



## TABLE OF CONTENTS

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES .....	iii-iv
I. BRIEF BACKGROUND .....	1
II. STANDARD OF REVIEW .....	2
III. SUMMARY OF MATERIAL FACTS.....	3
A. AT&T’s intent to transform its workforce into a younger one by 2020 through its three-step surplus-termination-release program .....	3
B. On January 11, 2019, the E.D. Pa. entered summary judgment against AT&T for violating the ADEA through its use of its “General Release.” .....	4
C. General Release’s waiver of claims and collective action waiver under the ADEA are crucial to AT&T’s systemic age discrimination .....	5
D. On January 28, 2019, AT&T notified Plaintiff and other older employees that they were selected for surplus/reduction in force and presented them with the <u>same</u> General Release and disclosures that the court in <i>Ray</i> already ruled violated the ADEA .....	6
E. AT&T knowingly and falsely told Plaintiff and other older employees that they were releasing their ADEA claims .....	7
F. AT&T obtained through the General Release a Class, Collective and Representative Action Waiver while falsely telling Plaintiff and other older employees that they had released all ADEA claims against AT&T anyway.....	10
G. AT&T never informed its terminated older employees that the General Release was invalid as to ADEA claims.....	11
IV. ARGUMENT: AT&T’S MOTION SHOULD BE DENIED .....	12
A. AT&T’s judicial estoppel argument is off the mark because Plaintiff has not reversed her position .....	12
B. It would be premature to dismiss at this stage Plaintiff’s collective action allegations based on AT&T’s assertion of an affirmative defense .....	15
C. Under Pennsylvania law, AT&T’s attempt to enforce the ADEA collective action waiver is a request for specific performance, which sounds in equity and is barred by the doctrine of unclean hands .....	18

1. AT&T’s arguments as to the insufficiency of the Amended Complaint’s allegations are unavailing .....20

D. The “Class, Collective and Representative Action Waiver” as applied to Plaintiff’s ADEA claims is unconscionable under Pennsylvania law and should not be enforced.....23

V. CONCLUSION.....25

## TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

## CASES

<i>Bell Atl. Corp. v. Twombly</i> , 550 U.S. 544, 555 (2007) .....	3
<i>Branson v. IKEA Holdings US</i> , 2021 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 180616 (E.D. Pa. Sep. 22, 2021) .....	3, 21
<i>Burtch v. Milberg Factors, Inc.</i> , 662 F.3d 212 (3d Cir. 2011) .....	21
<i>Cephalon, Inc. v. Slayback Pharma Ltd. Liab. Co.</i> , 2019 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 129020 (D. Del. Aug. 1, 2019) .....	23
<i>Donofrio v. IKEA US Retail, LLC</i> , 2019 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 230218 (E.D. Pa. May 15, 2019) .....	15
<i>Duffy v. Sodexho, Inc.</i> , 2008 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 93378 (E.D. Pa. Nov. 17, 2008) .....	21
<i>Halle v. W. Penn Allegheny Health Sys. Inc.</i> , 842 F.3d 215 (3d Cir. 2016) .....	15
<i>Hodczak v. Latrobe Specialty Steel Co.</i> , 2009 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 127888 (W.D. Pa. Mar. 9, 2009) .....	16
<i>Hoffmann-La Roche v. Sperling</i> , 493 U.S. 165 (1989) .....	20, 25
<i>Horowitz v. AT&amp;T, Inc.</i> , 2018 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 69191 (D.N.J. April 25, 2018) .....	25
<i>In re Spectrum All., LP, Bankr.</i> 2022 Bankr. LEXIS 175 (Bankr. E.D. Pa. Jan. 24, 2022) .....	13
<i>International Brotherhood of Teamsters v. United States</i> , 431 U.S. 324 (1977) .....	20
<i>Kubischta v. Schlumberger Tech. Corp.</i> , 2016 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 91556 (W.D. Pa. July 14, 2106) .....	25
<i>Mente v. Chev. Olds.</i> , 451 F. Appx 214 (3d Cir. 2011) .....	18, 19

...

<i>Quillon v. Tenet HealthSystem Philadelphia, Inc.,</i> 673 F.3d 221 (3d Cir. 2012) .....	24
<i>Romero v. Allstate Ins. Co.,</i> 52 F. Supp. 3d 715 (E.D. Pa. 2014) .....	19
<i>Sonos, Inc. v. D&amp;M Holdings Inc.,</i> 2016 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 105271 (D. Del. Aug. 10, 2016) .....	23
<b>STATUTES</b>	
29 U.S.C. § 216 .....	1
29 U.S.C. § 621 .....	1
29 U.S.C. § 623 .....	1
29 U.S.C. § 626 .....	1, 5
<b>RULES</b>	
Fed.R.Civ.P. 8 .....	12, 16
Fed.R.Civ.P. 12 .....	3, 16, 22

# 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.