

Episode 7: The ADA Three Decades Later: How Are We Doing?

Broadcast Date: April 13, 2022

Speakers: Jason Turkish, President and Managing Partner of Nyman Turkish PC
Eve Hill – Partner, Brown Goldstein & Levy

Host: Peter Blanck, Chairman Burton Blatt Institute Syracuse University

Disclaimer Note: The personal opinions expressed by guest speakers in this episode should not be understood as an endorsement by the ADA National Network, the Southeast ADA Center, or Syracuse University.

4 Wheel City: (rapping)

Barry Whaley:

Hi, everybody. On behalf of the Southeast ADA Center, the Burton Blatt Institute at Syracuse University and the ADA National Network, welcome to Episode Seven of Disability Rights Today. Disability Rights Today provides our listeners with new insights on recent court cases that shape the Americans with Disabilities Act and impact the civil rights of people with disabilities.

Barry Whaley:

I'm Barry Whaley, I'm director of the Southeast ADA Center. As a reminder, listening audience, if you have questions about the ADA, you can use our online form anytime at disabilityrightstoday.org. On today's episode, we'll be discussing how far we have come and how far we must go to ensure compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act. It's been 32 years since the passage of this very important civil rights legislation and yet we still find the ADA is often treated as an afterthought rather than a federal law by employers and businesses. To provide us with an overview of the years since the

passage of the ADA and compliance through those years, we welcome Eve Hill, Jason Turkish and of course, Dr. Peter Blanck.

Barry Whaley:

Eve is partner at the law firm of Brown, Goldstein and Levy. She's a nationally known disability rights advocate and expert on disability rights law. Jason Turkish is the president and managing partner of Nyman Turkish PC, a nationwide litigation and disability law firm with offices in California, Florida, and Michigan. Jason is a powerful advocate and has captivated the attention of clients, fellow attorneys, advocates, and the news media. As always our host for this episode is Dr. Peter Blanck, chairman of the Burton Blatt Institute and university professor at Syracuse University. Welcome and it's a privilege to have you. So Peter, I'm turning it over to you.

Dr. Peter Blanck:

Thank you, Barry, and Eve and Jason. It really is a pleasure to be speaking with you both today.

Eve Hill:

Thank you. It's nice to be here.

Jason Turkish:

Thank you so much. It's a pleasure to be joining you and your listeners.

Dr. Peter Blanck:

Well, Eve knows my wife, Wendy, and so do many on this call. Every year at New Year's, we try to predict our predictions for the coming year. We stopped writing them, I think, three years ago or two years ago, whenever the world was turned upside down or began to be turned upside down. Gosh knows none of us would've predicted the type of war the world is in today, the type of pandemic, the types of challenges people are facing in the

disability community in terms of poverty and housing and employment and this is 30 plus years after the ADA.

Dr. Peter Blanck:

So Jason and Eve, I thought I'd focus on today with you, not as much where we've been because many of us know, and our listeners are fairly savvy about the history of the ADA. Of course, we'll talk about some of your important efforts, but do you both believe we're kind of at a watershed moment? It almost seems like in our community more generally of which people with disabilities make up, align and share in America and around the world? Do you believe, I guess my question is that the decisions we make now will have long term future implications for many generations to come about the disability community? I guess I'll start with Eve. Eve and I go way back, sorry for such a big winded question, but I guess in essence, I'm asking Eve, are we operating in a new environment that we've never operated before that's related to the equality of people with disabilities?

Eve Hill:

Boy, am I not prepared to answer that question? I don't know. So I think in a lot of ways, we are at a catalyst point and really at this point it could go either way. One way is we're getting a lot of pushback on disability civil rights and LGBTQ rights. A lot, like vicious, back to the battle days. In fact, worse than the battle days. People will now say, "I don't want you here because of your disability." Where they used to say, "Oh, it's not your disability, I just want you to be protected." And the same thing about LGBTQ, people are much more blatantly prejudiced, some people.

Eve Hill:

On the other hand, younger people in particular are like, "What's the big deal?" And insist on inclusion, do inclusion naturally, and don't understand why anybody would be prejudice against people with disabilities or LGBTQ people, or why anybody would go somewhere where they were excluded or would not include them in everything they do. So if the young people, as they should, get to take over the world, we will be in excellent shape. If these old attitudes, which are clinging to the old attitudes in the face of this

transformation stay for longer, we will continue to be in this fairly bad place for a longer period of time. Sorry to be so unhelpful in the short term.

Dr. Peter Blanck:

No, that's a hard question and a very thoughtful response. I should have added, and Jason and I would put this to you, at the same time, our country has gone through kind of a racial reckoning, racial justice, police shootings, demonstrations, first African-American President, first African-American Vice President. And we're kind of beginning, I hope Jason, to view disability as just one element of an intersectional or multiple identity of many people. Do you find that true in your sense of where we're going, Jason? And certainly feel free to respond to the first part of the question as well.

Jason Turkish:

Well, my response to the first part of the question is I'm glad Eve went first because it's a big, complicated question. And it's very fascinating and it's something that as practitioners we encounter every single day, and it really does depend. Some days it certainly feels to me like we are progressing to maybe version 2.0 or even version 3.0 of disability rights as a civil right, where we're litigating more technical matters, more complex access issues, particularly around access to electronic materials and that this is an incremental steps towards progress are being made. Then I walk into the office today and I have a prospective client matter where a physician put in writing to his deaf patient, that he has no obligation to provide a sign language interpreter. And I'm thinking, "Wow, we really aren't that far along." So it really depends on the day.

Jason Turkish:

But I agree with the premise of your second question, which is that disability rights should be viewed as this sort of intersectional topic, that this is the civil rights issue that transcends all other demographic lines of race and gender and ethnicity and sexual orientation. Because those of us who practice in this area realize that we represent clients from every walk of life that we're all sort of, whatever expression you want to look at it, one car accident God forbid away, one chronic illness diagnosis away from some

definition of disability. And so therefore this should be the civil rights' topic that's easier for everybody to wrap their heads around. But it very much depends on the audience or in the case of the work even I do, I think very much depends on the judge or jury you find yourself in front of that day.

Dr. Peter Blanck:

Jason, I want to stay with you, because I think it's important we drill down a little bit on this physician's attitude that, I think if I heard you correctly, does not have to provide a sign language interpreter, that's their position? Where does that come from in this day and age? And I don't mean to be naive. I know the pushback as Eve has said, but have we not accomplished anything in this community in the last 30 years with doctors and others? Well, where is that coming from in your mind?

Jason Turkish:

Well, I don't want to go too far into speculating into their motivation because I can very much assure you, we will be litigating that, for sure, promptly in federal court in Detroit, but as far as...

Dr. Peter Blanck:

Not that particular doctor Jason, but I mean we hear this a lot, this scenario.

Jason Turkish:

Well, it's interesting when it's actually said, right? So it's one thing to sort of guess that you're being discriminated against. It's one thing to sort of guess that the reason your doctor seems very uninterested in caring for you, hypothetically, is because you've required them to have a sign language interpreter. It's a bit further along on a continuum of problematic when you actually put in writing, "No, I have no obligation to provide you the sign language interpreter. I won't be providing the sign language interpreter." And basically, "Oh, well..." So that, I mean, that exists on the end of a continuum where if we were talking about other minority groups, we would have public outrage. We would have a

CNN story. Unfortunately I don't think that level of outrage is automatic when it's a disability issue, this, "We will not serve you essentially."

Jason Turkish:

I think we've reached a point of as a society that in other civil rights topics, whether it's race, ethnicity, gender, "I will not serve you, get out of here. You're not welcome here." We've sort of gotten past that and the few very bad actors who take those positions are appropriately subjected to a lot of public scorn. Somehow in disability cases, it almost seems like it's still okay to take these negative attitudes. And I'd be curious on Eve's impression, but this sort of vitriol and this willingness to say, "We don't want people with disabilities here.", and I think she led with it in her first answer, it's something that's unique in my view to the disability community that other groups have not continued to face as persistently.

Dr. Peter Blanck:

I do want to hear Eve's view on this. I would cite to the first case before the United States Supreme Court, Eve and you can tell me the date of Bragdon v. Abbott, [crosstalk 00:11:43] where some would say it's a test case. And Dr. Bragdon wrote that denial of providing to fill her cavity because he said, "Take me to the United States Supreme Court." I wonder, Eve, what your view of Jason's comments are. And I wonder if, is there potential spillover from this new iteration of almost free speech, religion cases? The [cake masters 00:12:12] and the, "I won't serve a particular type of person because it goes against my interests." Are we in a different climate now?

Eve Hill:

Yeah, we're there but I don't think it's that much worse for people with disabilities than it is for racial minorities or certainly LGBTQ folks that people, some businesses, mostly businesses, are feeling much more free to say, "I don't want you here. And I think I have a good enough reason and it may be my religion and it may be my convenience." And in the disability case, they get to point to, maybe it's my expense. And sadly, I think courts are letting them get away with it and so that's a real problem right now.

Dr. Peter Blanck:

Whatever your partisan politics are, the Democrats do have the presidency in both Houses of Congress. Eve, why not strengthen the law, the ADA? Isn't now the time to fix these problems once and for all?

Eve Hill:

Well, if you could pass something with 50 votes, it would be, but we can't pass anything with 50 votes. So right now you would need 60 votes to pass anything, to update the ADA and opening up the ADA leads to the possibility of making things worse when the other party gets to say. Now disability used to be bipartisan. It really did. Bob Dole was one of our chief advocates and it is sadly not very bipartisan anymore.

Dr. Peter Blanck:

That's a very interesting and important point for our listeners. Many know of course it was a bipartisan bill, a Republican President and a Democratic Congress, very, very joint unanimous support. And that has changed. Jason, is this reflected? I know we talked about the doctor case potentially. Is this your sense of how this is reflected generally in what you're seeing from a litigation point of view?

Jason Turkish:

I think defendants are willing to take harsher stances against plaintiffs than maybe a few years ago, even if it's just the sort of the narrative or the theme of their defenses. I hear more, "They're just trying to get an unfair advantage." That seems to be a popular one, or "We're going to have to do this for everyone." Everyone loves the slippery slope argument. Although the slope, it's not that steep, it's not that slippery. And people still have to provide documentation to get, in appropriate circumstances, to get the types of accommodations that we're often finding ourselves litigating over.

Jason Turkish:

So I had a case in Federal Court where a plaintiff had been shot at 34 times in active duty combat in Afghanistan and was arguing for a transfer from the Southern border of the Homeland Security Department Border Patrol to Northern because the Texas border looked a heck of a lot like that scenery in Afghanistan and was triggering his PTSD. And without any evidence at all, the government defended that case on the narrative that he was a racist and wanted to be on the Northern border with people who looked more like him.

Jason Turkish:

His physicians pointed out that what he had been trained to do in Afghanistan was walk three miles per hour at a very slow speed listening for foreign speakers, because that was the first sign of an ambush. And evidently because they identified that as a trigger of his PTSD, he wanted to be with only English-speaking white people on the Northern border, because evidently people control, they choose to have PTSD. They choose what triggers them and they have control over them. That was the US Attorney's view you of disability in this modern era. So the harshness of which I am seeing defendants come at plaintiffs who have meritorious cases, the rhetoric is getting pretty intense, pretty ugly out there.

Dr. Peter Blanck:

Jason, let's go around to the other side of the table, Eve comment on this as well. You're a small business in Florida or California, and a plaintiff is sending out a thousand demand letters, and I know [some 00:16:46] is frivolous and some of it has been pushed back by the courts. But the public is aware of these challenges. There have been attempts to modify the law in terms of demand letters and so forth. What's the perspective from the other side of the table, Jason? A small business or a small doctor's office who basically gets Medicaid reimbursement, and that's it, and would have to pay for the sign language interpreter out of his or her pocket.

Jason Turkish:

I understand the concern on a general basis, but it's just not borne out in reality. The incidence rates of these disabilities and the frequency of needing to provide the

accommodation is minimal and the law is pretty well settled on what is a reasonable economic impact. There are protections for defendants in cases where the cost of providing an accommodation, particularly when it's physical modifications to existing structures, for example, are extraordinarily high relative to say a construction project. But Congress has considered, and on a bipartisan basis, rejected that you shouldn't ever face an economic cost of serving individuals with disabilities. And we've decided that as a matter of public policy, it's been the law for over three decades. And I'm not incredibly sympathetic to the concern that if somebody sees a couple hundred patients in a week and they have to pay for an interpreter for one patient every six weeks, it doesn't seem like a big cost to making medical care, which is so fundamental and such a basic human right, accessible to everybody.

Jason Turkish:

So I'm not entirely moved by it. Obviously I don't focus my practice on the type of cases that you're describing, where somebody's sending a thousand demand letters. I certainly understand that the media likes to talk about these things, that there's a sensationalism to them to say that these are frivolous lawsuits, or this is about attorneys making a quick, easy buck. I assure you the cases I do, they're not quick or easy in any way in the cases that we seek attorneys fees. They are about bringing about systemic long term change for people who have been marginalized for a very long time.

Eve Hill:

And I've heard these stories too, and just, I can see both sides sort of. It's been 32 years for heaven's sake, but why do you still have a step at your entrance and why for heaven's sake, isn't your website accessible? Because seriously, the whole internet thing has happened since the ADA. You might want to have thought about that. But on the other hand, I don't really believe in filing lawsuits without a demand letter and giving people an option to fix things without engaging in litigation. And I don't do stick up lawsuits, and I don't think anybody should. But the claim that these are all frivolous, I'm a little skeptical of, because if they were actually frivolous lawsuits, there would be bar complaints against these lawyers. And there aren't. That's a pretty cheap, pretty easy process, complaint filer

doesn't have to do any of the work. So I'm a little skeptical that these are frivolous when no one's actually taking the very easy process to challenge them.

Jason Turkish:

If somebody's suing over curb cuts at crosswalks, well, there's a lot of crosswalks in America. And if you can't get over them and you can't get to your doctor's office or your pharmacy or your place of business, and you're trapped in your house, just suing to remove one missing curb cut, isn't going to really help you if when you get to the next town over, there's similarly an issue there. And again, this isn't the work I do, but I'm very uncomfortable with impugning it because it's important. It's a different side of disability rights work, and it's not less important. And some of these cases do exist in significant quantities. And it doesn't mean that they are by definition frivolous. In fact, what sometimes it means is that defendants are very brazen to, 32 years after the ADA, continue to renovate, continue to build, continue to maintain existing infrastructure that is patently inaccessible.

Dr. Peter Blanck:

And is that because there's really no teeth in the compliance or enforcement structure? Is that a problem of DOJ in the private bar, Eve or Jason?

Eve Hill:

Well, having to litigate every small barrier leads you into things like this, getting accused of filing too many lawsuits, being a frivolous litigator. Litigation enforcement is the only tool we have, so that's what we do.

Dr. Peter Blanck:

We're living through a pandemic. And books, including my own and articles that have been written on the cases that have come out on disability during the pandemic, there's one area which I understand, which I was hoping you guys could clarify for our listeners and that relates to accommodations. But how an accommodation for a particular person with a disability may be implemented by having others change their behavior, like wearing

masks or getting vaccinated and so forth. Was that the original conception do you believe, of this concept of accommodation, Eve and Jason?

Eve Hill:

Oh, yeah.

Dr. Peter Blanck:

And is it correct under COVID?

Eve Hill:

No, and yeah, it was. The ADA sometimes inconveniences people without disabilities. You have to let the dog in, even if it might make you sneeze. You can't park in the wheelchair accessible spot even if it's the closest one. You can't park in the wheelchair accessible spot even if it's the only one that's not filled. You can't sit in the reserve seating for the wheelchair user, because it's the reserve seating for the wheelchair user. It sometimes inconveniences people without disabilities and having to wear a mask because your colleague with a disability might die doesn't seem like an irrational balance.

Dr. Peter Blanck:

Just stay with you Eve for a second. Then Jason, I want your opinion. So is there a distinction between inconvenience and forcing somebody else to have an affirmative behavior to take a shot or to wear a mask? Or is, am I missing, is it really the same thing in your mind?

Eve Hill:

There's no right not to wear a mask just as there is no right to not wear a seatbelt and there's no right to drive drunk.

Dr. Peter Blanck:

Jason?

Jason Turkish:

Couldn't agree with Eve more. I mean, even though a global pandemic perhaps was not thought of when the ADA was drafted and when the implementing regs were drafted, they nonetheless are informative in this time. The modifications that rise to such a burden that would fundamentally alter a defendant's programs and services, they might have a valid defense, but small nuisances or inconveniences or... And again, I'm describing them pejoratively, I'm not sure these really are that much of a nuisance or an inconvenience. I'm sort of painting them in the light most favorable to those that would make these spurious arguments. They don't seem like incredible inconveniences, separate from a legal requirement it actually just seems like human decency, that if you work three feet away from somebody who is severely immune compromised, and they ask you to wear a mask during a global pandemic, it just seems like the right thing to do. And it certainly doesn't seem like it rises to a level where there's a colorable defense to not having to do so.

Eve Hill:

The obligation to mask is stronger in places where you are near the person for a long time. In employment, in school, less so in the place where the person with the disability is popping in to grab something at the grocery store and you're further apart, and you're not there for very long. So maybe it's less a different balance then. And vaccination is also a different balance. So whether anyone could be required to be vaccinated because of a person with a disability, that simply hasn't been studied. It hasn't been studied whether people with disabilities would benefit from their peers being vaccinated. And it's a different set of burdens, much more inconvenient or difficult than wearing a mask is. So I don't have an answer on vaccination.

Dr. Peter Blanck:

I want to take a moment to thank our listeners. And of course, if they have questions about this topic or any other Disability Rights Today topics, please submit your questions

at disabilityrightstoday.org Disability Rights Today, all one word, dot org or call the Southeast ADA Center at 1404-541-9001.

Dr. Peter Blanck:

Well, we're continuing with a fascinating conversation with Eve Hill and Jason Turkish. Eve, if Bragdon was briefed and decided today, we have a very different composition on the United States Supreme Court. Is this the time not to bring cases, ADA disability cases, to this United States Supreme Court?

Eve Hill:

Probably depends on the case. I think Bragdon would be decided the same way. I'm not sure Casey Martin would be decided the same way. So it probably depends on the case and it depends on the issue. There are clearly perspectives of the Supreme Court that don't accept the existence of disparate impact discrimination or systemic discrimination and require sort of blatant one-to-one discrimination in order to find a violation and I think that's the biggest risk of going to the Supreme Court.

Dr. Peter Blanck:

So just for our listeners to unpack that a little bit, then Jason I want to hear, disparate impact can be both an individual claim as well as a class action claim?

Eve Hill:

Mm-hmm (affirmative).

Dr. Peter Blanck:

And that means the policies, practices, and standards that a person is challenging basically?

Eve Hill:

Think of it like the Kitagawa case where Hawaii required any dog coming into the state to be quarantined for, I think, two weeks. And that really was a problem for people who use service animals, they would be without their service animal for their entire vacation. And so you can say there are two ways that that could be a violation. One is, it's a failure to make a reasonable modification for this particular blind person who comes in with a service dog and that's not disparate impact. The other way to look at it is, this rule has a disparate impact on people with disabilities who use guide dogs. And so you can either say you, Hawaii, have to make an exception to this quarantine rule for guide dogs, or you can say your rule is so problematic entirely and can't exist because it hurts guide dogs.

Dr. Peter Blanck:

And you're saying this present Supreme Court may be antagonistic to this concept of disparate impact as a general matter?

Eve Hill:

Yes.

Dr. Peter Blanck:

And that would not just be towards disability, but other protected categories as well?

Eve Hill:

Yes, it started in the race context and has been going on there for a long time.

Dr. Peter Blanck:

And is that tied to the affirmative action questions at all?

Eve Hill:

Not really, I think it's more tied to whether you believe or not that discrimination exists beyond flat-out prejudice with animus. And so some people believe that discrimination is gone, we don't do it anymore, except a few bad apples who basically say, "I'm

discriminating against you because of this protected characteristic." And so if you believe that society is now basically not discriminatory and does not have systemic racism built into it, then you don't believe in disparate impact because it doesn't affect, because it goes after people who were not being intentionally discriminatory.

Dr. Peter Blanck:

And Jason, what do you think are among the most important disability topics before the courts today that are pending, that may or may not go up to the United States Supreme Court?

Jason Turkish:

I think you'd have to consider access to electronic resources as the most pressing issue today because technology is such an opportunity. We're at such an inflection point of being able to create new kinds of accessibility. The pandemic has shown us that participation by Zoom can be a real opportunity for somebody who physical attendance at even something like a court proceeding, was previously very challenging for. But it's only as useful as we are able to ensure basic levels of accessibility. And that's why cases that deal with issues like everything from eCommerce to voting, that's an important one, of being able to vote in an accessible electronic manner. Those matter really more than ever, or else the promise of technology to level the playing field will elude us.

Dr. Peter Blanck:

And Jason, we did a whole show on this Winn-Dixie case with the president of NFB, the president of NAD. I forget, and maybe the plaintiff as well, I can't remember. So that was kind of, for many of us with legal minds, it's still a little bit uncertainty around that whole idea of web accessibility, at least in that 11th Circuit. Where are we at in light of that case or are we back where started, that case is not impactful?

Jason Turkish:

Well, I think the concern for me when I read that case and I'd be concerned, I'd be interested in what Eve's thoughts are on this, is that if a case along similar facts went up

to the Supreme Court, there certainly is some risk. You asked earlier about do we need to be strategic in what we potentially bring before the court? And I think in areas that are sort of ripe for issues of first impression or for overhaul rulings on entire spheres of industry like eCommerce and web accessibility, we need to be particularly sensitive to which cases we're working on, which cases we're bringing up, making sure that we don't have situations where bad facts are creating bad law. I think we do need to be careful as a legal community and within the disability community of how we approach those issues.

Dr. Peter Blanck:

Many of us years ago were urging the DOJ, some of the people on this phone who were in positions of power to push forward a rule, some rulemaking in that regard, it hasn't come. Eve, comment on whether that's possible in this current environment and anything further on Winn-Dixie and its implications?

Eve Hill:

It is possible that they can get a rule out on web accessibility during this administration, so that's very positive and we're pushing them to do that of course. Winn-Dixie is currently just a toss up in the 11th Circuit. Nothing remains of that case at the moment. We'll see if Winn-Dixie tries to take it to the Supreme Court. Because nothing exists in that case at the moment, I don't think they can challenge the substance, there's no substantive decision there at all. There's only a decision about whether the case was moot and therefore couldn't be decided on appeal. So I don't know whether the Supreme Court's going to be interested in deciding a moot-ness question. Putting Winn-Dixie aside, worst case for us on web accessibility was in the Ninth Circuit where they said the website had to have a nexus to a brick and mortar location.

Eve Hill:

The 11th Circuit panel, the three judge panel, managed to come up with a worse standard than that although I can't say I really understood that other than that it was worse than the nexus standard. The rest of the country has seemed to say, "Yeah, I think websites are kind of covered." At least insurance policies that had no connection to a physical office

were covered. And so having crossed that line, we can guess that where they would go with websites. So we'll see, I'm sure there'll be another case in the 11th Circuit or the Fifth Circuit and that'll be very exciting.

Dr. Peter Blanck:

For full disclosure. I was co-counsel, minor role, with some amazing lawyers, Larry Paradis who's passed away at Disability Rights Advocates. Eve may have been involved in others in a case called National Federation of the Blind v. Target, where-

Eve Hill:

My partner was.

Dr. Peter Blanck:

... Requirement was established among other places. You're both lawyers. Closing comments, Eve, are you, I hope, optimistic about the future in some ways? It's a hard time to be optimistic I know, but we have some hope in this area, I believe still. What's your views, Eve? And then Jason, I'll ask you for final remarks.

Eve Hill:

I must be optimistic, I keep filing cases and I am very optimistic that the next generation totally gets this and is not going to do this stuff anymore. But right now I'm concerned about where we are and sadly judges lag behind generational shifts. And so that continues to be a question. I think more and more our cases are not decided on the substance. They're decided at very early stages, I think because courts want to reduce their caseloads. And so they're decided on things like standing and sovereign immunity and those kinds of things that really don't have an impact on the substance, so we're not getting a lot of law made these days, which is too bad, because there's a lot of work going into litigation where we could use some clarity in the law.

Dr. Peter Blanck:

Jason, same question to you.

Jason Turkish:

I would agree, I'm cautiously optimistic. For me, it hinges on whether the disability community is successful in increasing their levels of representation in the legal profession, on the bench. I think it's been very successful we understood by other groups, that if we want to really turn the page, then people need to have shared experiences and that diversity creates pathways to progress. Making disability part of the diversity equation is so often, it just isn't. So having lawyers with disabilities is really, really important. That would make me more optimistic.

Jason Turkish:

It's why I sort of have a soft spot for working on cases that deal with the sort of threshold issues that keep people out of the legal profession, whether it's standardized testing or difficulties with bar admission, because I think it's so important that we increase our numbers because guess who's going to handle cases like this? I mean, obviously there are fabulous disability rights attorneys who don't have disabilities, but if we can pair them with folks who have lived it and experienced it and really want to commit to this topic, we're going to be in a much better place because of it.

Dr. Peter Blanck:

Last question, quick response for both of you. Judge Brown Jackson, Supreme Court, good for disability? Eve?

Eve Hill:

I haven't done my own research, but the folks who have done the research say that she understands disability and treats it reasonably. And so, yes, good for disability.

Dr. Peter Blanck:

Jason?

Jason Turkish:

I haven't heard any negativity and the disability rights community is willing to speak up, should be a great addition to the court.

Dr. Peter Blanck:

Well, listeners, for me, these interviews are most, most satisfying. When two things, it's a conversation in which I am listening intently and I learn a lot. And both of these things happen today with amazing lawyers and citizens, great American citizens who are fighting for civil rights. Genuinely, Eve and Jason, I'm really grateful and we are all grateful for your time today and insights. I want to thank our listeners for joining us. Here's to us having a additional conversation in the future where we talk about some of these issues and some of the accomplishments to come. Barry, I turn it back to you now.

Barry Whaley:

All right. Thank you, Peter. And thank you to Eve Hill and Jason Turkish for being our guests today. What a great conversation. Thank you again for giving us some of your time.

Barry Whaley:

Listeners, as a reminder, you can access Disability Rights Today episodes at our website, that's disabilityrightstoday.org. All episode episodes are archived with streamed audio, accessible transcripts and resources. You can download Disability Rights Today on your handheld device. Go to your Podcast App Store and search for ADA Live. You can also listen to Disability Rights Today on our SoundCloud channel.

Barry Whaley:

Again, if you have questions about the ADA, you can submit them anytime online at disabilityrightstoday.org or contact your regional ADA Center at 1-800-949-4232. And as always, those calls are free and they're confidential. Disability Rights Today is a program at the Southeast ADA Center in collaboration with the Disability Inclusive Employment

Policy Project. Disability Rights Today is produced by Celestia [Razda 00:39:11] with Mary [Mortar 00:39:11], Marsha [inaudible 00:39:12], our student intern this semester, Chase Coleman, Beth Harrison and me, I'm Barry Whaley. Thanks for listening and remember, your rights matter.

4 Wheel City: (rapping)

[End of Transcript]

Disclaimer: The contents of this publication are developed under a grant from the National Institute on Disability, Independent Living, and Rehabilitation Research (NIDILRR grant #90DP0090-01-00). NIDILRR is a Center within the Administration for Community Living (ACL), Department of Health and Human Services (HHS). The contents of this publication do not necessarily represent the policy of NIDILRR, ACL, HHS, and you should not assume endorsement by the Federal Government.

The information, materials, and/or technical assistance provided by the Southeast ADA Center are intended solely as informal guidance and are neither a determination of your legal rights or responsibilities under the Act, nor binding on any agency with enforcement responsibility under the ADA. The Southeast ADA Center does not warrant the accuracy of any information contained herein.

Any links to non-Southeast ADA Center information are provided as a courtesy, and are neither intended to, nor do they constitute, an endorsement of the linked materials. The Southeast ADA Center provides these links as a courtesy and does not endorse, take responsibility, or exercise control of the organization nor vouch for the accuracy or accessibility of the contents of the link destination. The information is intended solely as informal guidance and is neither a determination of legal rights or responsibilities under the ADA, nor binding on any agency with enforcement responsibility under the ADA.

Contact for More Information or Assistance:

Southeast ADA Center

Email: ADAsoutheast@law.syr.edu

Phone: 404-541-9001