

Nos. 17-1618, 17-1623, 18-107

IN THE
Supreme Court of the United States

GERALD LYNN BOSTOCK,
Petitioner,

v.
CLAYTON COUNTY, GEORGIA,
Respondent.

ALTITUDE EXPRESS, INC., AND RAY MAYNARD,
Petitioners,

v.
MELISSA ZARDA AND WILLIAM MOORE, JR.,
CO-INDEPENDENT EXECUTORS OF THE ESTATE OF
DONALD ZARDA
Respondents.

R.G. & G.R. HARRIS FUNERAL HOMES, INC.,
Petitioner,

v.
EQUAL EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITY COMMISSION AND
AIMEE STEPHENS,
Respondents.

On Writs of Certiorari to the United States Courts of
Appeals for the Eleventh, Second, and Sixth Circuits

**BRIEF OF KENNETH B. MEHLMAN ET AL. AS
AMICI CURIAE IN SUPPORT OF THE EMPLOYEES**

ROY T. ENGLERT, JR.
Counsel of Record
LAURIE R. RUBENSTEIN
PETER A. GABRIELLI
CAROLYN M. FORSTEIN
ROBBINS, RUSSELL, ENGLERT, ORSECK,
UNTEREINER & SAUBER LLP
2000 K STREET NW 4TH FLR
WASHINGTON, DC 20006
(202) 775-4500
renglert@robbinsrussell.com

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
TABLE OF AUTHORITIES.....	ii
INTEREST OF THE <i>AMICI CURIAE</i>	1
SUMMARY OF ARGUMENT.....	2
ARGUMENT	5
I. THE PLAIN TEXT OF TITLE VII PROHIBITS DISCRIMINATION BECAUSE OF AN INDIVIDUAL EMPLOYEE’S SEXUAL ORIENTATION OR TRANSGENDER STATUS	5
A. Discrimination Because of Sexual Orientation or Transgender Status Necessarily Constitutes Discrimination Because of Sex	6
B. Congressional “Intent” Does Not Override Unambiguous Text	10
C. Title VII Prohibits Discrimination Against <i>Individuals</i> , Rather than Against Protected Classes at Large.....	15
II. PAST PRACTICE DOES NOT REQUIRE A CONTRARY RESULT	22
CONCLUSION	24

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

	Page(s)
Cases	
<i>Barnes v. Train</i> , No. 1828-73, 1974 WL 10628 (D.D.C. Aug. 9, 1974), <i>rev'd sub nom. Barnes</i> <i>v. Costle</i> , 561 F.2d 983 (D.C. Cir. 1977)	13
<i>Boyle v. United States</i> , 556 U.S. 938 (2009)	12
<i>Bridge v. Phoenix Bond & Indem. Co.</i> , 553 U.S. 639 (2008)	11
<i>Buckhannon Bd. & Care Home, Inc. v.</i> <i>W. Va. Dep't of Health & Human</i> <i>Res.</i> , 532 U.S. 598 (2001)	23
<i>City of Los Angeles, Dep't of Water &</i> <i>Power v. Manhart</i> , 435 U.S. 702 (1978)	20, 21
<i>Corne v. Bausch & Lomb, Inc.</i> , 390 F. Supp. 161 (D. Ariz. 1975), <i>vacated</i> , 562 F.2d 55 (9th Cir. 1977)	13
<i>EEOC v. Abercrombie & Fitch Stores,</i> <i>Inc.</i> , 135 S. Ct. 2028 (2015)	7
<i>Food Mktg. Inst. v. Argus Leader Media</i> , 588 U.S. ____ (2019) (slip op.)	23

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES—Continued

	Page(s)
<i>Gen. Dynamics Land Sys., Inc. v. Cline</i> , 540 U.S. 581 (2004)	15, 16
<i>Gross v. FBL Fin. Servs., Inc.</i> , 557 U.S. 167 (2009)	6
<i>Hively v. Ivy Tech Cmty. Coll.</i> , 853 F.3d 339 (7th Cir. 2017)	22
<i>Keene Corp. v. United States</i> , 508 U.S. 200 (1993)	23
<i>Lewis v. City of Chicago</i> , 560 U.S. 205 (2010)	11
<i>McNally v. United States</i> , 483 U.S. 350 (1987)	24
<i>Meritor Sav. Bank, FSB v. Vinson</i> , 477 U.S. 57 (1986)	12, 13, 14, 15
<i>Milner v. Dep't of Navy</i> , 562 U.S. 562 (2011)	23
<i>NLRB v. SW Gen., Inc.</i> , 137 S. Ct. 929 (2017)	10
<i>Oncale v. Sundowner Offshore Servs.</i> , 523 U.S. 75 (1998)	<i>passim</i>
<i>Pa. Dep't of Corr. v. Yeskey</i> , 524 U.S. 206 (1998)	10, 11, 12, 16

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES—Continued

	Page(s)
<i>Phillips v. Martin Marietta Corp.</i> , 400 U.S. 542 (1971).....	21, 22
<i>Sandifer v. U.S. Steel Corp.</i> , 571 U.S. 220 (2014).....	7
<i>Sedima, S.P.R.L. v. Imrex Co.</i> , 473 U.S. 479 (1985).....	12
<i>Univ. of Tex. Sw. Med. Ctr. v. Nassar</i> , 570 U.S. 338 (2013).....	6, 7
 Constitution and statutes	
U.S. CONST. Art. I, § 7	1
42 U.S.C. § 2000e	7
42 U.S.C. § 2000e-2(a)(1)	<i>passim</i>
42 U.S.C. § 2000e-2(m).....	7
42 U.S.C. § 12132	12
 Other Authorities	
CHAMBERS’S TWENTIETH CENTURY DICTIONARY (William Geddie ed., First American ed. 1965)	8, 17
THE OXFORD ENGLISH DICTIONARY (1933).....	8, 17, 18

Explore Litigation Insights

Docket Alarm provides insights to develop a more informed litigation strategy and the peace of mind of knowing you're on top of things.

Real-Time Litigation Alerts



Keep your litigation team up-to-date with **real-time alerts** and advanced team management tools built for the enterprise, all while greatly reducing PACER spend.

Our comprehensive service means we can handle Federal, State, and Administrative courts across the country.

Advanced Docket Research



With over 230 million records, Docket Alarm's cloud-native docket research platform finds what other services can't. Coverage includes Federal, State, plus PTAB, TTAB, ITC and NLRB decisions, all in one place.

Identify arguments that have been successful in the past with full text, pinpoint searching. Link to case law cited within any court document via Fastcase.

Analytics At Your Fingertips



Learn what happened the last time a particular judge, opposing counsel or company faced cases similar to yours.

Advanced out-of-the-box PTAB and TTAB analytics are always at your fingertips.

API

Docket Alarm offers a powerful API (application programming interface) to developers that want to integrate case filings into their apps.

LAW FIRMS

Build custom dashboards for your attorneys and clients with live data direct from the court.

Automate many repetitive legal tasks like conflict checks, document management, and marketing.

FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS

Litigation and bankruptcy checks for companies and debtors.

E-DISCOVERY AND LEGAL VENDORS

Sync your system to PACER to automate legal marketing.