From: ray.fair@yale.edu
To: "Nurse-Goodison, Margaret"
Subject: FW: CHRO ex rel. Ray Fair v. Yale University - Case No. 2330430 - Respondent"s Answer
Date: Wednesday, October 15, 2025 4:47:19 PM

From: ray.fair@yale.edu <ray.fair@yale.edu>
Sent: Friday, May 16, 2025 10:29 AM
To: 'John Oster' <jfo236@gmail.com>
Subject: RE: CHRO ex rel. Ray Fair v. Yale University - Case No. 2330430 - Respondent's Answer

The faculty senate, which is sometimes at odds with the administration, did not exist in 1993. This was some faculty committee, probably appointed by the president. I have no idea why it took them 10 years. An interesting question is why they started back again. Someone internally probably pointed out that this might be age discrimination. When ask why they changed the lawyer said "it was not popular."

From: John Oster <jfo236@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, May 16, 2025 10:23 AM
To: ray.fair@yale.edu
Subject: Re: CHRO ex rel. Ray Fair v. Yale University - Case No. 2330430 - Respondent's Answer

A related question is what happened between 1993 and 2013 when they actually implemented the recommendation. Seems slow even for Yale

Sent from my iPhone

> On May 16, 2025, at 10:13 AM, John Oster <jfo236@gmail.com> wrote:
>
> Right, they used the ERISA retirement age as a component of their formula for the "hypothetical" faculty member. Pretty clear case of age discrimination in my view. Why did the faculty senate push for this in 1993?
>
> Sent from my iPhone
>
> > On May 16, 2025, at 9:52 AM, ray.fair@yale.edu wrote:
> >
> > John, Here is Yale's response. When I first did this I was following what a few others had done, and some of the language I think is not original with me, but just using what others had said. As I said, I am the only one left. The main point is that Yale stopped payment based

on a complicated formula that included age. I think this is what Charles picked up on when ruling age discrimination. The formula is hypothetical, but it does include age. I am going to forward you the original email that discusses the formula. Dad

---

From: Park, Caroline B. <CPark@wiggin.com>
Sent: Friday, May 16, 2025 9:38 AM
To: officeofpublichearings@ct.gov
Cc: ray.fair@yale.edu; margaret.goodison@ct.gov
Subject: CHRO ex rel. Ray Fair v. Yale University - Case No. 2330430 - Respondent's Answer

Good morning,
Attached please find Respondent's answer in the above-referenced matter.
Thank you,
Caroline

Caroline B. Park
Partner
Wiggin and Dana LLP
265 Church Street
New Haven, Connecticut 06510
Direct: 203.498.4317 | cpark@wiggin.com
www.wiggin.com

<image001.png>

BOSTON | CONNECTICUT | NEW YORK | PHILADELPHIA | WASHINGTON, DC | FLORIDA

This electronic mail (including any attachments) may contain information that is privileged, confidential, and/or otherwise protected under applicable law from disclosure to anyone other than its intended recipient(s). Any dissemination or use of this electronic mail or its contents (including any attachments) by persons other than the intended recipient(s) is strictly prohibited. If you have received this message in error, please notify the sender or **Wiggin and Dana LLP** at **203-498-4400** immediately and then delete the original message (including any attachments) in its entirety. We take steps to protect against viruses and other malicious code but advise you to carry out your own checks and precautions as we accept no liability for any which remain. We may monitor electronic mail sent to and from our server(s) to ensure regulatory compliance to protect our clients and business.

Disclosure under U.S. IRS Circular 230: **Wiggin and Dana LLP** informs you that any tax advice contained in this communication (including any attachments) was not intended or written to be used, and cannot be used, for the purpose of avoiding federal tax related penalties or promoting, marketing or recommending to another party any transaction or matter addressed herein.

<2025.05.16 - CHRO No. 2330430 - Respondent's Answer.pdf>