

Bodman PLC June 30, 2025

## Supreme Court Eliminates "Background Circumstances" Test for Title VII Claims

By: Michelle L. Kolkmeyer, Member, Workplace Law Group

In a unanimous decision, the United States Supreme Court has formalized and affirmed the legal standard for employment discrimination claims for non-minority groups under Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964.

## What Changed?

Previously, some courts, including the Sixth Circuit, required majority-group employees (such as white, male, heterosexual, or non-minority employees) to meet a heightened burden when bringing discrimination claims. This heightened burden, deemed the "background circumstances" test, required plaintiffs to present extra evidence suggesting that the employer could be biased against majority-group members.

In Ames v. Department of Youth Services, the Sixth Circuit relied on that test to dismiss a heterosexual woman's claim that she was discriminated against based on her sexual orientation. The Supreme Court reversed, holding that Title VII protects any individual from discrimination based on race, color, religion, sex, or national origin—regardless of majority or minority status. The court emphasized that Title VII contains no language that limits protection only to members of historically marginalized groups.

## What Does This Mean for Employers?

This decision broadens the scope of who can bring a discrimination claim and eliminates the distinction between "majority" and "minority" employees. Any adverse action perceived to be taken "because of" a protected characteristic can form the basis of a claim—no extra evidentiary hurdle applies.

## **Takeaways for Employers:**

To mitigate risk, employers should ensure that *all* employment decisions, regardless of the employee's demographics, are:

Copyright 2025 Bodman PLC. Bodman has prepared this for informational purposes only. Neither this message nor the information contained in this message is intended to create, and receipt of it does not evidence, an attorney-client relationship. Readers should not act upon this information without seeking professional counsel. Individual circumstances or other factors might affect the applicability of conclusions expressed in this message.

- 1. Based on objective, job-related reasons;
- 2. Consistently applied across the workforce;
- 3. Thoroughly documented, including performance issues, disciplinary steps, and supporting evidence;
- 4. Reviewed with Human Resources before action is taken.

This decision is a reminder that Title VII protections apply to everyone and that robust documentation and clear, nondiscriminatory justifications for employment decisions are essential.

Please contact the author, Michelle L. Kolkmeyer (248-925-1935 | mkolkmeyer@bodmanlaw.com), or any member of Bodman's Workplace Law Group if you have questions regarding any of the information above. Bodman cannot respond to your questions or receive information from you without establishing an attorney-client relationship and clearing potential conflicts with other clients. Thank you for your patience and understanding.

WORKPLACE LAW GROUP	JOHN DAVID GARDINER Chair 616-205-3123 jgardiner@bodmanlaw.com	REBECCA C. SEGUIN-SKRABUCHA Vice Chair 248-925-1936 rseguin-skrabucha@bodmanlaw.com	JOHN T. BELOW 248-743-6035 jbelow@bodmanlaw.com
	JOHN C. CASHEN Of Counsel 248-743-6077 jcashen@bodmanlaw.com	MACKENZIE E. CLARK 248-925-1926 mclark@bodmanlaw.com	AMANDA McSWEEN EMPEY 313-392-1056 aempey@bodmanlaw.com
	GARY S. FEALK 248-743-6060 gfealk@bodmanlaw.com	AARON D. GRAVES 313-392-1075 agraves@bodmanlaw.com	MICHELLE L. KOLKMEYER 248-743-6031 mkolkmeyer@bodmanlaw.com
	KAREN L. PIPER Of Counsel 248-743-6025 kpiper@bodmanlaw.com	CAMERON D. RITSEMA 616-205-4358 critsema@bodmanlaw.com	DAVID B. WALTERS 248-743-6052 dwalters@bodmanlaw.com