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

SHADY HANAFY,

Plaintiff,

v.

HILL INTERNATIONAL, INC.,

Defendant.

ORDER

AND NOW, this 19th day of April, 2023, upon consideration of Defendant's Motion for Summary Judgment (ECF Nos. 25, 29) and Plaintiff's response thereto (ECF No. 28), IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that the motion is GRANTED IN PART and DENIED IN PART as follows:

- 1. With respect to Count I (pursuant to the ADA):
 - a. Summary judgment is **DENIED** with respect to Plaintiff's disparate treatment claim.
 - b. Summary judgment is **GRANTED** with respect to Plaintiff's hostile work environment, retaliation, and failure to accommodate claims.
- 2. With respect to Count II (pursuant to the FMLA):
 - a. Summary judgment is **GRANTED** with respect to both Plaintiff's interference and retaliation claims.
- 3. With respect to Count III (pursuant to the ADEA):
 - a. Summary judgment is **DENIED**.
- 4. With respect to Count IV (pursuant to Title VII):
 - a. Summary judgment is **DENIED** with respect to Plaintiff's disparate treatment claim.
 - b. Summary judgment is **GRANTED** with respect to Plaintiff's hostile work environment and retaliation claims.

- 5. With respect to Count V (pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1981):
 - a. Summary judgment is **DENIED** with respect to Plaintiff's disparate treatment claim.
 - b. Summary judgment is **GRANTED** with respect to Plaintiff's retaliation claim.
- 6. With respect to Count VI (pursuant to the PHRA):
 - a. Summary judgment is **DENIED** to the extent Plaintiff's PHRA claim is predicated on the same theories underlying Plaintiff's disparate treatment claims pursuant to the ADA, ADEA, Title VII, and Section 1981.
 - b. Summary judgment is **GRANTED** to the extent Plaintiff's PHRA claim is predicated on the same theories underlying Plaintiff's hostile work environment, retaliation, failure to accommodate, and FMLA interference claims.

BY THE COURT:	
/S/Wendy Beetlestone, J.	
WENDY BEETLESTONE, J.	