

# Massachusetts High Court Adds Teeth to Personnel Records Law With At-Will Employment Exception

December 22, 2021

On December 17, 2021, the Massachusetts Supreme Judicial Court (SJC) held that a termination of employment based only upon an employee's rebuttal to a negative performance review in the employee's personnel file violates the public policy exception to at-will employment. In so holding, the SJC reversed confusing lower court decisions and added teeth to the notoriously strict Massachusetts Personnel Records Law.

## The Massachusetts Personnel Records Law

The Massachusetts Personnel Records Law (G.L. c. 149, § 52C) is one of the most expansive in the US, imposing affirmative obligations on employers and equipping employees with certain rights. Specifically, the statute:

- Gives employees the right to inspect their personnel file.
- Requires employers to notify employees of any negative information placed in their file if such information may be used to negatively affect the terms of the employee's employment.
- Gives employees the right to rebut any negative information in their personnel file.

The state attorney general may impose fines between \$500 and \$2,500 for violation of the statute.

## At-will employment

In Massachusetts, at-will employment can generally be terminated for any reason or no reason at all. Courts in the commonwealth have long recognized narrow exceptions to at-will employment when employment is terminated in violation of public policy, including, for example, when an employee asserts a legally guaranteed right.

## *Meehan v. Medical Information Technology*

In *Terence Meehan v. Medical Information Technology, Inc.*, SJC-13117 (Dec. 17, 2021), Terence Meehan submitted a lengthy rebuttal to a performance improvement plan (PIP) with his personnel file. Meditech terminated Meehan's employment shortly thereafter. The SJC accepted Meehan's contention that he was fired because of the rebuttal.

Meehan alleged that he was exercising his statutory right under the Personnel Records Law by filing his rebuttal to the PIP. Accepting this as true, the question before the SJC was: Does retaliating against an employee for filing a rebuttal under the Personnel Records Law qualify as a public policy exception to at-will employment?

The SJC answered in the affirmative. Although the lower courts concluded that the right to rebuttal is an internal matter and not "important," the SJC held that the enactment of the Personnel Records Law established the importance of the right to rebuttal. The SJC explained that a common-law wrongful discharge action is also proper where an employer retaliates against an employee for exercising the statutory right of rebuttal because the Massachusetts Legislature only provided limited relief for violations of the Personnel Records Law.

The SJC's decision overturns confusing lower court decisions that baffled legal observers – why would the Massachusetts Legislature have a statute regarding the right of rebuttal for personnel files if there was no penalty for employers who violated it? This decision rights the ship, allowing employers to terminate employees

(even those who filed rebuttals) for any reason or no reason, as long as they do not terminate an employee for filing the rebuttal itself. The SJC made clear that the right of rebuttal does not shield employees from disciplinary action or termination due to legitimate reasons, such as poor attendance or performance.

To ensure compliance with this ruling, Massachusetts employers should be aware of an employee's statutory right to rebuttal, and reach out to a member of the Cooley employment team with any questions.

This content is provided for general informational purposes only, and your access or use of the content does not create an attorney-client relationship between you or your organization and Cooley LLP, Cooley (UK) LLP, or any other affiliated practice or entity (collectively referred to as "Cooley"). By accessing this content, you agree that the information provided does not constitute legal or other professional advice. This content is not a substitute for obtaining legal advice from a qualified attorney licensed in your jurisdiction, and you should not act or refrain from acting based on this content. This content may be changed without notice. It is not guaranteed to be complete, correct or up to date, and it may not reflect the most current legal developments. Prior results do not guarantee a similar outcome. Do not send any confidential information to Cooley, as we do not have any duty to keep any information you provide to us confidential. When advising companies, our attorney-client relationship is with the company, not with any individual. This content may have been generated with the assistance of artificial intelligence (AI) in accordance with our AI Principles, may be considered Attorney Advertising and is subject to our [legal notices](#).

## Key Contacts

Ann Bevitt London	abevitt@cooley.com +44 (0) 20 7556 4264
Wendy Brenner Palo Alto	brennerwj@cooley.com +1 650 843 5371
Leslie Cancel San Francisco	lcancel@cooley.com +1 415 693 2175
Helenanne Connolly Reston	hconnolly@cooley.com +1 703 456 8685
Joshua Mates San Francisco	jmates@cooley.com +1 415 693 2084
Gerard O'Shea New York	goshea@cooley.com +1 212 479 6704
Miriam Petrillo Chicago	mpetrillo@cooley.com +1 312 881 6612

Ryan Vann Chicago	rhvann@cooley.com +1 312 881 6640
Summer Wynn San Diego	swynn@cooley.com +1 858 550 6030

This information is a general description of the law; it is not intended to provide specific legal advice nor is it intended to create an attorney-client relationship with Cooley LLP. Before taking any action on this information you should seek professional counsel.

Copyright © 2023 Cooley LLP, 3175 Hanover Street, Palo Alto, CA 94304; Cooley (UK) LLP, 22 Bishopsgate, London, UK EC2N 4BQ. Permission is granted to make and redistribute, without charge, copies of this entire document provided that such copies are complete and unaltered and identify Cooley LLP as the author. All other rights reserved.