

Plain Language vs. Purpose: *The Seventh Circuit Debates Statutory Interpretation*

Prepared by:
Ryan N. Parsons
Foley & Lardner LLP



LORMAN[®]

Published on www.lorman.com - June 2019

Plain Language vs. Purpose: The Seventh Circuit Debates Statutory Interpretation, ©2019 Lorman Education Services. All Rights Reserved.

INTRODUCING

Lorman's New Approach to Continuing Education

ALL-ACCESS PASS

The All-Access Pass grants you **UNLIMITED** access to Lorman's ever-growing library of training resources:

- ✓ Unlimited Live Webinars - 120 live webinars added every month
- ✓ Unlimited OnDemand and MP3 Downloads - Over 1,500 courses available
- ✓ Videos - More than 1300 available
- ✓ Slide Decks - More than 2300 available
- ✓ White Papers
- ✓ Reports
- ✓ Articles
- ✓ ... and much more!

Join the thousands of other pass-holders that have already trusted us for their professional development by choosing the All-Access Pass.



Get Your All-Access Pass Today!

SAVE 20%

Learn more: www.lorman.com/pass/?s=special20

Use Discount Code Q7014393 and Priority Code 18536 to receive the 20% AAP discount.

*Discount cannot be combined with any other discounts.

Plain Language vs. Purpose: The Seventh Circuit Debates Statutory Interpretation

Written by [Ryan N. Parsons](#) – 2/4/19

Last week, in an 8-4 *en banc* decision, the Seventh Circuit held that the Age Discrimination in Employment Act does not provide a cause of action for outside job applicants on a “disparate impact” theory. *Kelber v. CareFusion Corp.*, No. 17-1206 (Jan. 23, 2019). Beyond the result, the court sharply divided over *how* to interpret the statute. Writing for the court, Judge Michael Scudder held that “plain language” dictated the outcome of the case, while Judge David Hamilton’s principal dissent aggressively defended a purposivist approach to statutory interpretation.

Section 4(a)(2) of the ADEA makes it unlawful for an employer “to limit, segregate, or classify *his employees* in any way which would deprive or tend to deprive any individual of employment opportunities or otherwise adversely affect his status as an employee, because of such individual’s age.” 29 U.S.C. § 623(a)(2) (emphasis added). Judge Scudder focused on the fact that the text limits itself to “employees,” as distinct from “applicants,” and concluded that the statute should be read according to its plain language. To reinforce this view further, his opinion examined analogous sections of the ADEA and Title VII. It noted that where Congress wished to provide protections for job applicants, as distinct from employees, it did so expressly. For example:

- Section 4(a)(1): The “disparate treatment” section of the ADEA expressly made it unlawful “*to fail or refuse to hire . . . any individual*” due to age.
- Section 4(c)(2): The section of the ADEA prohibiting labor unions from engaging in disparate impact expressly made it unlawful for a labor union to take actions that “adversely affect [any individual’s] status as an employee *or as an applicant for employment*” due to age.
- Section 4(d): The “retaliation” provision of the ADEA made it unlawful for employers to retaliate against “employees *or applicants for employment.*”
- Section 703(e)(2) of Title VII: In 1972, Congress amended the disparate impact section of Title VII, which was substantively identical to the ADEA, to make it unlawful for employers “to limit, segregate, or classify his employees *or applicants for employment*” in a way that tends to deprive individuals of employment opportunities based on any protected class under Title VII. Congress did not simultaneously amend the ADEA.

Against this backdrop, Judge Scudder concluded that the plain language of the statute controlled the outcome of the case. While acknowledging that an underlying purpose of the ADEA includes protecting job applicants from age discrimination, he pointed out that analyzing the purpose beyond the text can only occur when a statute is ambiguous. “There being no ambiguity in the meaning of § 4(a)(2) of the ADEA, our role ends.”

“Congress, of course, remains free to do what the judiciary cannot—extend § 4(a)(2) to outside job applicants, as it did in amending Title VII.”

In dissent, Judge Hamilton (joined in full by Chief Judge Diane Wood and Judge Ilana Rovner and in part by Judge Frank Easterbrook) argued that the better reading of the statute protected job applicants and that Supreme Court precedent controlled the outcome. Beyond this, however, he also made a full-throated purposivist defense of his interpretation: “I cannot imagine that when the ADEA was enacted, a reasonable person conversant with applicable social conventions would have understood the ADEA as drawing the line the majority adopts here.” Because, he went on, no one had “offered a reason why Congress might have chosen to allow the inside applicant but not the outside applicant to assert a disparate impact claim,” Judge Hamilton would read such protections into the statute.

Judge Easterbrook did not join Judge Hamilton’s purposivist approach, finding instead that Supreme Court precedent controlled the case. Though Judge Easterbrook did not find that the text had an ascertainable “plain meaning” in this case, he reiterated the principle that the text of the law must control the outcome of the case:

The purpose of a law is imputed by judges; it is not a thing to be mined out of a statute. . . . Our job is to apply the enacted text, the only thing to which the House, the Senate, and the President all subscribed, not to plumb legislators’ hopes and goals.

All four of President Trump's appointees to the court (Judges Scudder, Amy Barrett, Michael Brennan, and Amy St. Eve) voted with the majority. Just two years ago, before their confirmation and with Judges Richard Posner and Ann Claire Williams still on the bench, it's very easy to imagine that the case would have had a different outcome. For the foreseeable future, we can expect a textualist approach to continue to dominate the court's statutory-interpretation cases.

Disclaimer

This blog is made available by Foley & Lardner LLP ("Foley" or "the Firm") for informational purposes only. It is not meant to convey the Firm's legal position on behalf of any client, nor is it intended to convey specific legal advice. Any opinions expressed in this article do not necessarily reflect the views of Foley & Lardner LLP, its partners, or its clients. Accordingly, do not act upon this information without seeking counsel from a licensed attorney. This blog is not intended to create, and receipt of it does not constitute, an attorney-client relationship. Communicating with Foley through this website by email, blog post, or otherwise, does not create an attorney-client relationship for any legal matter. Therefore, any communication or material you transmit to Foley through this blog, whether by email, blog post or any other manner, will not be treated as confidential or proprietary. The information on this blog is published "AS IS" and is not guaranteed to be complete, accurate, and or up-to-date. Foley makes no representations or warranties of any kind, express or implied, as to the operation or content of the site. Foley expressly disclaims all other guarantees, warranties, conditions and representations of any kind, either express or implied, whether arising under any statute, law, commercial use or otherwise, including implied warranties of merchantability, fitness for a particular purpose, title and non-infringement. In no event shall Foley or any of its partners, officers, employees, agents or affiliates be liable, directly or indirectly, under any theory of law (contract, tort, negligence or otherwise), to you or anyone else, for any claims, losses or damages, direct, indirect special, incidental, punitive or consequential, resulting from or occasioned by the creation, use of or reliance on this site (including information and other content) or any third party websites or the information, resources or material accessed through any such websites. In some jurisdictions, the contents of this blog may be considered Attorney Advertising. If applicable, please note that prior results do not guarantee a similar outcome. Photographs are for dramatization purposes only and may include models. Likenesses do not necessarily imply current client, partnership or employee status.

The material appearing in this website is for informational purposes only and is not legal advice. Transmission of this information is not intended to create, and receipt does not constitute, an attorney-client relationship. The information provided herein is intended only as general information which may or may not reflect the most current developments. Although these materials may be prepared by professionals, they should not be used as a substitute for professional services. If legal or other professional advice is required, the services of a professional should be sought.

The opinions or viewpoints expressed herein do not necessarily reflect those of Lorman Education Services. All materials and content were prepared by persons and/or entities other than Lorman Education Services, and said other persons and/or entities are solely responsible for their content.

Any links to other websites are not intended to be referrals or endorsements of these sites. The links provided are maintained by the respective organizations, and they are solely responsible for the content of their own sites.