

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF CONNECTICUT

SCARLETT M. PIPKIN,
Plaintiff,

v.

ELAINE CARVALHO, and THE CITY
OF BRIDGEPORT,
Defendants.

:
:
:
:
:
:
:
:
:
:
:

No. 3:10cv1047 (WWE)

ORDER

In this action, plaintiff Scarlett Pipkin claims that defendants Elaine Carvalho and the City of Bridgeport discriminated against her based on her race and gender when they valued her property for tax purposes. Defendants have filed a motion for summary judgment. Defendants have failed to comply with Local Rules of Civil Rule Procedure 56(a)3, which provides that “[e]ach statement of material fact by a movant in a Local Rule 56(a)1 Statement . . . must be followed by a specific citation to (1) the affidavit of a witness competent to testify as to the facts at trial and/or (2) evidence that would be admissible at trial.” Without such citation, the Court cannot assess whether material facts are in dispute. Accordingly, the Motion for Summary Judgment is DENIED without prejudice [Doc. #29]. Defendant may submit a renewed motion for summary judgment that complies with the Local Rules for Civil Procedure.

Dated this 5th day of February, 2013, in Bridgeport, Connecticut.



WARREN W. EGINTON
SENIOR UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE