
Problem of the Week

Solution Eight

The Supreme Court today reversed its earlier ruling that let stand an appellate court's decision to overturn a lower court's finding that a restaurant owner had no right to fire a waiter for refusing to deny service to a male patron who was not wearing a tie and jacket. if a male patron now enters that restaurant without a tie and jacket, and if we assume the wait staff will serve anyone so long as they are confident they will not be fired for doing so, then will the patron be served?

SOLUTION: The trick is to work it backward.

1. The waiter "refused to deny service" to the poorly dressed patron. That means he served the patron.
2. He was fired for serving the patron.
3. The lower court found the restaurant owner had no right to fire the waiter.
4. The appellate court overturned that decision. At this point the owner had the right to fire the waiter.
5. The Supreme Court initially let this decision stand.
6. The Supreme Court then reversed that decision, meaning that the owner had no right to fire the waiter.

From this, we conclude that the patron will be served, despite not wearing a tie and jacket.