IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA

RUTH PARKER,

Plaintiff,

v.

CIVIL ACTION NO. 21-2828

DELOITTE CONSULTING LLP,

Defendant.

ORDER

AND NOW, this 30th day of January 2024, upon consideration of Defendant Deloitte Consulting LLP's Motion for Summary Judgment (Doc. No. 41), Plaintiff's Response in Opposition (Doc. No. 43), and Defendant Deloitte Consulting LLP's Reply (Doc. No. 46), and in accordance with the Opinion of the Court issued this day, it is **ORDERED** that Defendant's Motion for Summary Judgment (Doc. No. 41) is **GRANTED** in part and **DENIED** in part as follows:

- 1. Defendant's Motion for Summary Judgment (Doc. No. 41) is **GRANTED** as to Plaintiff's age discrimination claim under the Age Discrimination in Employment Act ("ADEA") and Pennsylvania Human Relations Act ("PHRA") in Counts One and Three of the Complaint (Doc. No. 1).
- 2. Defendant's Motion for Summary Judgment (Doc. No. 41) is **GRANTED** as to Plaintiff's retaliation claim under the ADEA and PHRA in Counts One and Three of the Complaint (Doc. No. 1.)

3. Defendant's Motion for Summary Judgment (Doc. No. 41) is **DENIED** as to

Plaintiff's disability discrimination claims under the Americans with Disabilities

Act ("ADA") and PHRA in Counts Two and Three of the Complaint (Doc. No. 1).

4. Defendant's Motion for Summary Judgment (Doc. No. 41) is **DENIED** as to

Plaintiff's ADA and PHRA failure to accommodate claim in Counts Two and Three

of the Complaint (Doc. No. 1).

5. Defendant's Motion for Summary Judgment (Doc. No. 41) is **DENIED** as to

Plaintiff's retaliation claim under the ADA and PHRA in Counts Two and Three of

the Complaint (Doc. No. 1).

6. The claims remaining in the case are: (1) Plaintiff's disability discrimination claim

under the ADA and PHRA; (2) Plaintiff's failure to accommodate claim under the

ADA and PHRA; and (3) Plaintiff's retaliation claim under the ADA and PHRA.

BY THE COURT:

/s/ Joel H. Slomsky

JOEL H. SLOMSKY, J.