

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF CONNECTICUT**

STEPHANIE BIEDIGER, et al.,
Plaintiffs,

No. 3:09cv621 (SRU)

v.

QUINNIPIAC UNIVERSITY,
Defendant.

CONFERENCE MEMORANDUM

On September 28, 2010, I held an in-person conference on the record with Jonathan Orleans and Alex Hernandez, representing the plaintiffs; and Edward Brill, Susan Friedfel, Rebecca Berkebile, and Jonathan Bardavid, representing the defendant, Quinnipiac University (“Quinnipiac” or “the University”). The purpose of the conference was to address the defendant’s Title IX compliance plan (doc. # 182) and take up scheduling matters.

During the conference, I stated that Quinnipiac’s plan, on its face, appears to be a good-faith effort that likely will bring the defendant into compliance with Title IX. I did not formally approve or disapprove the compliance plan, however, because the issue to be resolved in this case is not whether Quinnipiac will succeed in following the plan’s terms but whether the plan’s implementation will, in fact, bring the University into Title IX compliance. That can only be determined once Quinnipiac implements changes to its athletics department and the court holds a hearing on the legal effect of those changes.

I set the following schedule with respect to count one of the complaint, which was the basis for my memorandum of decision and injunction (docs. # 171 & # 180). Quinnipiac may move to lift the injunction or for an order declaring that the University is in compliance with Title IX. The court, however, will not act on Quinnipiac’s motion until at least 120 days

