California Employers Face Tighter Deadlines on Workplace Claim Responses

California’s civil rights agency receives about 33,000 complaints a year, and the statutory windows employers work within are narrower than many assume.

Consequences of Failing to Respond to an EEOC Charge

LOS ANGELES, CA, UNITED STATES, August 19, 2026 /EINPresswire.com/ -- California employers operate under one of the most active civil rights enforcement regimes in the country, and the procedural clocks that govern workplace claims have become a recurring source of avoidable exposure.

The California Civil Rights Department, the state agency that enforces the Fair Employment and Housing Act, describes itself as the largest state civil rights agency in the United States. It receives approximately 33,000 complaints annually from members of the public alleging discrimination or hate violence, covering employment, housing, businesses, and state-funded programs.

For employers, the significance is less about the headline number than about what the number implies. An agency handling that volume operates on fixed procedural timelines, and those timelines run whether or not a business has prepared for them.

Two Timetables, One Set of Facts

Under the Fair Employment and Housing Act, an individual generally has three years from the date of the alleged violation to file a complaint with the Civil Rights Department. Once the department issues a right-to-sue notice, the individual has one year to bring a civil action. The practical effect is a window that can extend well beyond the point at which the underlying events have faded from institutional memory.

That gap between conduct and claim is where most employer difficulty originates. Personnel decisions made in a single afternoon may be examined years later against records that were

> The timing of documentation matters just as much as the decision itself, because records created before a complaint arrives carry far more weight than those created afterward."
>
> *Farhad Novian, Managing Partner of Novian & Novian LLP*

never created with litigation in mind. Documentation practices, exit interview procedures, and the retention of contemporaneous notes tend to determine what a defense looks like long before anyone consults counsel.

The federal layer adds a second timetable. Because California is a deferral state with its own enforcement agency, the deadline to file a charge with the U.S. Equal Employment Opportunity Commission extends to 300 days from the date of the incident, rather than the shorter federal default. Many claims are dual-filed, meaning a single set of facts can proceed through both state and federal channels.

Responding to an [EEOC charge of discrimination] is a procedural exercise with its own requirements, and the position an employer takes in that first written response frequently shapes the remainder of the matter. Statements made at the charge stage are not easily revised later, and inconsistencies between an early position statement and subsequent testimony are among the issues most often examined in litigation.

Resolution timing has drawn similar attention. Employers weighing a [discrimination lawsuit settlement] against continued litigation face a calculation that has shifted as procedural costs have risen, and the analysis differs markedly depending on whether a matter is resolved at the administrative stage or after a civil action has been filed.

Counsel practicing in the area reports that questions about the [FEHA statute of limitations] arrive more often from employers than from employees, generally after a claim has already been received. By that stage the relevant window has usually been running for some time.

Novian & Novian LLP, a Los Angeles firm based in Century City, maintains an employment practice that includes employer defense alongside its business and commercial litigation work. The firm was founded by managing partners Farid Novian and Farhad Novian and comprises 18 attorneys.

Where Employers Most Often Fall Short

The compliance picture in California is not static. Employers with operations across multiple counties encounter regional variation in filing patterns, and businesses that expand into the state frequently apply policies drafted for jurisdictions with materially different requirements. Handbooks that satisfy federal minimums do not necessarily satisfy California law, and the divergence tends to surface only once a claim has been filed.

That mismatch is most visible among out-of-state employers opening a first California location. Policies that functioned without incident elsewhere can carry provisions the state does not permit, and the review usually happens after a complaint rather than before one.

Training obligations form part of the same picture. California requires periodic harassment prevention training for supervisors and non-supervisory employees at covered employers, and records of completion are among the first items requested when a claim proceeds to investigation.

Practitioners note that the pattern in employer-side matters has remained consistent. Businesses rarely encounter difficulty because they lacked a policy. Difficulty more commonly arises where a policy existed but was applied inconsistently, or where the reasoning behind a personnel decision was never recorded at the time it was made.

The state's enforcement posture has not narrowed. With complaint volume at the level the Civil Rights Department reports, and with dual-filing routine, the procedural timeline remains the element employers control least and prepare for least often.

About Novian & Novian LLP

Novian & Novian LLP is a Los Angeles law firm located at 1801 Century Park East, Suite 1201, Los Angeles, California. The firm's practice areas include business and commercial litigation, employment law, including employer defense, intellectual property, and personal injury.

Farhad Novian
Novian & Novian LLP
+1 (310) 553-1222
farhad@novianlaw.com
Visit us on social media:
LinkedIn
Instagram
Facebook
