

EXHIBIT A

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS
HOUSTON DIVISION**

WALIED SHATER,

Plaintiff,

V.

SHELL OIL COMPANY,

Defendant.

§
§
§
§
§
§
§
§
§
§

CIVIL ACTION NO. 4:20-cv-01465

**DEFENDANT'S OBJECTIONS AND ANSWERS TO PLAINTIFF'S
FIRST SET OF INTERROGATORIES**

Defendant Shell Oil Company ("Defendant") serves its Objections and Answers to Plaintiff Walied Shater's ("Plaintiff") First Set of Interrogatories pursuant to the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure.

Dated: July 31, 2020

Respectfully submitted,

/s/ Ethel J. Johnson

Ethel J. Johnson

State Bar No. 10714050

Federal ID No. 14155

Email: ethel.johnson@morganlewis.com

MORGAN LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP

1000 Louisiana Street, Suite 4000

Houston, TX 77002

T: 713.890.5000

F: 713.890.5001

Of Counsel:

John P. Bramble

State Bar No. 24101544

Federal ID No. 3113007

Email: john.bramble@morganlewis.com

MORGAN LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP

1000 Louisiana Street, Suite 4000

Houston, TX 77002

T: 713.890.5000

F: 713.890.5001

ATTORNEYS FOR DEFENDANT

SHELL OIL COMPANY

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that on the 31st day of July 2020, I served by email the foregoing document on the following attorneys of record:

Mark J. Oberti
State Bar No. 00789951
OBERTI SULLIVAN LLP
712 Main Street, Suite 900
Houston, TX 77002
(713) 401-3555 – Telephone
(713) 401-3547 – Facsimile
mark@osattorneys.com – Email

ATTORNEY FOR PLAINTIFF

/s/ Ethel J. Johnson _____

Ethel J. Johnson

OBJECTIONS AND ANSWERS

INTERROGATORY NO. 1: Who participated in drafting the opening for the RSM – Americas position that was posted by Shell in January 2017?

ANSWER: Shell objects to this Interrogatory as vague, ambiguous, and confusing because the phrase “drafting the opening” is neither defined nor clearly explained. Subject to and without waiving the foregoing objection, James Hall, Klara Smits, and Andrew Maynor were involved in setting the job requirements for the RSM – Americas position.

INTERROGATORY NO. 2: State Wayne Hunt’s total pay, compensation, and benefits that he has received, or been eligible for, during the entire time that he occupied the RSM – Americas position, as well as the pay, compensation, and benefits of any person who replaces Hunt as RSM – Americas.

ANSWER: Shell objects to this Interrogatory as overbroad in scope (i.e., “compensation or benefits that he has ... been eligible for...” but not received), irrelevant (i.e., “compensation or benefits that he has ... been eligible for...” but not received), because it has no bearing on the issues in this action. Shell further objects to the Interrogatory to the extent it assumes facts not in evidence (i.e., who replaces Hunt). Shell further objects to the extent that this Interrogatory seeks information that will not lead to the discovery of admissible evidence given that the total pay, compensation, and benefits that Hunt has received in the RSM – Americas position is in no way indicative of the total pay, compensation, and benefits that Shater would have received had he been selected for the RSM – Americas position. Subject to and without waiving these objections, and pursuant to Rule 33(d) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, the range of compensation for the RSM – Americas position during the period in which Hunt has occupied the position may be determined by examining the records Shell has produced, which are marked as SHELL0001476. Further, at this time, no person has replaced Hunt in the RSM – Americas position.

INTERROGATORY NO. 3: State the dates in which Wayne Hunt worked as a “Liaison Manager” in Mexico.

ANSWER: Shell objects to this Interrogatory as overbroad in time and scope, a fishing expedition, and neither relevant nor likely to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. This Interrogatory is also objectionable to the extent it calls for Shell to speculate. As to the relevance objection, the specific dates in which Hunt worked as a liaison manager in Mexico had no bearing on Shell’s decision to promote Hunt into the RSM – Americas position. Subject to and without waiving the foregoing objections, Hunt worked as a liaison manager in Mexico from approximately July 2010 to February 2012.

INTERROGATORY NO. 4: During his employment with Shell before May 1, 2017, how many days had Wayne Hunt actually physical spent in Venezuela?

ANSWER: Shell objects to this Interrogatory as overbroad in time and scope, a fishing expedition, and neither relevant nor likely to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. This Interrogatory is also objectionable to the extent it calls for Shell to speculate. As to the relevance objection, the specific number of days that Hunt actually spent in Venezuela had no bearing on Shell's decision to promote Hunt into the RSM – Americas position. Subject to and without waiving the foregoing objections, during his employment with Shell before May 1, 2017, Hunt physically worked in Venezuela for approximately one week. The exact number of days that Hunt physically spent in Venezuela are not recalled.

INTERROGATORY NO. 5: During his employment with Shell before May 1, 2017, how many days had Wayne Hunt actually physically spent in the United States of America?

ANSWER: Shell objects to this Interrogatory as overbroad in time and scope, a fishing expedition, and neither relevant nor likely to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. This Interrogatory is also objectionable to the extent it calls for Shell to speculate. As to the relevance objection, the specific number of days that Hunt actually physically spent in the United States had no bearing on Shell's decision to promote Hunt into the RSM – Americas position. Subject to and without waiving the foregoing objections, during his employment with Shell before May 1, 2017, Hunt worked in the Houston, Texas at least twice per year on projects concerning security exhibitions held annually in or around April and September. Hunt also worked on a separate project in Houston, Texas in 2016. The exact number of days that Hunt physically spent in the United States are not recalled.

INTERROGATORY NO. 6: Was Wayne Hunt given new direct reports to manage after December 1, 2016, but before February 9, 2017? If so, who decided to give Hall those new direct reports, and why did he or she make that decision?

ANSWER: Shell objects to this Interrogatory because it includes multiple discrete subparts and to the extent one such subpart is overly broad, a fishing expedition, and neither relevant nor likely to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. Subject to and without waiving the foregoing objections, in 2016, Shell's Physical Access Control System ("PACS") program was closing and Shell was deliberating about key positions that were then included in the PACS program and positions that needed to be transferred to Corporate Security and maintained thereafter. Because Hunt worked closely with the PACS program and understood the needed positions, Hunt received three direct reports on January 1, 2017. The individuals involved in deciding to assign these direct reports to Hunt include Stephen Jones (then Security Strategy & Assurance Manager) and Mike Sinclair (head of the PACS program). Their decision to assign these direct reports to Hunt was approved by James Hall, who considered the decision with his counterpart, Jerri Ballard (Executive Vice President of Real Estate).

INTERROGATORY NO. 7: As to each person hired by Shell into Shell's Corporate Security Department between April 30, 2011 and May 4, 2017, who James Hall was personally involved in making the decision to hire, state: (a) the name and job grade of the position the person was hired into; (b) the hired person's name; (c) the hired person's race; and (d) if the hired person is of British national origin.

ANSWER: Shell objects to this Interrogatory because it is a fishing expedition, overbroad in time and scope, and not relevant nor likely to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. As to the relevance objection, this Interrogatory is objectionable because it seeks information about individuals who are not proper comparators to Shater. Specifically, these are individuals who did not apply for the RSM – Americas position, individuals who were not considered for the RSM – Americas position, and individuals who were not selected for the RSM – Americas position. In addition, this Interrogatory is objectionable as overbroad in time and scope because it seeks information during a time period when Shater was not employed by Shell and for positions for which Shater did not apply and was not otherwise considered. Subject to and without waiving the foregoing objections, Shell is in the process of identifying responsive information to this Interrogatory as properly limited and will supplement this Answer with information about the person(s) who were hired into positions for which Shater applied and the hired person's race and national origin.

INTERROGATORY NO. 8: As to each person working in Shell's Corporate Security Department who was promoted between April 30, 2011 and May 4, 2017, who James Hall was personally involved in making the decision to promote, state: (a) the name and job grade of the position the person was promoted into; (b) the promoted person's name; (c) the promoted person's race; and (d) if the promoted person is of British national origin.

ANSWER: Shell objects to this Interrogatory because it is a fishing expedition, overbroad in time and scope, and not relevant nor likely to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. As to the relevance objection, this Interrogatory is objectionable because it seeks information about individuals who are not proper comparators to Shater. Specifically, these are individuals who did not apply for the RSM – Americas position, individuals who were not considered for the RSM – Americas position, and individuals who were not selected for the RSM – Americas position. In addition, this Interrogatory is objectionable as overbroad in time and scope because it seeks information during a time period when Shater was not employed by Shell and for positions for which Shater did not apply and was not otherwise considered. Subject to and without waiving the foregoing objections, Shell is in the process of identifying responsive information to this Interrogatory as properly limited and will supplement this Answer with information about the person(s) who were promoted into positions for which Shater applied and/or was otherwise considered, and the promoted person's race and national origin.

INTERROGATORY NO. 9: As to each promotion identified in response to interrogatory number 8, state the names, job titles, race, and national origin, of every other person who applied for each of the at-issue promotions.

ANSWER: Shell objects to this Interrogatory because it is a fishing expedition, overbroad in time and scope, and not relevant nor likely to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. As to the relevance objection, this Interrogatory is objectionable because it seeks information about individuals who are not proper comparators to Shater. Specifically, these are individuals who did not apply for the RSM – Americas position, individuals who were not considered for the RSM – Americas position, and individuals who were not selected for the RSM – Americas position. In addition, this Interrogatory is objectionable as overbroad in time and scope because it seeks information during a time period when Shater was not employed by Shell and for positions for which Shater did not apply and was not otherwise considered. Lastly, this Interrogatory is objectionable because it is unduly burdensome and harassing.

INTERROGATORY NO. 10: The names and nationalities of security contractors (other than security guards) performing work for Shell (or any Shell Joint Venture) in Iraq during the time that James Hall was the Vice President of Corporate Security for Shell.

ANSWER: Shell objects to this Interrogatory because it is a fishing expedition, overbroad in time and scope, and not relevant nor likely to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. As to the relevance objection, this Interrogatory is objectionable because it seeks information about individuals who are not proper comparators to Shater. Specifically, these are individuals who did not apply for the RSM – Americas position, individuals who were not considered for the RSM – Americas position, and individuals who were not selected for the RSM – Americas position. In addition, this Interrogatory is objectionable as overbroad in time and scope because it seeks information during a time period when Shater was either not employed by Shell and/or for positions for which Shater did not apply and was not otherwise considered. This Interrogatory is also objectionable because it is unduly burdensome and harassing.

INTERROGATORY NO. 11: The names and nationalities of security contractors (other than security guards) performing work for Shell (or any Shell Joint Venture) in Nigeria during the time that James Hall was the Vice President of Corporate Security for Shell.

ANSWER: Shell objects to this Interrogatory because it is a fishing expedition, overbroad in time and scope, and not relevant nor likely to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. As to the relevance objection, this Interrogatory is objectionable because it seeks information about individuals who are not proper comparators to Shater. Specifically, these are individuals who did not apply for the RSM – Americas position, individuals who were not considered for the RSM – Americas position, and individuals who were not selected for the RSM – Americas position. In addition, this Interrogatory is objectionable as overbroad in time and scope because it seeks information during a time period when Shater was either not employed by Shell and/or for positions for which Shater did not apply and was not otherwise considered. This Interrogatory is also objectionable because it is unduly burdensome and harassing.

INTERROGATORY NO. 12: State the experience Wayne Hunt had “operating as a Regional Security Manager externally” prior to May 1, 2017?

ANSWER: Shell objects to this Interrogatory vague, ambiguous, and confusing to the extent the term “operating” is neither defined nor explained. To this end, it is unclear whether the term “operating,” as used in this Interrogatory, seeks information relating to experiences where Hunt occupied a position with the title Regional Security Manager or seeks information relating to experiences where Hunt performed duties and responsibilities related to regional security management. Subject to and without waiving these objections, Hunt performed duties and responsibilities related to regional security management in his role as a Regional Security Manager UK & Offshore Corporate Security, Barclays; in his role as a Liaison Officer to the Colombian Police Intelligence Directorate, UK Government; and in his role as a Liaison Officer to the Mexican Attorney General Office, UK Government.