

8/58 2:21 pm red-stUNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIAMATTHEW F. FOGG,
Plaintiff,

v.

JANET RENO,
Defendant.

Civil Action No. 94-2814 (TPJ)

JURY INTERROGATORIES

1. Do you find that the plaintiff, Matthew Fogg, was subjected to and affected by a working environment that was racially hostile to African-American Deputy U.S. Marshals prior to November 21, 1991?

YES ☒ NO ☐

2. Do you find that the plaintiff, Matthew Fogg, was subjected to and affected by a working environment that was racially hostile to African-American Deputy U.S. Marshals on and after November 21, 1991?

YES ☒ NO ☐

3. Do you find that defendant U.S. Marshals Service discriminated against plaintiff Matthew Fogg, by disparate treatment and/or retaliation, in the following instances:

a. By his reprimand from Chief Hein in 1985 and his subsequent removal from the Welch/Columb Task Force and transfer to Superior Court?

YES ☒ NO ☐

b. By the promotion of Deputy Slack rather than plaintiff to a GS-12 position in 1986?

YES ___ NO ☒

c. By the failure to take timely action on plaintiff's 1985 EEO complaint?

YES ☒ NO ___

d. By the failure to give plaintiff annual performance ratings for the two year period beginning in April 1990?

YES ☒ NO ___

e. By the promotion of Deputy Earp rather than plaintiff in May 1990?

YES ☒ NO ___

f. By the alleged failure to promote plaintiff to a GM-13 position while he was on the Metropolitan Area Task Force?

YES ☒ NO ___

g. By the failure to promote plaintiff to a GM-14 position while he was on the Metropolitan Area Task Force?

YES ☒ NO ___

h. By limiting plaintiff's supervisory duties on the Metropolitan Area Task Force in March 1992?

YES ☒ NO ___

i. By inquiring about plaintiff's Equal Employment Opportunity activities during his working hours in 1993?

YES ☒ NO ☐

j. By ordering plaintiff back to work in September 1994?

YES ☒ NO ☐

k. By returning plaintiff to the GM-12 level in December 1994?

YES ☒ NO ☐

l. By ordering plaintiff to report for a fitness-for-duty examination in 1995?

YES ☒ NO ☐

m. By dismissing plaintiff from the U.S. Marshals Service on grounds of insubordination in September 1995?

YES ☒ NO ☐

4. If the answer to number 2 and/or any of questions 3(f) through (m) above is YES, please indicate in the space below the amount of damages that plaintiff should be awarded for his pecuniary losses (property losses and credit damage) as well as for his emotional pain and suffering, inconvenience, embarrassment, humiliation, mental anguish and loss of enjoyment of life caused by the hostile racial environment and/or discrimination since November 21, 1991.

\$ four million (\$4,000,000.-)

5. Had defendant U.S. Marshals Service not maintained a working environment racially hostile to African-American Deputy U.S. Marshals, and had defendant not engaged in acts of discrimination against plaintiff Matthew Fogg, please indicate below the pay level that Matthew Fogg would have risen to in the U.S. Marshals Service by today:

Senior Executive Service _____

GS-15 (Chief Deputy) ✓ _____

GS-14 (Supervisor) _____

GS-13 _____

GS-12 _____