

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF ILLINOIS  
EASTERN DIVISION

MAE F. WORMELY,	)	
	)	
Plaintiff,	)	
	)	
v.	)	No. 08 C 5903
	)	
CITY OF CHICAGO,	)	
	)	
Defendant.	)	

MEMORANDUM ORDER

On October 17, 2008 this Court issued a very brief memorandum order ("Order") that called the attention of counsel for plaintiff Mae Wormely ("Wormely") to an important deficiency in her Title VII employment discrimination Complaint against her ex-employer City of Chicago ("City"): the omission of an EEOC right-to-sue letter regarding Wormely's charge of race-based discrimination and a related retaliation claim. But instead of tendering a brief and simple amendment to the Complaint covering that omission, Wormely's counsel took the needless (and really meaningless) step of refiling the identical Complaint (changed only by heading it with the caption "FIRST AMENDED COMPLAINT" in place of "COMPLAINT"), to which refiling counsel did attach the requested copy of an EEOC July 15, 2008 right-to-sue letter.<sup>1</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> Although that submission was timely, having been electronically filed on October 24, counsel violated this District Court's LR 5.2(e) by failing to deliver a paper copy to this Court's chambers--a requirement that is essential in these days of electronic filings, because the assigned judge is otherwise unaware that such a filing has taken place. This Court's website has not only emphasized the need for such

This memorandum order is issued because of some further information that, in light of the new filing, needs to be provided to address the timeliness of the steps taken by Wormely or on her behalf. With EEOC's letter having been issued on July 15 and suit having been filed on October 15, 2008 (the 92<sup>nd</sup> day after such issuance), Wormely must promptly provide a written representation as to her date of receipt of the right-to-sue letter. And at the same time that is done, photocopies of her charge or charges of discrimination should also be proffered to facilitate this Court's ascertainment of the different aspects of timeliness. Accordingly Wormely's counsel is ordered to submit those materials by way of a brief amendment to the First Amended Complaint (not a self-contained Second Amended Complaint) on or before November 17, 2008.



---

Milton I. Shadur  
Senior United States District Judge

Date: November 3, 2008

---

compliance but has forewarned counsel that a fine might be imposed if noncompliance has made it necessary for this Court's staff to print out a chambers copy instead. In this instance the minute clerk has had to do so, and Wormely's counsel is ordered to pay a modest fine of \$50 to the Clerk of Court as a matter of principle.