PARAMOUR CLAIMS/REDUCING EMPLOYER LIABILITY FOR CO-WORKER/EMPLOYER CONSENTING SEXUAL RELATIONSHIP

Under Title VII, employers may be liable when employees are denied employment benefits because of a co-worker's consenting sexual liaison or relationship with a representative of the employer. Such claims are called <u>paramour claims</u>.

As with employer liability under Title VII for sexual harassment claims, an employer's potential liability may be predicated upon conduct by agents, supervisors, co-workers, and non-employee third parties.

The EEOC recognizes paramour claims as an issue related to sexual harassment, thereby making paramour issues governed by general Title VII principles.

Employer preventive measures or protections against paramour claims parallel protection against

sexu	ial harassment claims and include:
	provisions of an internal complaint/resolution process with confidentiality protections,
	training of all employees in how to make such internal appeals,
	provisions of a policy which prohibits sexual harassment and which addresses sexual liaisons on
	the job,
	training of supervisors and employees in that policy and specifically warning supervisors of the
	legal perils associated with sexual liaisons and of the potential for paramour claims,
	promptly identifying and prudently taking steps to correct job performance deficiencies caused by
	relationships, on or off company premises, between employees and between employees and
	supervisors,
	utilizing "confidential" record keeping procedures in documenting (such as sealed envelopes with
	limited access notations), corrective job performance counseling, disciplinary action, or other
	corrective measures taken toward employees and supervisors,
	requiring that supervisors justify in writing (for review by top-level managers) reasons for \underline{all}
	promotions where two or more aspirants or potential promotees exist, $\underline{\text{whether or not}}$ there exists
	any form of consenting relationship and $\underline{\text{whether or not}}$ there is a difference in sex or sexual
	preference between the job aspirants or between a job aspirant and the supervisor,
	$management\ review\ of\ all\ such\ promotions,\ \underline{whether\ or\ not}\ sexual\ liaison/relationships\ are\ known$
	to exist, even if company policies do not explicitly prohibit such relationships,
	MARC CHECKLIST/CONSIDERATIONS IN "SEXUAL LIAISON" OR "SEXUAL PROMISCUITY"
	SITUATIONS.

Reference: EMPLOYEE RELATIONS LAW JOURNAL Vol. 15, No. 1, Summer 1989, pgs. 57-66.