HP-13 Companion Article: Family and Medical Leave

Why a Worker-First National Family and Medical Leave System Is Structured This Way

HUMAN PARTY POLICY DRAFT

Solutions First, Humanity Always

Introduction

Document control	HP-13-CA-01
Status	**CURRENT EXPLANATORY ARTICLE**
Purpose	Plain-language explanation of the legal and administrative design of HP-13 family and medical leave.
Authority / successor	Explains HP-13 Part IV and HP-13-ANNEX-A. It does not create independent policy rights.

Controlled library review date: July 31, 2026

Part IV of HP-13 is built around a simple administrative principle: a worker facing a medical, family, safety, military, or bereavement event should not lose income or employment merely because government and employers need time to determine which rule or funding stream applies. The policy therefore separates immediate protection from later verification, coordinates payment with actual work time lost, centralizes private evidence in one public administration, and places restoration before punishment when rights are violated.

1. Why the law must state remedies expressly

The current FMLA provides lost compensation, actual monetary losses within statutory limits, interest, liquidated damages, equitable relief, attorney fees, expert fees, and costs. Its structure is primarily remedial after harm occurs. HP-13 adds preventive protection, mandatory restoration, and statutory accountability for interference itself because many violations cause coercion, lost opportunity, or chilled leave use before a worker can prove a clean dollar amount.

Ragsdale v. Wolverine World Wide, Inc., 535 U.S. 81 (2002), illustrates why Congress should write those remedies directly. The Supreme Court invalidated an agency-created categorical remedy that did not fit the remedial structure Congress had enacted. The lesson for HP-13 is not that stronger remedies are forbidden. It is that the statute should clearly authorize them, identify when they apply, and avoid asking an agency to manufacture a replacement legislative scheme through regulation.

2. Restoration before punishment

A worker-first system treats reinstatement, corrected records, restored leave, back pay, restored benefits, seniority, hours, classification, advancement opportunity, and protection from renewed retaliation as the minimum remedy. Civil penalties then scale according to whether the employer made an isolated good-faith mistake, operated negligently or repeatedly violated the rules, or deliberately obstructed and retaliated.

This structure avoids two extremes. It does not treat every payroll error as intentional misconduct, but it also does not permit an employer to gamble on violating the law and merely return what it took after being caught.

3. Provisional protection and actual-loss payment

Unexpected leave requests receive provisional job protection immediately. Wage replacement is not an automatic payment for a full scheduled period. The administration coordinates with payroll and scheduling

records to replace only actual earnings lost. A partial-day absence produces partial replacement, worked hours remain employer-paid, and all programs are reconciled so compensation does not exceed 100 percent.

The agency must verify eligibility within 14 calendar days. Once approved, benefits continue until the agency proves that eligibility ended or deliberate fraud occurred. This places the risk of administrative delay on the system that controls the process, not on the worker who has already lost time from work.

4. State employers and constitutional structure

Public-sector enforcement requires more than one legal pathway. Nevada Department of Human Resources v. Hibbs, 538 U.S. 721 (2003), upheld Congress's authority to subject States to damages suits under the family-care provision because Congress had developed a record of sex-based discrimination and acted under Section 5 of the Fourteenth Amendment.

Coleman v. Court of Appeals of Maryland, 566 U.S. 30 (2012), reached a different result for the FMLA self-care provision. The Court concluded that the provision did not validly remove State sovereign immunity from private damages suits on the record before Congress. HP-13 therefore does not rely exclusively on private damages actions against States. It combines direct federal administration, prospective compliance orders, clear federal-funding conditions, express waivers where constitutionally available, reimbursement mechanisms, and carefully developed legislative findings.

These cases are examples of the present legal landscape, not permanent boundaries. The architecture should be revisited when later judicial decisions, statutes, implementation findings, or constitutional developments change the available tools.

5. One claim rather than a bureaucratic relay

Many Part IV situations touch multiple institutions. A military relocation may involve the employer, the leave fund, DoD, VA, workforce agencies, and unemployment administration. A permanent medical transition may involve a treating professional, vocational services, National Disability, and the employer. HP-13 requires one submission and one claimant-facing record, with agencies verifying and reconciling responsibility behind the scenes.

That rule also serves the broader Human Party Reduction in Paperwork standard: government should not ask a person to reproduce information government already lawfully holds, and digital efficiency must not eliminate telephone, mail, in-person, or assisted access.

6. Why leave categories share one framework

Pregnancy, medical, caregiving, safety, military, and bereavement leave use the same core machinery: immediate eligibility protection, actual-loss wage replacement, agency-only evidence, minimal employer disclosure, restoration, no double counting, end-of-period review, and appeal continuity. Category-specific rules alter duration, qualifying purpose, funding, and extension standards without rebuilding the administrative system each time.

This modular design makes the statute easier to administer and easier to correct. New public-health emergencies can activate a temporary category without permanently distorting ordinary medical and caregiving leave. Future findings can adjust one category while preserving the shared protections around it.

7. Public accountability

The program is reviewed every three years during its first 15 years and every five years thereafter. Each review must produce a public-facing report on participation, approval and denial, processing time, appeals, solvency, reserves, employer effects, restoration, retaliation, privacy, access disparities, interagency performance, fraud findings, and recommended corrections. Public reporting turns policy revision into evidence-driven maintenance rather than ideological guesswork.

Current Legal References

- 29 U.S.C. § 2617, Enforcement under the Family and Medical Leave Act. U.S. House, Office of the Law Revision Counsel: https://uscode.house.gov/view.xhtml?edition=prelim&num=0&req=granuleid:USC-prelim-title29-section2617
- Ragsdale v. Wolverine World Wide, Inc., 535 U.S. 81 (2002).
- Nevada Department of Human Resources v. Hibbs, 538 U.S. 721 (2003).
- Coleman v. Court of Appeals of Maryland, 566 U.S. 30 (2012).

Legal note: The cases above are used as drafting examples and should be rechecked by legislative counsel when the proposal is converted into introduced bill text.

Document Relationships and Revision Status

Controlling policy: HP-13, Social Security and National Worker Protection, Controlled Working Edition (July 31, 2026).

- **Policy basis:** This article explains HP-13 Part IV and HP-13-ANNEX-A.
- **Legal effect:** It is explanatory and does not independently create or narrow rights.
- **Review dependency:** Current legal and operational issues are catalogued in HC-LOR-13.