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**Introduction**

 The case of Jones vs. Robinson property group is about an African American individual who was refused to offer a job on the basis of his race and color. It is important to consider the fact that Jones is an African American male who wanted to take a position as poker supervisor or dealer. Extensive experience of Jones made him a potential candidate for the job of Poker supervisor or dealer. It is noteworthy to indicate that Jones dealing skills as poker dealer are better than the majority of poker dealer in the region. His job application was refused by Ken Lambert who was a manager at Horseshoe Casino. Rejection to be a poker dealer in the Appellee Robinson Property Group, Jones complained a file against Lambert that his rejection was solely based on race and color. It is obvious that African Americans are discriminated and oppressed by whites on the basis of color and race (Adler, 2000). Whites always considered them superior to other races, hence they tend to discriminate them in every field. Jones applied for more than 10 times between 1995 and 2002 for a poker dealer position. However, every time he got rejected for that position (*Jones v. Robinson Property Group*). He was hired on a temporary basis in Horseshoe during poker tournaments, but he was not offered with a permanent job. In the meantime, Horseshoe hired 40 to 45 white poker dealers by offering them a permanent position. Jones filed his charges of discrimination against the Robinson property group in September 2002 due to the racial offense of Lambert.

**Issue**

 It was impossible for Jones to establish a prima face case as the defendant had already hired some African Americans who belong to Jones' protected class.

**Ruling**

 Summary judgment was granted by the district court against Jones as he was unable to submit any direct evidence regarding racial discrimination.

**Facts**

 It is important to evaluate various facts in the case of Jones vs. Robinson Property Group to get a better understanding of the entire scenario. Jones claimed that he was discriminated by Robinson Property Group due to his race. Jones had to face several rejections from Robinson Property Group regarding his application for the position of poker dealer. He claimed that he had more experience as compared to other poker dealers in the Horseshoe Casino (Dylan, 2005). Constant rejection regarding permanent job position as a poker dealer compelled Jones to file a charge on the basis of racial discrimination under Title VII of the Civil Rights Act. Furthermore, Jones claimed that Lambert made comments about him on the basis of his race and color. On the other hand, Lambert refused to accept that he ever made any comments that attributed on the basis of racial animus. Lambert stated that two shift supervisors at Horseshoe Casino insisted that Jones is not well-liked in a casino (Dylan, 2005). However, those two shift supervisors refused to accept that they ever made such statements against Jones. Jones filed a charge against both Lambert and RPG with the EEOC alleged. By utilizing civil right acts, Jones filed a charge against RPG alleging race discrimination (Dylan, 2005). It is important to consider the fact that Jones utilized civil rights acts due to the racial discrimination of RPG to hire him as a poker dealer. Jones claimed that in the same period, RPG hired many white poker dealers that clearly demonstrated its discrimination against African Americans. Jones provided some evidence of racial discrimination through Lambert assistant (Dylan, 2005). Lambert assistant stated that Lambert did not want Jones to be a poker dealer as white boys do not like a black person to handle their cards. However, the district court held a decision that Jones did not provide any direct evidence of discrimination from RPG.

**Analysis**

 A critical examination of the entire case is highly necessary to get a better understanding of the case. Evaluation of Jones's evidence is sufficient to ensure that the RPG discriminated him on the basis of race and color. Jones claimed that RPG did not hire him for the position of poker dealer as he is an African American. The claims of Jones regarding racial discrimination are justified through civil rights acts. In order to strengthen his case, Jones filed a charge alleging racial discrimination under Title VII and 42 U.S.C. § 1981. It is important to indicate that Under Title VII, employers are forbidden to “fail or refuse to hire or to discharge any individual, or otherwise to discriminate against any individual with respect to his compensation, terms, conditions, or privileges of employment, because of such individual's race” 42 U.S.C. § 2000e-2(a) (1). Furthermore, it is essential for the Plaintiff to prove racial discrimination through circumstantial or direct evidence. In the considered case of Jones vs. Robinson Property Group, the court held a decision that Jones did not provide any direct evidence of racial discrimination (Dylan, 2005). Reference from previous cases made it clearer that Jones must provide some direct or justifiable evidence to strengthen his claim regarding racial discrimination (Dylan, 2005). Statements from Lambert’s assistance also made it clear that Lambert passed some comments regarding racism.

 Jones had to establish a claim for retaliation by meeting three important aspects. First, the Plaintiff should be involved in any activity that comes under Title VII. Second, the defendant must have taken a negative employment action against Plaintiff. Third, there should be a causal connection between employment action and activity that comes under Title VII. The claim of retaliation is based on Mattern v. Eastman Kodak Co., 104 F.3d 702, 705 (5th Cir.1997). In the considered case, it is analyzed that the first two conditions for the claim of retaliation are met as Jones filed a charge under Title VII and civil rights acts (Dylan, 2005). To establish a genuine issue regarding Jones protected activity's connection with adverse employment action of RGP, sufficient data were available. Jones filed a charge against that company in 2002, while in the meantime that company hired six poker dealers. This justifies that RGP racially discriminated Jones. However, Jones was unable to provide some direct evidence of retaliation. A period of a minimum of 60 days is required to prove a significant connection between adverse employment action and the protected activity (Dylan, 2005). Compliance with a specific period is highly necessary to determine a causal connection. The maximum period of proving a causal link for summary judgment purposes is 4 months in accordance with Evans v. Houston, 24F.3d 344. Delay in proclaiming a reprisal entitlement had made it obvious for the court that Jones' actions are unjustifiable (Dylan, 2005). Hence, Jones motions for leave are denied by the district court due to prolong period.

**Conclusion**

 In a nutshell, claims of Jones regarding racial discrimination by Robinson Property Group were denied by the court as Jones was unable to provide specific evidence in this regard. The denial of the district court's decision regarding a motion for leave is justifiable. However, as per foregoing reasons, the grant of summary judgment by the district court is not justifiable as it is in the favor of Robinson Property Group. The district court should need to review its decision on the basis of Jones’s discrimination claims and it should reverse the grant of summary judgment.
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