



2008 Decisions

Opinions of the United
States Court of Appeals
for the Third Circuit

1-15-2008

Watcher v. Pottsville Area

Precedential or Non-Precedential: Non-Precedential

Docket No. 04-4253

Follow this and additional works at: http://digitalcommons.law.villanova.edu/thirdcircuit_2008

Recommended Citation

"Watcher v. Pottsville Area" (2008). *2008 Decisions*. 1749.

http://digitalcommons.law.villanova.edu/thirdcircuit_2008/1749

This decision is brought to you for free and open access by the Opinions of the United States Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit at Villanova University Charles Widger School of Law Digital Repository. It has been accepted for inclusion in 2008 Decisions by an authorized administrator of Villanova University Charles Widger School of Law Digital Repository. For more information, please contact Benjamin.Carlson@law.villanova.edu.

NOT PRECEDENTIAL

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE THIRD CIRCUIT

Nos. 04-4253 & 04-4271

SHIRLEY WATCHER;
CHARLES WATCHER, H/W

v.

POTTSVILLE AREA EMERGENCY MEDICAL SERVICES, INC.;
GARRY THOMAS LAUBACH

Shirley Watcher; Charles Watcher,
Appellants in 04-4253

Pottsville Area Emergency Medical Service, Inc.,
Appellant in 04-4271

On Appeal from the United States District Court
for the Middle District of Pennsylvania
(D.C. No. 00-cv-01123)
District Court: Hon. A. Richard Caputo

Before: SCIRICA, McKEE, and STAPLETON, Circuit Judges

ORDER AMENDING OPINION

At the direction of the Court, the opinion filed September 18, 2007 is amended. Insofar as an error exists in the numbering sequence of the sections of the opinion, the section formerly designated I. 4 shall be redesignated as I. 3; the section formerly designated as III shall be redesignated as II; and the section formerly designated as IV shall be redesignated as III.

The second to the last sentence in the first full paragraph on page 5 is amended as follows:

Even though the work environment she left was found to be “hostile” within the meaning of Title VII, the jury quite properly could have concluded that she was terminated because she was absent from work and failed to notify anyone of her absence, not because of age bias.

For the Court,
Marcia M. Waldron
Marcia M. Waldron
Clerk

Dated: 15 January 2008

/cc: