

910

discriminate against Plaintiff on the basis of his national origin. This discrimination was pervasive in the workplace and also carried out through Defendant's supervisory personnel. Further, the discrimination by Defendant's employees was further condoned by Defendant's supervisory personnel. Thus, Defendant's practices were illegal and discriminatory conditions of employment and violated 42 U.S.C. Section 2000 (e-2). See Henson v. City of Dundee, 682 F.2d 897 (11th Cir. 1982); Garber V. Saxon Business Products, Inc. 552 F.2d 1031 (4th Cir. 1977).

Lastly, with regard to the jury findings within the special jury interrogatories, those findings are not res judicata upon this Court within the Title VII action. At most, the jury's answers constitute an advisory opinion for this Court. In this regard, Plaintiff cites Defendant's counsel's objection to the use of these jury interrogatories due to the fact that the Court's reliance upon them would cause the Title VII action to be tried by a jury, when the trial of such cause of action is to be exclusively decided by the Court. Further, the jury was considering Plaintiff's claim of racial discrimination, and its verdict in favor of Defendant denied Plaintiff's claim only in that regard. This should not affect this Court's determination of Plaintiff's national origin claim.

In fact, it is questionable whether the jury fully understood the special jury interrogatories. Initially, on Thursday, May 8, 1986 at approximately 5:20 p.m. the jury