

Sample Discovery Objections

EQUAL EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITY COMMISSION BALTIMORE DISTRICT OFFICE

IN THE MATTER OF:]	Current EEO File No.:
]	EEOC 123-45-6789X
Ive Ben Wronged,]	
]	
Complainant,]	
]	
vs.]	
]	AGENCY #1-H-234-4567-89
Secretary, Department of the Navy,]	OFO Appeal #01234567
]	
Agency.]	

COMPLAINANT'S OBJECTIONS AND RESPONSES TO AGENCY'S INTERROGATORIES

GENERAL OBJECTIONS: Complainant hereby OBJECTS to the Agency's Discovery on the grounds that said Discovery is overbroad, vague, overly burdensome, requests irrelevant, immaterial or inadmissible information or information protected by privilege, and/or contains multipart questions in violation of law, rule or regulation.

Interrogatory No. 1: Please provide the name, location, address, and telephone numbers of any and all witnesses who will testify in person and/or via affidavit or deposition on your behalf at the EEOC hearing.

OBJECTIONS: Complainant reiterates his General Objections and adds that he has not determined yet which witnesses "who will testify" and therefore this Interrogatory is premature. The following individuals **may** testify and/or have relevant information.

RESPONSE: Complainant contends that the following persons will be called to testify in person and/or via affidavit or deposition:

Arnold Sweater
Dana Sweater
Rabbi Hillel Teeshirt
Dr. Robert Blouse
Ronald Cufflink
Keith Ringaround
David Buttonhole

Interrogatory No. 2: State the relationship of each witness identified in Interrogatory No. 1 to your case and how long you have known each witness.

OBJECTIONS: Relevance.

RESPONSE: Complainant contends that the following relationships to the Complainant are held for persons identified in Interrogatory No. 1:

Name	Relationship	Known for how long
Arnold Sweater	Self	N/A
Dana Sweater	Spouse	15 yrs
Rabbi Hillel Teeshirt	Jewish Orthodox Rabbi	12 yrs
Dr. Robert Blouse	Treating physician/psychiatrist	3 years
Ronald Cufflink	Colleague	20 yrs
Keith Ringaround	Colleague	22 yrs
David Buttonhole	Colleague	21 yrs

Interrogatory No. 3: Provide a summary of the expected testimony of each witness identified in response to Interrogatory No. 1.

OBJECTIONS: Complainant reiterates and restates each Objection from above, and adds that this Interrogatory requests information subject to privilege, including attorney work product. Without waiving any privilege, Complainant responds as follows:

RESPONSE: Complainant contends that the following is a summary of the expected testimony for persons identified in Interrogatory No. 1:

Name	Summary of testimony
Arnold Sweater	<p>ABC and DE Division management officials have created a hostile workplace environment and have treated the Complainant adversely because of his religion and have retaliated against him because of his prior EEO activity and EEO related complaints.</p> <p>Complaints include but are not limited to being treated differently with respect to the terms and conditions of the Complainant's employment, lower than deserved performance ratings, restrictions on collaborations, slower than normal purchase request approvals, more stringent work monitoring than applied to others, and imposed work monitoring that is not mandated by the Complainant's job description.</p> <p>Official requests for an adjusted work schedule to accommodate the Complainant's religious observances and family responsibilities due to the disabling and chronic health</p>

	<p>condition of my spouse have not been approved even though they would cause no undue hardship to the Agency.</p> <p>On a continuous basis the Complainant has been denied reassignment to a more productive work environment where hostility and discrimination do not exist.</p> <p>On a continuous basis management officials have diminished and denigrated the Complainant's accomplishments and those of other Jews (or those perceived to be Jewish) currently or formerly in the ABCDE Division.</p> <p>The ABCDE Division has an ongoing pattern and practice of anti-Semitism and prejudice.</p> <p>On a continuous basis the Complainant has made his concerns known to Division management officials, the IG Office, and EEO Office, about discrimination and hostile work place environment. However, management officials have been non-responsive and have failed to act to correct the situation. The work place has contributed to increased distress, frustration, impatience, anxiety, sleeplessness, strained family relations, and a decrease in enjoyment of life (i.e., a depressed outlook) for the Complainant. The Complainant is tired and frustrated with the discrimination at work. The Complainant has decreased energy, impatience, and is drained from dealing with poor managers and too few supportive colleagues at work. The Complainant often desires to quit work due to unfair ratings and reviews, continuous nit-picking and trivial fault-finding. Other examples of discrimination at work are badgering of the Complainant and held up manuscripts. Examples of damages this has caused the Complainant at home are difficult relationships with his wife and children, etc.</p> <p>The Complainant is a loyal, dedicated, and trustworthy Navy employee.</p>
Dana Sweater	<p>On a continuous basis the Complainant worries about his livelihood because of discrimination and a hostile work place environment. Work related problems have contributed to adverse emotional and physical health effects, e.g., increased distress, frustration, impatience, anxiety, sleeplessness, and a decrease in the Complainant's enjoyment of life (i.e., a depressed outlook). Difficult relationships at home (with wife and children) have resulted from the discrimination and mistreatment of the Complainant at work. The Complainant is a hardworking, caring, and dedicated husband and father.</p>

Rabbi Hillel Teeshirt	The Complainant has daily religious and moral obligations, to include conducting morning and afternoon prayers, caring for wife and family, earning a livelihood, giving to charitable organizations, etc. The Complainant has frequently voiced his concerns about discrimination and a hostile work place environment for himself and other Jewish employees. The Complainant is a loyal, dedicated, and trustworthy Jew.
Dr. Robert Blouse	The Complainant has voiced concerns about discrimination and a hostile work place environment for many years. The Complainant has raised concerns about his increased distress, frustration, impatience, anxiety, sleeplessness, strained family relations, and a decrease in enjoyment of life (i.e., a depressed outlook). The Complainant has been concerned about having decreased energy, impatience, and difficult relationships with his wife and children.
Ronald Cufflink	The Complainant's scientific research for the Navy is very good. In the Navy organization there are good managers and poor managers. No Jews, good scientific women, or Blacks were put in management positions. Jewish scientists were not promoted despite greater numbers of publications. Another Jewish employee in the Division has also experienced vicious anti-Semitic attacks and a hostile work environment in the Division.
Keith Ringaround	There are cultural problems, a culture of anti-Semitism in the Division, wherein employees and managers shun people and allege the Jews or those perceived to be Jewish are not up to snuff. The Complainant has voiced concerns about discrimination and a hostile work place environment for many years. The Complainant has had undue hardships from his supervisors in publishing, collaborating with other top scientists of his choice, obtaining an approved alternate work schedule, spending customer funds that he brought in to the Laboratory, obtaining advanced leave for Jewish holidays, obtaining fair performance ratings based on merit and achievement, and obtaining a transfer to a more productive research group where no discrimination or prejudice exists. The Complainant is a loyal, dedicated, and trustworthy Navy employee.
David Buttonhole	The ABCDE Division has an ongoing pattern and practice of anti-Semitism and prejudice. The Complainant has voiced concerns about discrimination and a hostile work place

	environment for many years. The Complainant has had undue hardships from his supervisors in awarding his last promotion, publishing manuscripts, collaborating with other Jewish scientists, obtaining an approved alternate work schedule, borrowing leave for Jewish holidays, obtaining fair performance ratings based on merit and achievement, and obtaining a transfer to a more productive research group where no discrimination or prejudice exists. Division employees and managers have been overheard to make virulent anti-Semitic remarks and have brought false allegations against Jews and those perceived to be Jewish regarding the value of their research work and productivity. The Complainant is a loyal, dedicated, and trustworthy Navy employee.
--	---

Interrogatory No. 4: State the name, location, address, and telephone number of any and all persons who have information that is relevant to the issues in this appeal, but who are not listed in the response to Interrogatory No. 1, and the nature of the information that each of those persons possesses.

OBJECTIONS: Complainant reiterates and restates each Objection from above, and adds that this Interrogatory requests information subject to privilege, including attorney work product, and calls for speculation – i.e., how can Complainant know “all persons who have information that is relevant?” Complainant therefore reserves his right to object to this Interrogatory, and to supplement it with further information.. Without waiving any privilege, Complainant responds as follows:

RESPONSE: Complainant contends that one additional person has information that is relevant to the issues in this case:

Mickey Mouse
Naval Base Toronto, CA

Summary of relevant information: The Complainant and his colleagues have voiced concerns about discrimination and a hostile work place in ABCDE Division for many years. The Complainant is a hard-working, loyal, dedicated, and trustworthy Navy employee. The Complainant has had undue hardships from his supervisors in publishing, collaborating with other top scientists of his choice, and obtaining a transfer to a more productive research group where no discrimination or prejudice exists.

Interrogatory No. 5: Identify each agency employee you believe committed an act of discrimination, reprisal or other prohibited personnel action against you from January 1, 2000 to December 31, 2004.

OBJECTIONS: Complainant reiterates and restates each Objection from above, and adds that this Interrogatory requests information subject to privilege, including attorney work product. Further, the incidents are so numerous that it is impossible to name them all; the main ones are related here, but Complainant reserves the right to supplement this (and every other) Response. Without waiving any privilege, Complainant responds as follows:

RESPONSE: Complainant contends that the following Agency employees and managers have committed acts of discrimination, reprisal, and prohibited personnel action against the Complainant from January 1, 2000 to December 31, 2004:

1. Mickey Mouse
2. Donald Duck
3. Goofy

Interrogatory No. 6: Describe the precise manner in which you allege each agency employee identified in Interrogatory No. 5 committed a discriminatory act, reprisal or otherwise engaged in a prohibited personnel practice.

OBJECTIONS: Complainant reiterates and restates each Objection from above, and adds that this Interrogatory requests information subject to privilege, including attorney work product. Without waiving any privilege or objection, Complainant responds as follows:

RESPONSE: Complainant contends that the following actions (or inactions) by Agency employees and managers constituted acts of discrimination, reprisal, and prohibited personnel practice against the Complainant:

1. Mickey Mouse
 - a. Selected Jon Whitewash in 2001 as Division Chief after the Complainant and others had filed EEO grievances and related complaints against them due to discrimination, anti-Semitism, and/or harassment.
 - b. Selected Doug Nazi-in-disguise in 2003 as Division Chief after the Complainant and others had filed EEO grievances and related complaints against them due to discrimination, anti-Semitism, and/or harassment.
2. Daffy Duck
 - a. As the EEO Office Chief, approved for the Director the appointment of Jon Whitewash in 2001 as Division Chief after the Complainant and others had EEO and related complaints against them due to discrimination, anti-Semitism, and/or harassment.
 - b. As the EEO Office Chief, approved for the Director the appointment of Doug Nazi-in-disguise in 2003 as Division Chief

after the Complainant and others had EEO and related complaints against them due to discrimination, anti-Semitism, and/or harassment.

3. Doug Goofy
 - a. Assigned bogus research objectives to the Complainant with the help of Dennis the Menace, Jon Whitewash, and Ronald McDonald.
 - b. Repeatedly made false allegations against the Complainant regarding the value and quality of the Complainants research and productivity.
 - c. Explanations and proof of the Complainant's achievements were overruled, dismissed or ignored, and were forever subject to nit-picking and trivial fault-finding. The Complainant's supervisors regularly expressed doubts over the Complainant's performance and standard of work, however, the doubts lacked substantive and quantifiable evidence.
 - d. Never offered the Complainant the opportunity to earn religious comp time.
 - e. Repeatedly, rated the Complainant lower than deserved or recommended by other management officials.
 - f. Failed to respond to the Complainant's e-mails about concerns of hostile work place and discrimination from the Complainant's Branch supervisor and Team Leader.
 - g. Previously made the anti-Semitic comment, "The Navy doesn't care if it has Nazis working for it."
 - h. Previously, promoted to high level Division management a vocal Holocaust denier.
 - i. Repeatedly harassed and discriminated against the Complainant's Jewish or Jewish sympathizer colleagues.
 - j. Enabled and fostered a hostile work environment in the Division for Jewish employees and those perceived to be Jewish by failing to take any substantive corrective actions with regard to numerous and repeated complaints by the Complainant and his colleagues about anti-Semitism and discrimination and harassment.

Interrogatory No. 7: Describe how each act of discrimination, reprisal and/or prohibited personnel practice adversely affected a term or condition of your employment.

OBJECTIONS: Complainant reiterates and restates each Objection from above, and adds that this Interrogatory requests information subject to privilege, including attorney work product. Further, the incidents are so numerous that it is impossible to name them all; the main ones are related here, but Complainant reserves the right to supplement this (and every other) Response. Further, Complainant alleges that this Interrogatory is in

part irrelevant, since reprisal claims do not have to prove a tangible employment action. Without waiving any privilege, Complainant responds as follows:

RESPONSE: Complainant contends that the following statements describe how the acts of discrimination, reprisal, and prohibited personnel action given in Interrogatory No. 6 adversely affected the term or conditions of the Complainant's employment:

1. Lower than deserved performance ratings
2. Lower pay increases and/or bonus payouts
3. Delay in publishing
4. Degraded communication and information exchange with other scientists
5. Lower morale and esprit de corps
6. Personal depressed outlook and undue stress
7. Additional EEO grievances, attorney's costs and fees
8. Additional use of leave hours
9. Expenditure of additional effort and time to maintain or increase scientific productivity
10. More stringent work monitoring than applied to others
11. Increased ostracization from Team, Branch, and Division activities
12. Endured harmful reprisals and retaliations
13. Personal agenda and political ambition of managers resulted in continued harassment and discriminatory behaviors encountered by the Complainant and his colleagues.
14. Attempts to impose research requirements and procedures not mandated by the Complainant's job description.
15. Loss of faith in management; managers showed a poor example of Navy leadership.
16. Anti-Semitic slurs and personal support for Holocaust deniers created a hostile work environment for the Jewish Complainant
17. The work and scientific ethics of managers were sub-standard.
18. Managers did not answer scientific inquiries with integrity or sincerity. Instead they answered with contradictions and personal complaints.
19. Supporting and encouraging the ostracization of the Complainant was considered continued harassment and discriminatory behavior against the Complainant.
20. Non-constructive interference with the Complainant's performance of his job duties was unprofessional, not useful, and unethical.

Interrogatory No. 8: State the name, address, and telephone number of each person to whom you have made any statement or statements in any form, written, oral, typed, or by electronic transmission regarding the allegations in your appeal.

OBJECTIONS: Complainant contends that all statements regarding the allegations in his current EEO case made with his attorney are privileged. In addition, the Complainant contends that all statements regarding the allegations in his current EEO case made with his parents are immaterial to the proceedings. Complainant reiterates and restates each

Objection from above, and adds that this Interrogatory requests information subject to privilege, including attorney work product. Further, the incidents are so numerous that it is impossible to name them all; the main non-privileged ones are related here, but Complainant reserves the right to supplement this (and every other) Response. Without waiving any privilege, Complainant responds as follows:

RESPONSE: Complainant contends that he made statements regarding the allegations in his current EEO case with the following persons:

Name	Location/Address	Telephone
Dana Sweater		
Mr. & Mrs. Robert Sweater		
Michael J. Snider, Esq.	Snider & Associates, LLC 104 Church Lane, Suite 201 Baltimore, MD 21208	410-653-9060

Interrogatory No. 9: Provide the date of each statement, the form of each statement, whether written, oral, or by recording device, and the name, address, and telephone number of each person having possession of statements identified in Interrogatory No. 8 above, and provide a detailed summary of each oral statement;

OBJECTIONS: Complainant hereby OBJECTS to the Agency's Discovery on the grounds that said Discovery is overbroad, overly burdensome, and requests irrelevant, immaterial or inadmissible information or information protected by privilege, and/or contains multipart questions in violation of law, rule or regulation.

Complainant contends that all statements regarding the allegations in his current EEO case made with his attorney are privileged. In addition, the Complainant contends that all statements regarding the allegations in his current EEO case made with his parents are immaterial to the proceedings.

Complainant reiterates and restates each Objection from above, and adds that this Interrogatory requests information subject to privilege, including attorney work product. Further, the incidents are so numerous that it is impossible to name them all; the main ones are related here, but Complainant reserves the right to supplement this (and every other) Response. Without waiving any privilege, Complainant responds as follows:

RESPONSE: Complainant contends that he made the following statements regarding the allegations in his current EEO case with the following persons:

1. Dana Sweater
 - a. Oral statements made at home from January 2001-present.
 - i. The Complainant told his wife that his managers were not treating him well in comparison to others (non-Jews) and that he had filed

- formal EEO grievances against the Agency.
- ii. The Complainant said (as his wife was well aware from years earlier) that there was a pattern and practice of anti-Semitism in the BE Division and that he was looking to get a re-assignment to a better research group,
 - iii. The Complainant told his wife that his supervisors (P. and D.) were giving the Complainant undue hardships in obtaining an alternate work schedule.
 - iv. The Complainant told his wife that his supervisors (P. and J.) were giving the Complainant undue hardships in obtaining a re-assignment out of Division to a more productive and less hostile work environment.
 - v. The Complainant told his wife that that his supervisors (P. and J.) were giving the Complainant lower than deserved ratings.
 - vi. The Complainant told his wife that his supervisor (P.) was giving the Complainant undue hardships in publishing.
 - vii. The Complainant told his wife that the EEOCRA had rejected his claim of non-compliance of his negotiated settlement agreement.
 - viii. The Complainant told his wife that the ARL EEO office was inept at scheduling his mediation for which the negotiator would have the authority to approve all settlement options, like re-assignment out of Division.

Interrogatory No. 10: State whether you, your attorneys, or anyone acting on your behalf obtained statements in any form from any person regarding any of the facts alleged in your appeal. If so state the name, address, and telephone number of each person from whom any such statement was taken, the date on which each such statement was taken, the name(s) and address of the person(s) who took such statements, name(s) and address of the person(s) having custody of such statements, whether such statements were taken by writing, by recording device, by court reporter or stenographer, and provide a detailed summary of each oral statement.

OBJECTIONS: Complainant hereby OBJECTS to the Agency's Discovery on the grounds that said Discovery is overbroad, vague, overly burdensome, requests irrelevant, immaterial or inadmissible information or information protected by privilege, and/or contains multipart questions in violation of law, rule or regulation. Complainant reiterates and restates each Objection from above, and adds that this Interrogatory requests information subject to privilege, including attorney work product. Further, the incidents are so numerous that it is impossible to name them all; the main ones are related here, but Complainant reserves the right to supplement this (and every other) Response. Without waiving any privilege, Complainant responds as follows:

RESPONSE: Complainant contends that he obtained statements regarding the facts alleged in this EEO case from the following persons:

See prior response.

Interrogatory No. 11: With respect to each expert witness you intend to call at the hearing (if you intend to call any experts) state the expert's name and address, the area of his or her expertise, the subject matter on which each such expert is expected to testify, the substance of the facts and opinions to which each expert is expected to testify, and provide a summary of the grounds for each opinion of each such expert;

OBJECTIONS: Same as above.

RESPONSE: Complainant has not determined whether or not to call any expert witnesses at this time; if a determination is so made, this Interrogatory Response will be supplemented.

Interrogatory No. 12: If you are claiming any physical or emotional harm, to include stress, as a result of any action or failure to act by a government employee, state the name, business address, and business telephone number of each physician, psychologist, psychiatrist, or other medical practitioner you consulted during the period beginning January 1, 2000 and continuing to the present date.

OBJECTIONS: Complainant asserts and does not waive any doctor-patient privilege and explicitly directs the Agency to not contact any of his medical practitioners for any reason whatsoever connected with this case.

RESPONSE: Complainant consulted the following medical practitioners during the period beginning January 1, 2000 and continuing to the present date because of physical or emotional harm, to include stress, as a result of repeated actions and failures to act by multiple government employees.

Dr. A
Dr. B
C, LCSW-C
Dr. D

Interrogatory No. 13: For each such medical practitioner identified in Interrogatory 11, summarize the treatment and instructions you received from each practitioner.

OBJECTIONS: Complainant reiterates and restates each Objection from above, and adds that this Interrogatory requests information subject to privilege, including attorney work product. Complainant reserves the right to supplement this (and every other) Response. Without waiving any privilege, Complainant responds as follows:

RESPONSE: Complainant contends that the following is a summary of the treatment and instructions received from each practitioner identified in Interrogatory No. 11.

Dr. A	Prescribes medication to help alleviate symptoms aggravated by anxiety and stress. Provides medication management counseling. Prescribes medication to help alleviate sleeplessness.
Dr. B	Requires 3-5 month return visits for medical exams. Checks weight, heart, lungs, blood pressure, etc. Takes blood samples for cholesterol screening. Provides medication management counseling.
CLCSW-C	Provided stress and anxiety management counseling. Provided counseling on maintaining and improving productivity in a hostile workplace environment.
D	Prescribed medication to help alleviate symptoms aggravated by anxiety and stress. Provided medication management counseling.

Interrogatory No. 14: Identify any diary, calendar, or other document in or on which you recorded your activities during the period beginning in January 1, 2000 and ending December 31, 2004.

OBJECTIONS: See Standard Objections, above.

RESPONSE: Complainant contends that the following is a list of documents recording his activities during the period January 1, 2000 through December 31, 2004.

1. Chronology (1 file)
2. Time record (1 file)
3. Meeting notes (notepads)
4. Lab notes (multiple files)

Interrogatory No. 15: Identify by name, position, grade, and religion each employee you allege was treated more favorably than you from January 1, 2000 to the present.

OBJECTIONS: Complainant reiterates and restates each Objection from above, and adds that this Interrogatory requests information subject to privilege, including attorney work product. Further, the incidents are so numerous that it is impossible to name them all; the main ones are related here, but Complainant reserves the right to supplement this (and every other) Response. Without waiving any privilege, Complainant responds as follows:

RESPONSE: Complainant contends that the following is a list of Division employees that **WERE NOT** treated more favorably than the Complainant from January 1, 2000 to the present.

1. A
2. B

3. C
4. D

The Complainant contends that **ALL** other Division employees and managers **WERE** treated more favorably than the Complainant (in one or more ways) from January 1, 2000 to the present.

Interrogatory No. 16: State precisely how each employee identified in Interrogatory 15 was treated more favorably than you.

OBJECTIONS: Complainant reiterates and restates each Objection from above, and adds that this Interrogatory requests information subject to privilege, including attorney work product. Further, the incidents are so numerous that it is impossible to name them all; the main ones are related here, but Complainant reserves the right to supplement this (and every other) Response. Without waiving any privilege, Complainant responds as follows:

RESPONSE: The Complainant contends that each employee and manager in the Division **other than those specifically identified** in Interrogatory No. 15 was treated more favorably in one or more of the following manners:

1. Received higher performance ratings
2. Endured fewer (if any) hardships in publishing
3. Endured fewer (if any) hardships in requesting or obtaining leave
4. Endured fewer (if any) hardships in requesting or obtaining software
5. Endured fewer (if any) hardships in spending their customer funds to support their mission research objectives
6. Endured less stringent work monitoring
7. Endured less abuse, badgering, and false allegations regarding the quality, quantity, and value of their work.
8. Endured less abuse of their intellectual property rights.
9. Received more credit for actual achievements and accomplishments
10. Received more credit for interactions with other scientists within and outside the Laboratory.
11. Received more support from management for interactions with other scientists within and outside the Laboratory.
12. Received awards
13. Received more timely responses from their managers to address work place and job-related concerns.
14. Received more timely processing of Forms.
15. Endured fewer (if any) allegations of improper timekeeping or job performance
16. Endured fewer (if any) ethnic slurs or religious based discriminations
17. Endured fewer (if any) reprisals or retaliations due to prior EEO activity or EEO related complaints.

18. Were included in Division/Branch/ Team discussions, particularly regarding topics related to their scientific area of interest.
19. Were included in Division/Branch/ Team technical manuscript or contract proposal reviews, particularly regarding topics related to their scientific area of interest.
20. Maintained (in general) higher morale and esprit de corps

Interrogatory No. 17: Identify each request you made for an adjusted work schedule from January 1, 2000 through December 31, 2004. By identify I mean give the date of the request, the form of the request (oral, written, e-mail), to whom it was made, and the specific remedy requested.

OBJECTIONS: Complainant reiterates and restates each Objection from above, and adds that this Interrogatory requests information subject to privilege, including attorney work product. Further, the incidents are so numerous that it is impossible to name them all; the main ones are related here, but Complainant reserves the right to supplement this (and every other) Response. Without waiving any privilege, Complainant responds as follows:

RESPONSE: The Complainant contends that the following is a list of his requests for an adjusted work schedule from January 1, 2000 through December 31, 2004:

1. 30 August 2001, e-mail to P

The Complainant requested to arrive at work at 1130 Sunday through Friday.
2. 21 July 2003, e-mail to C

The Complainant requested to arrive at work at 1115 Monday through Friday and no later than 1500 on Sunday.

3. 21 July 2003, e-mail to D

The Complainant requested to work from 1115-1945 Monday through Thursday, 1115-1515 Friday and 1515-1915 on Sunday.

4. 24 July 2003, e-mail to P

The Complainant requested to work from 1115-1945 Monday through Thursday, 1115-1515 Friday, and 1515-1915 on Sunday.

Interrogatory No. 18: Describe the response received to each request identified in response to Interrogatory No: 17.

OBJECTIONS: Complainant reiterates and restates each Objection from above, and adds that this Interrogatory requests information subject to privilege, including attorney work product. Further, the incidents are so numerous that it is impossible to name them all; the main ones are related here, but Complainant reserves the right to supplement this (and every other) Response. Without waiving any privilege, Complainant responds as follows:

RESPONSE: The Complainant contends that the following list describes the responses received to his requests for an adjusted work schedule identified in Interrogatory No. 17:

1. "No"

Interrogatory No. 19: Please identify any physical limitations that impact your ability to care for your children. By identify, I mean give the medical diagnosis and impact of physical limitations on such activities as preparation of food, dressing and/or bathing children, operation of a motor vehicle, and similar activities.

OBJECTIONS: Complainant hereby OBJECTS to the Agency's Discovery on the grounds that said Discovery is overbroad, overly burdensome, and requests irrelevant, immaterial or inadmissible information or information protected by privilege, and/or contains multipart questions in violation of law, rule or regulation. Complainant reiterates and restates each Objection from above, and adds that this Interrogatory requests information subject to privilege, including attorney work product. Further, the facts are so numerous that it is impossible to name them all; the main ones are related here, but Complainant reserves the right to supplement this (and every other) Response. Without waiving any privilege, Complainant responds as follows:

RESPONSE: The Complainant contends that the following list describes the physical limitations that impact his ability to care for children:

1. chronic pain condition in lower extremities and lower back that resulted from two previous injuries.
2. disabled because of this chronic pain.
3. irreversible and agonizing nerve damage and unhealed, overly sensitive scar tissue in her right knee and left foot.
4. medical treatment 1-2 times per week.

Interrogatory No. 20: Is your wife employed outside the home? By employed I mean does she engage in activities that produce an income and/or engage in volunteer activities for non-profit organizations.

OBJECTIONS: Relevance, privilege.

Interrogatory No. 21: If your response to Interrogatory No. 20 is yes, give the name address and telephone number or her employer or the volunteer organization for which she works.

OBJECTIONS: Same as above.

Interrogatory No. 22: Describe in detail how your children are transported to and from school each day.

OBJECTIONS: Complainant hereby OBJECTS to the Agency's Discovery on the grounds that said Discovery requests irrelevant, immaterial or inadmissible information or information protected by privilege.

Interrogatory No. 23: Identify the place where you perform morning prayers. By identify I mean give the place name, address, and telephone number.

OBJECTIONS: Complainant reiterates and restates each Objection from above, and adds that this Interrogatory requests information subject to privilege, including attorney work product. Objection based upon relevance. Further, the information is so numerous that it is impossible to name them all; the main ones are related here, but Complainant reserves the right to supplement this (and every other) Response. Without waiving any privilege, Complainant responds as follows:

RESPONSE: The Complainant contends that he conducts weekday morning prayers at work in his office.

The Complainant contends that he conducts silent (or quiet) meditation and prayer in his office (most often from 1100-1145 and later at or close to sunset for approx. 10 minutes) at work to meet daily religious obligations.

The Complainant contends that this activity is done on his own time (as one who engages in physical exercise activities) and does not in any way affect his scientific productivity or cause any hardship to the normal business of the Agency.

The Complainant contends that only occasionally he conducts weekday morning prayers from 0900-1030 AM Synagogue.

The Complainant contends that only rarely he conducts weekday morning prayers from 0630-0730 and/or from 0915-1015 AM at Synagogue #2.

Interrogatory No. 24: State the time of day that daily prayer services are available at the location identified above.

OBJECTIONS: Same as above.

RESPONSE: The Complainant contends that no daily prayer services with a quorum are available at the U.S. Navy Laboratory.

Interrogatory No. 25: Please identify the specific term of the negotiated settlement agreement you signed on 24 July 1998 you allege management attempted to coerce you to change. By identify I mean give the page, paragraph, and line of the agreement management wanted to change.

OBJECTIONS: Confidential.

Interrogatory No. 26: State precisely how management wanted to change the term of the agreement identified in Interrogatory No. 25 above.

OBJECTIONS: Confidential.

Respectfully Submitted,

Michael J. Snider, Esq.
Law Offices of Snider & Associates,

LLC