

<p align="center"><b>CHARGE OF DISCRIMINATION</b></p> <p align="center"><small>form is affected by the Privacy Act of 1974. See enclosed Privacy Act Statement and other information before completing this form.</small></p>	<p>Charge Presented to: Agency(ies) Charge No(s):</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> FEPA <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> EEOC</p>
---	---

Maryland Commission on Human Relations and EEOC

State or local Agency, if any

Name (indicate Mr. Ms. Mrs.) <b>Candis Riggins</b>	Home Phone (incl. Area Code) [REDACTED]	Date of Birth [REDACTED]
---	--	-----------------------------

Street Address City, State and ZIP Code  
[REDACTED]

Named is the Employer, Labor Organization, Employment Agency, Apprenticeship Committee, or State or Local Government Agency That I believe Discriminated Against Me or Others. (If more than two, list under PARTICULARS below.)

Name <b>Wal-Mart Stores, Inc. (doing business as Walmart)</b>	No. Employees, Members Approximately: <b>More than 15</b>	Phone No. (Include Area Code) <b>(301) 604-0180</b>
--	---	--

Street Address City, State and ZIP Code  
**3549 Russett Green, Laurel, MD 20724**

Name	No. Employees, Members	Phone No. (Include Area Code)
------	------------------------	-------------------------------

Street Address City, State and ZIP Code

<p>DISCRIMINATION BASED ON (Check appropriate box(es).)</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> RACE <input type="checkbox"/> COLOR <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> SEX <input type="checkbox"/> RELIGION <input type="checkbox"/> NATIONAL ORIGIN</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> RETALIATION <input type="checkbox"/> AGE <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> DISABILITY <input type="checkbox"/> OTHER (Specify below.)</p>	<p>DATE(S) DISCRIMINATION TOOK PLACE</p> <table style="width:100%; border: none;"> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;"><small>Earliest</small></td> <td style="text-align: center;"><small>Latest</small></td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;"><b>3/14</b></td> <td style="text-align: center;"><b>5/19/14</b></td> </tr> <tr> <td colspan="2" style="text-align: center;"><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> CONTINUING ACTION</td> </tr> </table>	<small>Earliest</small>	<small>Latest</small>	<b>3/14</b>	<b>5/19/14</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> CONTINUING ACTION	
<small>Earliest</small>	<small>Latest</small>						
<b>3/14</b>	<b>5/19/14</b>						
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> CONTINUING ACTION							

THE PARTICULARS ARE (If additional paper is needed, attached extra sheet(s)):

**Please see attached.**

<p>I want this charge filed with both the EEOC and the State or local Agency, if any. I will advise the agencies if I change my address or phone number and I will cooperate fully with them in the processing of my charge in accordance with their procedures.</p>	<p>NOTARY – When necessary for State and Local Agency Requirements</p>
--	--

<p>I declare under penalty of perjury that the above is true and correct.</p>	<p>I swear or affirm that I have read the above charge and that it is true to the best of my knowledge, information and belief.</p> <p>SIGNATURE OF COMPLANANT</p>   <p>SUBSCRIBED AND SWORN TO BEFORE ME THIS DATE (month, day, year)</p>
<p>_____ Date</p> <p>_____ Charging Party Signature</p>	

Attachment to EEOC Charge of Discrimination  
Filed by Charging Party Candis Riggins against Wal-Mart Stores, inc.

Charging Party Candis Riggins is Represented by:

A Better Balance  
80 Maiden Lane, Suite 606  
New York, NY 10038  
(212) 430-5982

Mehri & Skalet, PLLC  
1250 Connecticut Ave., NW, Ste. 300  
Washington, DC 20036  
(202) 822-5100  
(202) 822-4997 (fax)

National Women's Law Center  
11 Dupont Circle, NW, Ste. 800  
Washington, DC 20036  
(202) 588-5180

The particulars are:

On her own behalf, Candis Riggins claims that her former employer, Wal-Mart Stores, Inc. (Wal-Mart) discriminated against her on the basis of her gender and because of pregnancy and disability by: (1) failing to accommodate her during her pregnancy, such as providing light duty, temporary alternative duty, or other accommodations; (2) treating her differently from individuals similar in their ability or inability to work; and (3) terminating her employment in violation of Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 as amended, the Americans with Disabilities Act as amended, and Maryland pregnancy and disability discrimination law.

Candis Riggins also brings her charge of discrimination on behalf of all female sales associates who have been employed by Wal-Mart and its subsidiaries within the 300 days prior to the filing of the charge of discrimination of another pregnant worker (EEOC Charge No. [REDACTED], January 11, 2014, through the date the charge of discrimination and any resultant litigation is resolved. Wal-Mart has engaged in systemic discrimination against the class by engaging in a pattern or practice of failing to accommodate employees with pregnancy-related disabilities and of failing to treat pregnant women the same as other individuals who are similar in their ability or inability to work, in violation of the Americans with Disabilities Act as amended and Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 as amended.

Prior to March, 2014, Wal-Mart's written policies regarding light duty, temporary alternative duty and accommodation singled out pregnancy as a medical condition not eligible for alternative duty, light duty or other identified accommodations. The policy did not treat pregnant workers the same as workers similar in their ability or inability to work, such as, for example, workers who had disabilities that required accommodation. Wal-Mart provided reasonable accommodations to workers with disabilities unless it posed an undue hardship, but held workers with limitations arising out of pregnancy to a much higher standard, in violation of the Pregnancy Discrimination Act (PDA). Pregnant workers were only eligible for the more limited category of job aids or environmental adjustments when the aid

or adjustment would be “easily accommodated” and would have “no negative impact on the business.” After pressure from legal advocacy and worker’s rights groups, including a charge filed on behalf of another pregnant worker (EEOC Charge No. [REDACTED] on March 5, 2014, in a letter to the U.S. Securities and Exchange Commission, Wal-Mart announced a change in its policies related to pregnancy accommodation. The Revised Policy states that disabilities entitled to reasonable accommodation include “a temporary disability caused by pregnancy.” However, Wal-Mart’s treatment of Candis Riggins demonstrates that adoption of the new policy has failed to change Wal-Mart’s pattern and practice of treating pregnant workers different from individuals similar in their ability or inability to work.

Ms. Riggins started working as a full-time maintenance associate at the Laurel, Maryland Wal-Mart store on June 7, 2013. Maintenance associates clean the store and bathrooms. In early March, 2014, at 23 weeks pregnant, Ms. Riggins started to feel nauseated by the harsh chemicals she used when cleaning the bathrooms. She approached a co-manager and told him she was pregnant and that the chemicals in the bathroom were making her sick, and she asked if she could temporarily work as a cashier. The co-manager agreed to reassign her for that day and did so from time to time thereafter, since the store was sometimes short-staffed of cashiers. However, this was not a formal arrangement, and Ms. Riggins was not permitted to work as a cashier on those occasions when the store was not short-staffed. When she was not permitted to work as a cashier, Ms. Riggins was required to continue to clean with harsh chemicals. Within days of speaking with the co-manager, she went to the Emergency Room because she was feeling very ill. She told the doctors there about her job duties and they told her that she should not be working with the chemicals at the store, since it could harm her fetus and herself.

A few weeks later, at 25 weeks pregnant, Ms. Riggins again spoke with a manager about changing jobs based on her health concerns. This time, the manager told her to submit a Career Preference form requesting to change jobs—from maintenance to cashier or sales associate. Ms. Riggins submitted the form on the Wal-Mart store computer, but never received a response. It was the first of many Career Preference forms she submitted.

Ms. Riggins was qualified to be a cashier; in fact, she performed these duties on four or five occasions after her initial request in early March. Two to three new cashiers were hired every two weeks after Ms. Riggins submitted the first Career Preference form in which she asked to be a cashier. These new cashiers were hired instead of Ms. Riggins despite the fact that she was available, ready, and willing to take a position as a cashier. Although Wal-Mart refused to accommodate Ms. Riggins, another employee in the store, “Bob,” with an on-the-job back injury was provided with an accommodation in or around February, 2014—he was transferred to be a door greeter.

In early April, at 30 weeks pregnant, Ms. Riggins was sitting at a bus stop on her way to work and passed out, dropping to the ground. She went to the hospital, and was again told she should not be working around harsh chemicals. She went back to work the next day, but left early to go back to the hospital since she continued to feel very ill.

In mid-April, at 32 weeks pregnant, Ms. Riggins returned to work and told her assistant manager that she had been in the hospital because of pregnancy-related complications. She again requested lighter duty, because the chemicals she had to use as a maintenance associate continued to make her ill and because she was experiencing significant back pain. Her doctor had advised her that the back pain was caused and exacerbated by the repeated bending and lifting required by the maintenance work. The manager told her that, instead of cleaning the bathrooms, she could sweep, mop, and clean the doors in the store. Ms. Riggins attempted to do this, but her back still hurt and the chemicals used for cleaning

the doors still made her sick. She continued to ask for accommodations. On or about April 20<sup>th</sup>, Ms. Riggins was asked to work as a greeter at the store entrance. There was a stool at the entrance, so she sat down while performing the job. Shortly after, a co-manager told her she could not sit on the stool, despite the fact that injured workers were allowed to use stools while working as greeters. Ms. Riggins stood for 8 hours as a result. Because of her continuing symptoms of pain and nausea, and because of Wal-Mart's refusal to provide her with reasonable accommodations, Ms. Riggins decided that she could no longer risk her health and her baby's health and thereafter began to call out sick, losing critical income.

In mid-May, Ms. Riggins received a letter stating that she was terminated effective May 19, 2014.

While she was pregnant, no one at Wal-Mart ever engaged with Ms. Riggins in a discussion of her job duties and what she could or could not do at work, although she repeatedly raised concerns about the impact her job duties were having on her health and the health of her pregnancy with multiple managers and submitted multiple Career Preference forms seeking to transfer to a cashier position. Ms. Riggins was never provided with a Request for Accommodation form or told about Wal-Mart's new policy of accommodating pregnancy-related temporary disabilities. Wal-Mart accommodated individuals with other medical conditions at Ms. Riggins' store.

Wal-Mart's policies and practices with regard to accommodation of employees with medical conditions are centrally controlled, and, as such, Ms. Riggins' experiences at Wal-Mart are similar to those of other female sales associates.

In summary, Wal-Mart discriminated against Ms. Riggins because of her gender, including her pregnancy and pregnancy-related conditions, and because of her disability. Wal-Mart has engaged in a pattern or practice of gender discrimination against female sales associates and in policies or practices that have a disparate impact against women. Wal-Mart's treatment of Ms. Riggins does not comply with the law and confirms that adoption of the new policy has failed to ensure that Wal-Mart will treat pregnant associates in accordance with legal requirements. Ms. Riggins brings her charge of discrimination on behalf of herself and all similarly situated women.