumstances prevented the timely filing of the request.** Any supporting documentation must be submitted together with the request for reconsideration. **The Commission will consider requests for reconsideration filed after the deadline only in very limited circumstances.** See 29 C.F.R. § 1614.604(c).

#### COMPLAINANT'S RIGHT TO FILE A CIVIL ACTION (R0610)


This is a decision requiring the Agency to continue its administrative processing of your complaint. However, if you wish to file a civil action, you have the right to file such action in an appropriate United States District Court **within ninety (90) calendar days** from the date that you receive this decision. In the alternative, you may file a civil action **after one hundred and eighty (180) calendar days** of the date you filed your complaint with the Agency, or filed your appeal with the Commission. If you file a civil action, you must name as the defendant in the complaint the person who is the official Agency head or department head, identifying that person by his or her full name and official title. Failure to do so may result in the dismissal of your case in court. "Agency" or "department" means the national organization, and not the local office, facility or department in which you work. **Filing a civil action will terminate the administrative processing of your complaint.**

#### RIGHT TO REQUEST COUNSEL (Z0815)

If you want to file a civil action but cannot pay the fees, costs, or security to do so, you may request permission from the court to proceed with the civil action without paying these fees or costs. Similarly, if you cannot afford an attorney to represent you in the civil action, you may request the court to appoint an attorney for you. **You must submit the requests for waiver of court costs or appointment of an attorney directly to the court, not the Commission.** The court has the sole discretion to grant or deny these types of requests.

Such requests do not alter the time limits for filing a civil action (please read the paragraph titled Complainant's Right to File a Civil Action for the specific time limits).

FOR THE COMMISSION:

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Carlton M. Hadden, Director  
Office of Federal Operations

December 14, 2020

Date