THOMAS E. PEREZ Assistant Attorney General JOHN M. GADZICHOWSKI Chief ESTHER G. LANDER Deputy Chief BARBARA E. THAWLEY MEREDITH BURRELL Senior Trial Attorneys United States Department of Justice Civil Rights Division **Employment Litigation Section** 950 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W. Patrick Henry Building, Room 4908 Washington, D.C. 20530 (202) 514-3852 Attorneys for Plaintiff United States

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT DISTRICT OF NEW JERSEY

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff,

v.

Civil Action No.

STATE OF NEW JERSEY AND NEW JERSEY CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION,

Defendants.

COMPLAINT

Plaintiff, United States of America, alleges:

1. This action is brought on behalf of the United States to enforce the provisions of

Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, 42 U.S.C. § 2000e, et seq., as amended ("Title VII").

2. This Court has jurisdiction of this action under 42 U.S.C. § 2000e-6(b), 28 U.S.C. §§ 1331 and 1343, and 28 U.S.C. § 1345.

Defendant State of New Jersey ("New Jersey") is a person within the meaning of
 42 U.S.C. § 2000e(a), and an employer within the meaning of 42 U.S.C. § 2000e(b).

4. Defendant New Jersey Civil Service Commission ("NJCSC") is a five-member body, each member of which is appointed by the Governor of New Jersey with the consent of the New Jersey Senate.

5. On June 30, 2008, the civil service responsibilities of the former New Jersey Department of Personnel were assumed by the NJCSC. With respect to time periods prior to that date, references to the NJCSC in this Complaint include and incorporate its predecessor, the former New Jersey Department of Personnel.

6. Under state law, the NJCSC is responsible for, *inter alia*, establishing procedures for the promotion of law enforcement officers in municipalities and counties that participate in the New Jersey Civil Service system.

7. Defendant NJCSC is a person within the meaning of 42 U.S.C. § 2000e(a), and an employer within the meaning of 42 U.S.C. § 2000e(b).

8. Since at least 2000, the NJCSC has maintained, and it continues to maintain, selection procedures for promotion to the rank of Police Sergeant. These procedures are utilized by hundreds of New Jersey cities and counties that participate in the New Jersey Civil Service system.

9. Since at least 2000, the NJCSC has administered, and it continues to administer, a written multiple-choice examination as part of its Police Sergeant promotion procedures. At all relevant times, the NJCSC has been, and it continues to be, responsible for setting the minimum

-2-

qualifications for admission to the examination, developing and administering the examination, scoring the examination, determining the pass/fail cutoff score that will be used on the examination, establishing Police Sergeant eligibility lists and certifying Police Sergeant candidates to the local jurisdictions participating in the New Jersey Civil Service system.

10. Police officers in local jurisdictions participating in the New Jersey Civil Service system cannot be considered for promotion to the position of Police Sergeant unless they take and pass the written examination administered by the NJCSC. Participating local jurisdictions cannot implement alternative selection procedures, use different written examinations from those administered by the NJCSC, or set different passing scores from those set by the NJCSC.

11. Police Sergeant candidates who meet the minimum qualifications set by the NJCSC and achieve a passing score on the NJCSC's written examination are placed on separate Police Sergeant "eligibility lists" by jurisdiction. On each eligibility list, the candidates are listed in descending rank-order based on their "final scores," which are a combination of their Police Sergeant written examination scores, weighted 80%, and seniority credits, weighted 20%.

12. Local jurisdictions participating in the New Jersey Civil Service system can make promotions to the rank of Police Sergeant only from a "certification list" established by the NJCSC at the request of the local jurisdiction. The NJCSC creates certification lists using the "Rule of Three" pursuant to New Jersey state law, N.J. Stat. Ann., § 11A:4-8. Under the "Rule of Three," for the first Police Sergeant vacancy in a jurisdiction requesting a certification list, the NJCSC certifies the three highest-ranking candidates on the jurisdiction's eligibility list. For each additional vacancy, the NJCSC certifies the next ranked candidate on the eligibility list. If more than one candidate has the same final score, the tied candidates are certified together.

-3-

13. Each year between 2000 and 2008, the NJCSC administered a written examination as part of the Police Sergeant promotional process.

14. For the entire period between 2000 and 2008, approximately 89% of the white candidates who took the written examination passed the examination, while only approximately 73% of the African-American candidates passed the examination. This difference between the pass rate of African-American candidates and that of white candidates is statistically significant.

15. Moreover, when each administration of the written examination between 2000 and 2008 is considered separately, African-American candidates passed at a rate statistically significantly lower than did white candidates in each year.

16. For the entire period between 2000 and 2008, while approximately 89% of the white candidates who took the written examination passed the examination, only approximately 77% of the Hispanic candidates passed the examination. This difference between the pass rate of Hispanic candidates and that of white candidates is statistically significant.

17. Moreover, when each administration of the written examination between 2000 and 2008 is considered separately, Hispanic candidates passed at a rate lower than the rate at which white candidates passed in each year, and the difference in pass rates is statistically significant for each year between 2001 and 2008.

18. Because the NJCSC ranks candidates for promotion to Police Sergeant on eligibility lists based upon the candidates' combined written examination scores and seniority credits, and certifies candidates in descending rank-order from the eligibility lists, many candidates who pass the written examination do not rank high enough to be certified or promoted.

-4-

19. Among candidates who passed the NJCSC Police Sergeant written examination, African Americans were under-represented in the higher score ranges and over-represented in the lower score ranges for each year between 2000 and 2008. Thus, for each administration of the examination between 2000 and 2008, the mean written examination score of African-American candidates was statistically significantly lower than the mean written examination score of white candidates.

20. The difference between the African-American and white mean scores on the written examination are reflected in the final (*i.e.*, combined written examination and seniority) scores of candidates who passed the written examination. Thus, for each year from 2000 to 2008, the mean final score of African-American candidates was statistically significantly lower than the mean final score of white candidates.

21. Among candidates who passed the NJCSC Police Sergeant written examination, Hispanics were under-represented in the higher score ranges and over-represented in the lower score ranges for each year between 2001 and 2008. Thus, for each administration of the examination between 2001 and 2008, the mean written examination score of Hispanic candidates was statistically significantly lower than the mean written examination score of white candidates.

22. The difference between the Hispanic and white mean scores on the written examination are reflected in the final (*i.e.*, combined written examination and seniority) scores of candidates who passed the written examination. Thus, for each year from 2001 to 2008, the mean final score of Hispanic candidates was statistically significantly lower than the mean final score of white candidates.

23. In those jurisdictions for which the NJCSC established eligibility lists that

-5-

contained both white candidates and African-American or Hispanic candidates, African-American and Hispanic candidates were less likely to rank high enough to be placed on a certification list and considered for promotion than were white candidates. Between 2000 and 2008, approximately 35% of the white candidates on the eligibility lists in such jurisdictions were certified, while approximately 20% of African-American candidates and 22% of Hispanic candidates were certified. Similarly, while approximately 18% of the white candidates on the eligibility lists in such jurisdictions were promoted, approximately 9% of African-American candidates and 13% of Hispanic candidates were promoted.

24. Defendants' pass/fail use of the NJCSC Police Sergeant written examination to screen candidates for promotion and defendants' certification of candidates in descending rankorder, based on a combination of candidates' written examination scores and seniority credits, have resulted in disparate impact upon African-American candidates.

25. Defendants' pass/fail use of the NJCSC Police Sergeant written examination to screen candidates for promotion and defendants' certification of candidates in descending rank-order, based on a combination of candidates' written examination scores and seniority credits, have resulted in disparate impact upon Hispanic candidates.

26. Defendants have not demonstrated that their pass/fail use of the NJCSC Police Sergeant written examination or their certification of candidates in descending rank-order, based on a combination of candidates' written examination scores and seniority credits, is job related for the Police Sergeant position and consistent with business necessity.

27. Defendants have pursued and continue to pursue policies and practices that discriminate against African-American and Hispanic candidates and that deprive or tend to

-6-

deprive African Americans and Hispanics of employment opportunities or adversely affect their status as employees because of their race and national origin in violation of Section 707 of Title VII, 42 U.S.C. § 2000e-6. Defendants have implemented these polices and practices, among other ways, as follows:

- a. by using written promotional examinations as pass/fail screening devices in a manner that results in disparate impact upon African-American and Hispanic candidates for promotion to the position of Police Sergeant, is not job related for the position in question and consistent with business necessity, and does not otherwise meet the requirements of Section 703(k) of Title VII, 42 U.S.C. § 2000e-2(k);
- b. by certifying candidates for promotion to the position of Police Sergeant from eligibility lists in descending rank-order, based upon a combination of candidates' scores on the Police Sergeant written examination and seniority credits, where such rank-order certification results in disparate impact upon African-American and Hispanic candidates, is not job related for the position in question and consistent with business necessity, and does not otherwise meet the requirements of Section 703(k) of Title VII, 42 U.S.C. § 2000e-2(k); and
- by failing or refusing to take appropriate actions to correct the present effects of their discriminatory promotional practices.

28. The policies and practices of defendants described in Paragraphs 8 through 27 *supra*, constitute a pattern or practice of resistance to the full enjoyment by African Americans and Hispanics of their right to equal employment opportunities without discrimination based on

-7-

race or national origin, in violation of Section 707 of Title VII, 42 U.S.C. § 2000e-6. This pattern or practice is of such a nature and is intended to deny the full exercise of the rights secured by Title VII. Unless restrained by order of this Court, defendants will continue to pursue policies and practices that are the same as or similar to those alleged in this Complaint.

29. All conditions precedent to the filing of this lawsuit have been performed or have occurred.

WHEREFORE, the United States prays for an order enjoining defendants, the State of New Jersey and the New Jersey Civil Service Commission, and their officers, agents, employees, successors and all persons in active concert or participation with them from engaging in employment practices which discriminate against African Americans on the basis of Race and Hispanics on the basis of national origin in violation of Title VII, and specifically from:

- a. using written promotional examinations as pass/fail screening devices in a manner that results in disparate impact upon African-American and Hispanic candidates for promotion to the position of Police Sergeant, that are not job related for the position in question and consistent with business necessity, and do not otherwise meet the requirements of Section 703(k) of Title VII, 42 U.S.C. § 2000e-2(k);
- b. certifying candidates for promotion to the position of Police Sergeant from eligibility lists in descending rank-order, based upon a combination of candidates scores on the written examination and seniority credits, where such rank-order certification results in disparate impact upon African-American and Hispanic candidates, is not job related for the position in question and consistent with business necessity, and does not otherwise meet the requirements of Section

-8-

703(k) of Title VII, 42 U.S.C. § 2000e-2(k);

- c. failing or refusing to provide make-whole relief, including back pay with interest and promotion with retroactive seniority, to individuals who have suffered loss or will suffer loss as a result of the discriminatory policies and practices alleged in this Complaint; and
- d. failing or refusing to take appropriate action to overcome the present effects of the defendants' discriminatory policies and practices, including but not limited to the following:
 - (i) adopting promotional procedures that do not result in disparate impact or that otherwise comply with Title VII; and
 - (ii) taking such other reasonable actions that are necessary to correct the present effects of past discrimination.

Plaintiff United States prays for such additional relief as justice may require, together with its costs and disbursements in this action.

ERIC H. HOLDER Attorney General

THOMAS E. PEREZ Assistant Attorney General Civil Rights Division

By:

JOHN M. GADZICHOWSKI (WI/Bar No. 1014294) Chief Employment Litigation Section

-9-

By:

By:

s/ Esther Lander ESTHER LANDER (DC Bar No. 461316) Deputy Chief

s/ Barbara E. Thawley BARBARA THAWLEY (DC Bar No. 358944) MEREDITH L. BURRELL (MD Bar, no number) Senior Trial Attorneys U.S. Department of Justice Civil Rights Division **Employment Litigation Section** 950 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W. Patrick Henry Building, Room 4908 Washington, D.C. 20530 Telephone: (202) 514-3852 Facsimile: (202) 514-1105 Barbara.E.Thawley@usdoj.gov

United States Attorney's Office Peter Rodino Federal Building 970 Broad Street, Suite 700 Newark, New Jersey 07102 (973) 645-2700

Attorneys for Plaintiff United States

Case 2:10-cv-00091-KSH -MAS Document 1-1 Filed 01/07/10 Page 1 of 2 PageID: 11

SJS 44 (Rev. 12/07, NJ 5/08)

CIVIL COVER SHEET

by local niles of court. This f	d the infornation contained herein neither replace nor su orm, approved by the Judicial Conference of the United INSTRUCTIONS ON THE REVERSE OF THE FORM.)	upplement the filing and service of pleadngs or other papers as States inSeptember 1974, is required for the use of the Clerk of	required by law, except as povided of Court for the purpose of initiating	
I. (a) PLAINTIFFS	- <u>-</u>	DEFENDANTS		
United States of America		State of New Jersey and New Jersey Commission	∕ State Civil Service	
(b) County of Residenc	e of First Listed Plaintiff	County of Residence of First Listed Defendant		
(c) Attorney's (Firm Name, Address, Telephone Number and Email Address) John M. Gadzichowski, Chief; Esther Lander, Deputy Chief; Barbara E. Thawley and Meredith L. Burrell, Employment Litigation Section, Civil Rights Division, U.S. Dept. of Justice, 950		NOTE: IN LAND CONDEMNATION CASES, U LAND INVOLVED.		
	W., Washington D.C. 20530	Anne Milgram, Attorney General for S		
II. BASIS OF JURIS	DICTION (Place an "X" in One Box Only)	Dorio Ruch, Deputy Attorney General I. CITIZENSHIP OF PRINCIPAL PARTIES		
X 1 U.S. Government Plaintiff	 G 3 Federal Question (U.S. Government Not a Party) 	(For Diversity Cases Only) PTF DEF Citizen of This State I I Incorporated or I of Business In Th	and One Box for Defendant) PTF DEF Principal Place	
2 U.S. Government Defendant	4 Diversity (Indicate Citizenship of Parties in Item III)	Citizen of Another State 2 2 Incorporated and of Business In	Principal Place 5 5 5 Another State	
		Citizen or Subject of a 🗖 3 🗇 3 Foreign Nation Foreign Country	G 6 G 6	
IV. NATURE OF SU	IT (Place an "X" in One Box Only) TORTS	FORFEITURE/PENALTY BANKRUPTCY	OTHER STATUTES	
 110 Insurance 120 Marine 130 Miller Act 140 Negotiable Instrument 150 Recovery of Overpayment & Enforcement of Judgmer 151 Medicare Act 152 Recovery of Defaulted Student Loans (Excl. Veterans) 153 Recovery of Overpayment of Veteran's Benefits 160 Stockholders' Suits 190 Other Contract 195 Contract Product Liability 196 Franchise 210 Land Condemnation 220 Foreclosure 230 Rent Lease & Ejectment 245 Tort Product Liability 290 All Other Real Property 	PERSONAL INJURY PERSONAL INJURY 310 Airplane 362 Personal Injury - Med. Malpractice Liability 365 Personal Injury - Med. Malpractice 1 320 Assault, Libel & Slander 368 Asbestos Personal 330 Federal Employers' Liability 368 Asbestos Personal 340 Marine PERSONAL INJURY 345 Marine Product 370 Other Fraud Liability 371 Truth in Lending 355 Motor Vehicle Property Damage Product Liability 385 Property Damage	□ 610 Agriculture □ 422 Appeal 28 USC 158 □ 620 Other Food & Drug □ 423 Withdrawal □ 625 Drug Related Seizure of Property 21 USC 881 □ 423 Withdrawal □ 630 Liquor Laws □ 28 USC 157 □ 640 R.R. & Truck □ 820 Copyrights □ 650 Airline Regs. □ 830 Patent □ 660 Occupational □ 840 Trademark □ 670 Other □ SOCIAL SECURITY □ 710 Fair Labor Standards Act □ 861 HIA (1395ff) □ 720 Labor/Mgmt.Relations □ 863 DIWC/DIWW (405(g)) □ 740 Railway Labor Act □ 865 RSI (405(g)) □ 790 Other Labor Litigation □ 870 Taxes (U.S. Plaintiff) □ 791 Empl. Ret. Inc. □ 871 Tacs—Third Party. □ 1MMIGRATION □ 871 IRS—Third Party. □ 1MMIGRATION □ 871 IRS	 400 State Reapportionment 410 Antitrust 430 Banks and Banking 450 Commerce 460 Deportation⁻ 470 Racketeer Influenced and Corrupt Organizations 480 Consumer Credit 490 Cable/Sat TV 810 Selective Service 	
🖾 1 Original 🔲 2 I	State Court Appellate Court	4 Reinstated or 5 Transferred from 6 Multidis Reopened (specify) 6 Multidis filing (Do not cite jurisdictional statutes unless diversity): 1964, as amended, 42 U.S.C. 2000e et seq.	n Judgment	
VI. CAUSE OF ACT	ION Brief description of cause:	discrimination based on race and national o		
VII. REQUESTED II COMPLAINT:	N CHECK IF THIS IS A CLASS ACTION UNDER F.R.C.P. 23	DEMANDS Backpry CHECK YES oni INjouction, other JURY DEMANI	y if demanded in complaint: D: D Yes Ø No	
VIII. RELATED CA	SE(S) (See instructions): JUDGE	- DOCKET NUMBER		
Explanation:	0			
01/07/2010 Barbara E. Thawley Marham E. Thawley				

JS 44 Reverse (Rev. 12/07, NJ 1/08)

INSTRUCTIONS FOR ATTORNEYS COMPLETING CIVIL COVER SHEET FORM JS 44

Authority For Civil Cover Sheet

The JS 44 civil cover sheet and theinformation contained herein neither replaces nor supplements the filings and service of peading or other papers as required by law, except as provided by local rules of court. This form, approved by the Judicial Conference of the United Statesin September 1974, is required for the use of the Clerk of Court for the purpose of initiating the civil ddget sheet. Consequently, a civil cover sheet is submitted to the Clerk of Court foreach civil complaint filed. The attorney filing a case should complete the form as follows:

(a) Plaintiffs-Defendants. Enter names (last, first, middle initial) of plaintiff and defendant. If the plaintiff or defendant is a government agency, use only I. the full name or standard abbreviations. If the plaintiff or dendant is an official within a government agency identify first the agency and then the official giving both name and title.

(b) County of Residence. For each civil case filed, excepU.S. plaintiff cases, enter the name of the county where the firstlisted plaintiff resides at thetime of filing. In U.S. plaintiff cases, enter the name of the ounty in which the first listed defendant resides at the time of fling. (NOTE: In land condemnation cases, the county of residence of the "defendant" is the location of the tract of land involved.)

(c) Attorneys. Enter the firm name, address, telephone number, and attorney of record. If there are several attorneys, list them on an attachment, noting in this section "(see attachment)".

Jurisdiction. The basis of jurisdiction isset forth under Rule 8(a), F.R.C.P., which requires that jurisdictions be shown in pleadings. Place an "X" in one II. of the boxes. If there is more than one basis of jurisdiction, precedence is given in the order shown below.

United States plaintiff. (1) Jurisdiction based on 28 U.S.C. 1345 and 1348. Suits by agencies and officers of the United States are included here.

United States defendant. (2) When the plaintiff is suing the United States, its officers or agencies, place an "X" in this box.

Federal question. (3) This refers to suits under 28 U.S.C. 1331, where jurisdicti on arises under the Constitution of the Unite d States, an am endment to the Constitution, an act of Congress or a treaty of the United States. In cases where the U.S. is a party, the U.S. plaintiff or defendant code takes precedence, and box 1 or 2 should be marked.

Diversity of citizenship. (4) This refers to suits under 28 US.C. 1332, where parties are citizens of different states. When Box 4 is checked, the citizenship of the different parties must be checked. (See Section III below; federal question actions take precedence over diversity cases.)

Residence (citizenship) of Principal Parties. This section of the JS 44 is to be completed if diverty of citizenship was indicated above. Markhis section m. for each principal party.

IV. Nature of Suit. Place an 'X' in the appropriate box. If the nature of suit canot be determined, be sure the cause of action, in Section Vbelow, is sufficient to enable the deputy clerk or the statistical clerks in the Administrative Office to determine the nature of suit. If the cause fits more than one nature of suit, select the most definitive.

V. Origin. Place an "X" in one of the seven boxes.

Original Proceedings. (1) Cases which originate in the United States district courts.

Removed from State Court. (2) Proceedings initiated in statecourts may be removed to the district courts under Title 28 U.S.C. Section 1441. When the petition for removal is granted, check this box.

Remanded from Appellate Court. (3) Check this box for cases remanded to the district court for further action. Use the date of remand as the filing date.

Reinstated or Reopened. (4) Check this box for cases reinstated or reopened in the district court. Use the reopening date as the filing date.

Transferred from Another District. (5) For cases transferred under Title 28 U.S.C. Section 1404(a). Do not use this for within district transfers or multidistrict litigation transfers.

Multidistrict Litigation. (6) Check this box when a nultidistrict case is transferred into the district under authority of Title 28 U.S.C. Section 1407. When this box is checked, do not check (5) above.

Appeal to District Judge from Magistrate Judgment. (7) Check this box for an appeal from a magistrate judge's decision.

Cause of Action Report the civil statute directlyrelated to the cause of action and give a brief description of the causeDo not cite jurisdictional statutes VI. U.S. Civil Statute: 47 USC 553 Brief Description: Unauthorized reception of cable service unless diversity. Example:

Requested in Complaint. Class Action. Place an "X" in this box if you are filing a class action under Rule 23, F.R.Cv.P.

VII. Demand. In this space enter the dollar amount (in thousands of dollars) being demanded or indicate other demand such as a preliminary injunction.

Jury Demand. Check the appropriate box to indicate whether or not a jury is being demanded.

VIII. Re lated Cases. This section of the JS 44 is used to reference related pending cases if any. If there are related pending cases, insert the docket numbers and the corresponding judge names for such cases. Provide a brief explanation of why the cases are related.

Date and Attorney Signature. Date and sign the civil cover sheet.