

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS
TYLER DIVISION

DEREK T. TROUTMAN,

Plaintiff,

vs.

TEVA PHARMACEUTICALS USA,
INC. and TEVA SALES AND
MARKETING, INC.

Defendants.

§
§
§
§
§
§
§
§
§
§

CIVIL ACTION NO. 6:22-CV-395

JURY TRIAL DEMANDED

DEREK T. TROUTMAN'S RESPONSE IN OPPOSITION TO
TEVA PHARMACEUTICALS USA, INC. AND TEVA SALES
AND MARKETING, INC.'S MOTION FOR SUMMARY JUDGMENT

Dated: April 9, 2024

Respectfully submitted,

KILGORE & KILGORE, PLLC

Clark B. Will

Texas Bar No. 21502500

THE LAW OFFICE OF CLARK B. WILL, P.C.

Member of Kilgore & Kilgore, PLLC

3141 Hood Street, Suite 500

Dallas, TX 75219

Telephone: (214) 379-0834

Facsimile: (214) 379-0838

E-mail: cbw@kilgorelaw.com

And

WASH & THOMAS

Danny C. Wash

Texas Bar No. 20896000

6613 Sanger Ave.

Waco, Texas 76710

(254) 776-3611

(254) 776-9217 - Fax Number

danwash@washthomas.com

ATTORNEYS FOR PLAINTIFF

DEREK T. TROUTMAN

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that a true and correct copy of the foregoing document has been served upon the following counsel of record by electronic mail (e-mail) and/or ECF electronic service on this the 9th day of April, 2024.

David B. Jordan
LITTLER MENDELSON, P.C.
A PROFESSIONAL CORPORATION
1301 McKinney Street Suite
1900 Houston, TX 77010
713.951.9400 (Telephone)
713.951.9212 (Telecopier)
djordan@littler.com

/s/ Clark B. Will

Clark B. Will

TABLE OF CONTENTS

TABLE OF EXHIBITS.....iii

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES.....iv

I. SUMMARY OF PLAINTIFF’S RESPONSE TO DEFENDANTS’ KEY ARGUMENTS.....1

II. PLAINTIFF’S RESPONSE TO DEFENDANTS’ ISSUES TO BE DECIDED.....2

III. RESPONSE TO TEVA’S “UNDISPUTED” STATEMENT OF FACTS.....3

IV. INTRODUCTION.....3

V. ARGUMENTS AND AUTHORITIES.....6

Summary Judgment Standard.....6

Fact Issues Exist as to Each Element of Derek’s Discrimination Claims.....6

Derek Had a Bona Fide Religious Belief.....8

Teva’s Litany of District Court Opinions from Other Circuits.....9

Teva’s Citations at Odds with the Fifth Circuit.....9

Teva Ignores N. Dist. Opinion Rejecting Their Arguments.....10

Derek’s Requests for Accommodation Were Reasonable.....15

Derek Could Perform His Essential Job Functions Even Accommodated.....15

This Court Must Follow Current Supreme Court Precedent.....18

Harper Requires the Court to Follow Groff.....19

Teva Has Not Established “Undue Hardship” as a Matter of Law.....20

Groff and Hebrew Show Teva Has Not Proven Undue Hardship as a Matter of Law.....21

There is Evidence that Teva USA was Derek’s Employer.....25

There is Evidence of Teva’s Retaliation for Derek Seeking Accommodation.....26

Derek Has a Valid Claim for Loss of Community Property Interest.....27

IV. PRAYER.....30

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Cases

Alkhalwaldeh v. Dow Chem. Co. 851 F.3d 422, 427 (5th Cir. 2017) 26

Anderson v. General Dynamics Convair Aerospace Division, 589 F.2d 397, 402
(9th Cir. 1978), *cert. denied*..... 23

Baker v. The Home Depot, 445 F.3d 541, 547 (2nd Cir. 2006)..... 10, 11

Barber v. Nabors Drilling U.S.A., Inc., 130 F. 3d 702, 708 (5th Cir.1997) 11, 15

Bordeaux v. Lions Gate Ent., Inc., Dist. Ct. Central Dist CA., Nov. 21, 2023) 9

Brown v. ATX Grp. Inc., WL 3962617 at *19-20 (N.D. Tex. Jul 16, 2012)..... 30

Brown v. General Motors Corp., 601 F.2d 956, 961 (8th Cir. 1979) 23

Burton v. Freescale Semiconductor, Inc. 798 F.3d 222, 236-37 (5th Cir.2015) 28

Burwell v. Hobby Lobby Stores, Inc., 573 U.S. 682, 725, 134 S. Ct. 2751,
189 L. Ed. 2d 675 (2014) 11

Busby v. Busby,457 S.W.2d 551 (Tex. 1970); *Galarza v. Union Bus Lines, Inc.*,
38 F.R.D. 401, 404 (S.D. Tex. 1965)..... 30

Bushouse v. Local Union 2209, 164 F. Supp. 2d 1066, 1076 n.15 (N.D. Ind. 2001) 11

Casey Enterprises, Inc. v. American Hardware Mutual Inc. Co., 655 F. 2d 598
(5th Cir. 1981)..... 6

Celotex Corp. v. Catrett, 477 U.S. 317, 323-25 (1986)..... 6

Chandler v. City of Dallas, 2 F.3d 1385, 1393-94 (5th Cir. 1993), *cert. denied*,
114 S.Ct. 1386 (1994)..... 11, 16

Chevron Phillips Chem., 570 F.3d at 621 18, 20

Cook v. Chrysler Corp., 981 F.2d 336, 339 (8th Cir. 1992), *cert. denied* 23

Dillard v. City of Austin, Texas 837 F.3d 557, 562-63 (5th Cir. 2016) 18

Draper v. United States Pipe and Foundry Co., 527 F.2d 515, 520 (6th Cir. 1975)..... 23

E.E.O.C. v. Abercrombie & Fitch Stores, Inc., 575 U.S. 768, 771,
135 S. Ct. 2028, 192 L. Ed. 2d 35 (2015) 7, 8, 14

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.