

DAVID STRAS AND AGE DISCRIMINATION

Highlights:

- David Stras ruled in favor of age discrimination.

Stras Ruled In Favor Of Age Discrimination

IN PETERSON V. CITY OF MINNEAPOLIS, PETERSON FILED AN AGE DISCRIMINATION COMPLAINT WHICH WAS AFFIRMED BY THE MINNESOTA SUPREME COURT

Peterson Filed An Age Discrimination Lawsuit After Their Employer Dismissed A Complaint Whose Investigation Lasted More Than One Year, The State Wanted Dismiss The Case Because Peterson Filed It Outside The One-Year Statute Of Limitations. According to Case Text, “In Peterson v. City of Minneapolis, Peterson filed a complaint with the human resources department under the City’s ‘Respect in the Workplace Policy’ in November 2011. Following an investigation that lasted more than one year (concluding in January 2013), the City determined it could not substantiate his claim. Peterson then filed an age discrimination lawsuit under the MHRA. The City moved for summary judgment, arguing that Peterson’s claim was time-barred because he filed it outside the one-year statute of limitations. While the district court agreed and dismissed the claim, the court of appeals reversed. The Minnesota Supreme Court affirmed.” [Case Text, accessed [6/24/24](#)]

STRAS DISSENTED FROM A DECISION ALLOWING PETERSON’S SUIT TO GO FORWARD

The Minnesota Supreme Court Affirmed A Lower Court Decision That Allowed The Suit To Go Forward. According to Case Text, “In Peterson v. City of Minneapolis, Peterson filed a complaint with the human resources department under the City’s ‘Respect in the Workplace Policy’ in November 2011. Following an investigation that lasted more than one year (concluding in January 2013), the City determined it could not substantiate his claim. Peterson then filed an age discrimination lawsuit under the MHRA. The City moved for summary judgment, arguing that Peterson’s claim was time-barred because he filed it outside the one-year statute of limitations. While the district court agreed and dismissed the claim, the court of appeals reversed. The Minnesota Supreme Court affirmed.” [Case Text, accessed [6/24/24](#)]

Stras Agreed With Justice Anderson In The Belief That Peterson Was Not In A Dispute Resolution Process So The Statute Of Limitation Did Not Need To Be Suspended Thus Peterson Should Not Have Won His Suit. According to Case Text, “ANDERSON, Justice (dissenting). I respectfully dissent. The plain language of Minn. Stat. § 363A.28, subd. 3(b) (2016), requires that the parties be engaged in a ‘dispute resolution process’ to suspend the statute of limitations for a claim of unlawful discrimination under the Minnesota Human Rights Act (MHRA). Because the City of Minneapolis’s Respect in the Workplace Policy is not a dispute resolution process and the complainant was unable to engage in the Workplace Policy investigation, the statute of limitations here was not suspended under the statute, the complaint was not timely filed, and I would accordingly reverse the decision of the court of appeals. [...] STRAS, Justice (dissenting). I join in the dissent of Justice Anderson.” [Case Text, accessed [6/24/24](#)]