Case 3:10-cv-02109-L-BH Document 1 Filed 10/19/10 Page 1 of 4 PageID 1 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF TEXASON US DISTRICT COURT NORTHERN DIST. OF TX

RIGINAL

2010 OCT 19 AM 10: 32

			DEFUTY CLERK more recommendation of the comment of	
Melody R Geor	rge			
Plaintiff				¥
v.			8-10 CY 2109 Civil Action No.	IOA-T
			Civil Action No.	
Jones Day Defendant				
		COMPLAINT		
				···
Date	10/19/2010			
Signature	mil-de Dog			
Print Name	Melody R George			
Address	230 High Pointe Lane			
City, State, Zip	Cedar Hill, TX 75104-5110			
Telephone	972/293-6225 or 214/395-4101			

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT NORTHERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS

MELODY R. GEORGE,	
Plaintiff,)
v.)
JONES DAY,)
Defendant.)

COMPLAINANT

NOW INTO COURT comes Melody R. George, pro se, who respectfully represents that,

On or about December 15, 2008, the Complainant (hereinafter referred to as "Plaintiff") suffered an on-the-job injury which resulted in her sustaining a back/neck impairment. The impairment affected the Plaintiff's ability to walk, stand, sit, bend, and a host of other major life activities. She is a qualified individual with a disability under the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA).

The Plaintiff was out of work from December 15, 2008 to March 4, 2009.

The Plaintiff returned to work with some medical restrictions on March 5, 2009 to March 17, 2009 but soon found further alterations to her work were required to perform the essential functions of her position. These alterations were made known to the Defendant.

The Plaintiff did not get these alterations and found it difficult to continue without the alterations. As per her doctors' requests, Plaintiff went back to work again with medical restrictions on or about April 6 and April 24, 2009, but Defendant's Human Resources informed Plaintiff that they did not have any positions available and sent Plaintiff home. Again, no alterations were made.

During the Plaintiff's illness, she was placed on leave pursuant to the Defendant's Short Term Disability/Leave Policy.

The Defendant's policy is to terminate employees who have exhausted their leave. These facts were explained in a letter issued to the Plaintiff on or about June 23, 2009.

The Defendant's Short Term Disability policy is essentially a no-fault leave policy which is prohibited under the ADA. It operates to terminate employees once they have exhausted their leave. The Plaintiff's disability was such that she needed leave beyond what was available under the Defendant's leave policy.

Defendant terminated the Plaintiff on July 2, 2009.

WHEREFORE, the Plaintiff prays that this Court finds that the Defendant violated the ADA when it failed to provide Plaintiff with a reasonable accommodation.

That Defendant's leave policy violates the ADA in its application as essentially a no-fault leave policy.

That Plaintiff is entitled to compensatory and punitive damages and all other remedies just and equitable under the law.

Respectfully submitted,

Melody R. George, Pro Se

COMPLAINT:	UNDER F.R.C.P. 23	JURY DEMAND:	
VIII. RELATED CASE(S)			
PENDING OR CLOSED:	JUDGE	DOCKET NUMBER	
DATE	SIGNATURE OF ATTORNEY OF RECORD		
FOR OFFICE USE ONLY			
RECEIPT # AMOUN	T APPLYING IFP	TUDGE MAG TUDGE	