SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF DELAWARE

FRED S. SILVERMAN JUDGE

NEW CASTLE COUNTY COURTHOUSE 500 North King Street, Suite 10400 Wilmington, DE 19801-3733 Telephone (302) 255-0669

March 27, 2014

(E-FILED)

Albert M. Greto, Esquire Law Offices of Albert M. Greto 715 North Tatnall Street P.O. Box 756 Wilmington, DE 19899-0756

Marc S. Casarino, Esquire White & Williams, LLP 824 North Market Street, Suite 902 P.O. Box 709 Wilmington, DE 19899-0709

RE: Marianne Watson-Pedrys v. Brandywine School District, et al C.A. No. 13C-03-222 FSS

Upon Defendant's Motion for Summary Judgment –

DENIED without prejudice.

Upon Plaintiff's Motion to file Second Amended Complaint –

DENIED.

Dear Counsel:

This is a wrongful termination case. Plaintiff was a paraprofessional at a public school. She was injured on the job and when out on long term disability. Accordingly, consistent with state law, she was terminated. Meanwhile, Plaintiff

1

Albert M. Greto, Esquire
Marc S. Casarino, Esquire
Marianne Watson-Pedrys v. Brandwyine School District, et al
C.A. No. 13C-03-222 FSS
Letter/Order
March 27, 2014
Page 2

claims that she attempted to go back to work before she hit the long term disability point. That forms the bases of her claim. Defendant has moved for summary judgement alleging Plaintiff had no protectable interest in her job, she failed to exhaust administrative remedies before filing suit, and assorted, make-weight arguments.

On its face, the argument that Plaintiff did not have a protected interests is week.² The argument about not exhausting administrative remedies has potential merit but the record is open and far from complete. Accordingly, the argument is premature.

Although Defendants have aggressively pursued motion practice, discovery is not complete. Actually, a discovery deadline is not in place, although the court will rectify that presently.

The record as to what, if any, administrative remedies Plaintiff pursued is incomplete. In conclusory fashion, however, she alleges, "I fully cooperated with both my employer and the Delaware OMB in my efforts to secure alternative employment." It remains to be seen what that means. As a minimum, she had to get her doctor's return to work authorization.³

For Plaintiff's part, she has repeatedly filed motions to amend. This time she wants to add gender and age discrimination claims. Recently, she received a "right to sue" letter from the EEOC.⁴ While this motion to amend's timing is understandable, it is difficult to see what those claims add. In other words, if Plaintiff can prevail on her first amended complaint, she will receive the full measure of

²

³

⁴

Albert M. Greto, Esquire
Marc S. Casarino, Esquire
Marianne Watson-Pedrys v. Brandwyine School District, et al
C.A. No. 13C-03-222 FSS
Letter/Order
March 27, 2014
Page 3

damages, including attorney fees, that she would receive under the second amended complaint. Conversely, if she cannot prevail on her first amended complaint, she will not be able to make out a case under the new claims. Meanwhile, as mentioned, the parties are focused on motion practice, and the second amended complaint will precipate another round of dispositive motions, which will further delay this case's resolution and greatly add to its costs. If Plaintiff can explain how she could lose on the amended complaint she has already filed, yet win on the second amended complaint she has leave to file a motion for reargument within ten days of this letter/order's date. She must also explain, however, to the extent that she believes the second amended complaint will add to the litigation's costs and length.

For the foregoing reasons, Defendant's motion for summary judgment is **DENIED** without prejudice to Defendant's renewing the motion upon completion of discovery. Plaintiff's motion to file a second amended complaint is **DENIED**, except as provided above.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Very truly yours,

/s/ Fred S. Silverman

FSS:mes

oc: Prothonotary (Civil)