

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLORADO  
Judge Robert E. Blackburn**

Civil Action No. 14-cv-00290-REB-CBS

VALERIE ARNOLD,

Plaintiff,

v.

CITY OF DENVER, COUNTY OF DENVER,

Defendant.

---

**ORDER ADOPTING RECOMMENDATION OF  
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE**

---

**Blackburn, J.**

This matter is before me on the following: (1) the **Defendant's Motion for Summary Judgment** [#65]<sup>1</sup> filed November, 10 2014; (2) **Plaintiff's Motion for Partial Summary Judgment** [#91] filed November 12, 2014; and (3) the **Recommendation of United States Magistrate Judge** [#114] filed December 19, 2014. The plaintiff filed objections [#119] to the recommendation, and the defendant filed a response [#127] to the objections. I overrule the objections and approve and adopt the recommendation.

As required by 28 U.S.C. § 636(b), I have reviewed *de novo* all portions of the recommendation to which the parties object. I have considered carefully the recommendation, the objections, the response to the objections, and the applicable

---

<sup>1</sup> “[#65]” is an example of the convention I use to identify the docket number assigned to a specific paper by the court's case management and electronic case filing system (CM/ECF). I use this convention throughout this order.

case law. Because the plaintiff is proceeding *pro se*, I have construed her pleadings and other filings more liberally and held them to a less stringent standard than formal pleadings drafted by lawyers. **See *Erickson v. Pardus***, 551 U.S. 89, 94 (2007); ***Andrews v. Heaton***, 483 F.3d 1070, 1076 (10th Cir. 2007); ***Hall v. Bellmon***, 935 F.2d 1106, 1110 (10<sup>th</sup> Cir. 1991).

As detailed in the recommendation [#119], the plaintiff, Valerie Arnold, asserts claims of sex discrimination in employment and retaliation under Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, 42 U.S.C. §§ 2000e - 2000e-17. Correctly, the magistrate judge concludes that the evidence in the record shows there are disputed issues of material fact related to both the sex discrimination claim and the retaliation claim. Given those issues, the magistrate judge recommends, of course, that the two motions for summary judgment be denied. Nothing in the objections filed by Ms. Arnold undermines the rationale and conclusions of the magistrate judge. The recommendation is detailed, well reasoned, and correct. Therefore, I approve and adopt the recommendation and overrule the objections.

**THEREFORE, IT IS ORDERED** as follows:

1. That the **Recommendation of United States Magistrate Judge** [#114] filed December 19, 2014, is **APPROVED** and **ADOPTED** as an order of this court;
2. That the objections [#119] of the plaintiff are **OVERRULED**;
3. That the **Defendant's Motion for Summary Judgment** [#65] filed November, 10 2014, is **DENIED**; and

4. That the **Plaintiff's Motion for Partial Summary Judgment** [#91] filed November 12, 2014, is **DENIED**.

Dated January 23, 2015, at Denver, Colorado.

**BY THE COURT:**



Robert E. Blackburn  
United States District Judge