

Trouble with images? [View](#) as a Web page.

 Facebook

 Twitter

 More...

Polsinelli
Shughart



LABOR & EMPLOYMENT LAW

IN THE NEWS

September 2012

Dream Act Might Be a Nightmare for Employers



ATTORNEYS

W. Terrence Kilroy
Practice Area Chair

Anthony J. Romano
Practice Area Vice Chair

Carol C. Barnett
Jeffrey S. Bell
Gillian McKean Bidgood
Jon A. Bierman
Jill M. Borgonzi
Jack L. Campbell
Stacy A Carpenter
Jay M. Dade
Robert E. Entin
Sean R. Gallagher
Karen R. Glickstein
Marc D. Goldstein
Mark B. Grebel
Elizabeth T. Gross
Robert J. Hingula
JoAnne Spears Jackson
Christopher L. Johnson

On August 15, 2012, the Immigration Service began accepting applications for deferred action from certain individuals under 31 years of age who arrived in the United States more than five years ago as children under the age of sixteen. Deferred action is a discretionary decision by the Department of Homeland Security not to pursue immigration enforcement (e.g. deportation) for a specific period of time. The deferred action program is commonly referred to as a "Dream Act;" however, what is one individual's dream may turn into a nightmare for an employer.

As part of applying for deferred action qualifying aliens are also eligible for employment authorization. Generally, work permit applications take two to three months to process so by this fall, potentially hundreds of thousands of individuals will receive lawful permission to work in the United States. Some of these individuals might already be employed by your company.

Employees provide at the time of hire documents to confirm their identity and ability to work in the United States (the I-9 requirements). It is not uncommon for undocumented employees to provide false documents to gain employment and which employers unknowingly accept. What is an employer to do when a current employee seeks to provide a new work permit or other document with different information than on the documents provided to complete the I-9 at the time of hire?

Bradley G. Kafka
Jamie Zveitel Kwiatek
Alison P. Lungstrum
Chris M. Mason
Blair H. Moses
Eric E. Packel
William S. Robbins Jr.
Erin D. Schilling
James C. Sullivan
Christopher C. Swenson
Eric M. Trelz
Lynn G. Trevino-Legler
Johnny S. Wang
Mark W. Weisman
Judy Yi
Brian J. Zickefoose

To learn more
about our
Labor and Employment
group, click [here](#)

polsinelli.com

What Should Employers Do?

In this case, the “knee jerk” reaction of many employers is to discharge the employee for lying on an employment application and/or providing false employment documents. And if employers have fired other employees in the past, for falsifying applications, resumes, and similar documentation, employers may be able to do so with limited exposure. The word may is emphasized, however, because no federal agency (neither the Department of Labor (“DOL”), the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission (“EEOC”), the Department of Justice Office of Special Counsel for Immigration-Related Unfair Employment Practices (“OSC”), nor the National Labor Relations Board (“NLRB”)) has commented on the Dream Act or provided any guidance to employers as to what to do when current employees provide the new, lawful work authorizations. This lack of guidance is frustrating because all employees who would have lied on such employment documents will belong to a protected class, and adverse employment actions probably will be scrutinized by the very agencies that have failed to provide a roadmap for compliance.

Notwithstanding, companies should not feel compelled to continue to employ employees who dishonestly gained employment. If an employer believes that it has no choice but to fire an employee, lying or falsifying employment documentation is a facially neutral reason that should be used as justification for all terminations. Employers who have “honesty policy” provisions in employee handbooks or other personnel policies should specifically refer to them in all documentation. Employers who do not have such policies should consider revising their handbooks to include them. Significantly, employers should self-audit their own employee files to ensure that discharge is consistent with past practice. If offenses like this in the past only have led to warnings or suspensions, levying a heftier punishment could lead to an inference of pretext. Finally, employers should not justify any termination decision based on “failure to possess the proper papers.” Similar to the problems with “no match” letters, such decisions disparately impact a certain segment of the population belonging to a different national origin, and federal agencies have not been tolerant of such excuses.

For the Dreamer employees who continue in employment, employers are advised to complete a new I-9 form and attach to the initial I-9 created at the time of hire.

Hopefully, some guidance will be forthcoming by the time that employers feel the impact of the Dream Act. Regardless, an employer facing this type of documentary nightmare should consider the immigration regulations as well as state employment laws in charting a course of action. Employers are advised to seek the assistance of legal counsel who can assist in both of these areas.

For More Information

To learn more about the impact of the Dream Act, please contact the authors of this alert or another member of Polsinelli Shughart's Labor and Employment practice group:

- Jeff Bell | 816.360.4264 | jbelle@polsinelli.com (Kansas City)
- Rob Entin | 312.873.3610 | rentin@polsinelli.com (Chicago)

Polsinelli Shughart | In the News

Headlines and Bylines from polsinelli.com



- ▶ [Silicon Prairie News Names Polsinelli Shughart Attorney 2012 Startup Service Provider of the Year](#)
- ▶ [Gray Area Surrounds Work Cellphone Privacy Debate](#)
- ▶ Video: [Polsinelli Shughart - Legal Insights, Strategic Advantage](#)
- ▶ e-Alert: [Employment Eligibility Verification: Set to Expire August 31, 2012, Current I-9 Form Still Valid](#)

Get more news from polsinelli.com.



ABOUT POLSINELLI SHUGHART:

With more than 600 attorneys, Polsinelli Shughart is a national law firm and a recognized leader in the areas of health care, financial services, real estate, life sciences, energy and business litigation. Serving corporate, institutional and individual clients, the firm builds enduring relationships by creating value through our legal services – with passion, ingenuity and a sense of urgency. The firm can be found online at www.polsinelli.com. Polsinelli Shughart PC. In California, Polsinelli Shughart LLP.

Chicago | Dallas | Denver | Edwardsville | Jefferson City | Kansas City | Los Angeles | New York
Overland Park | Phoenix | St. Joseph | St. Louis | Springfield | Topeka | Washington, D.C. | Wilmington

polsinelli.com

To update your email preferences, please contact us at Interaction@polsinelli.com. To opt out of these communications, click the unsubscribe link below.

Polsinelli Shughart provides this material for informational purposes only. The material provided herein

is general and is not intended to be legal advice. Nothing herein should be relied upon or used without consulting a lawyer to consider your specific circumstances, possible changes to applicable laws, rules and regulations and other legal issues. Receipt of this material does not establish an attorney-client relationship.

Polsinelli Shughart is very proud of the results we obtain for our clients, but you should know that past results do not guarantee future results; that every case is different and must be judged on its own merits; and that the choice of a lawyer is an important decision and should not be based solely upon advertisements.

Polsinelli Shughart PC. In California, Polsinelli Shughart LLP.

Polsinelli Shughart® is a registered trademark of Polsinelli Shughart PC.

Copyright © 2012 Polsinelli Shughart PC ®.