

Title VII cases finding that **trans individuals are covered by SEX anti-discrimination protections.**

Jurisdiction	Title VII Case	Citation	Link to full text
6th Circuit	Smith v. City of Salem	378 F.3d 566 (2004)	http://scholar.google.com/scholar_case?case=988234023344471066&hl=en&as_sdt=2&as_vis=1&oi=scholar
	Barnes v. City of Cincinnati	401 F.3d 729 (2005)	http://scholar.google.com/scholar_case?case=5441074903636757220&q=401+F.3d+729+&hl=en&as_sdt=2,22&as_vis=1
9th Circuit	Schwenk v. Hartford	204 F.3d 1187 (2000)	http://caselaw.findlaw.com/us-9th-circuit/1452083.html
11th Circuit	Glenn v. Brumby	663 F. 3d 1312 (2011)	http://scholar.google.com/scholar_case?case=16555670383261317325&hl=en&as_sdt=2&as_vis=1&oi=scholar
EEOC	Macy v. Holder	Appeal No. 0120120821	http://www.eeoc.gov/decisions/0120120821%20Macy%20v%20DOJ%20ATF.txt

6 In *Doe v. City of Belleville*, the Seventh Circuit held that a young man who was taunted by co-workers for wearing an earring and who was repeatedly asked whether he was “a boy or a girl” clearly stated a Title VII sexual harassment claim by alleging that “the way in which he projected the sexual aspect of his personality (and by that we mean his gender) did not conform to his coworkers’ view of appropriate masculine behavior.” *Doe v. City of Belleville*, 119 F.3d 563, 580 (7th Cir. 1997), vacated on other grounds by 523 U.S. 1001 (1998).