

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA

United States of America,	:	CIVIL ACTION
ex rel. Terry Jackson	:	NO. 15-020
	:	
Plaintiff,	:	
v.	:	
	:	
DePaul Health System, et al.,	:	
	:	
Defendants.	:	

ORDER

AND NOW, this **15th** day of **April, 2020**, after considering Defendants' Motion for Summary Judgment (ECF No. 60), Defendants' Motion in Limine (ECF No. 61), Plaintiff's Response in Opposition to Motion in Limine (ECF No. 62), Response in Opposition to Motion for Summary Judgment (ECF No. 63), Defendants' Motion for Leave to File Reply in Support of Motion in Limine (ECF No. 64), Defendants' Motion for Leave to File Reply in Support of Motion for Summary Judgment (ECF No. 65), Plaintiff's Opposition to Motion to File Reply for Motion in Limine (ECF No. 66), Plaintiff's Opposition to Motion to File Reply for Motion for Summary Judgment (ECF No. 67), Plaintiff's Motion for Leave to File Sur-reply in Opposition to Motion for Summary Judgment (ECF No. 68), and Response in Opposition to Motion for Leave to File Sur-reply (ECF No. 69), and for the

reasons stated in the accompanying memorandum, it is hereby
ORDERED that:

1. Defendant's Motion for Summary Judgment (ECF No. 60) is
GRANTED IN PART;
2. Defendants' Motion in Limine (ECF No. 61) is **GRANTED IN PART;**
3. Defendants' Motion for Leave to File Reply in Support of
Motion in Limine (ECF No. 64) is **GRANTED;**
4. Defendants' Motion for Leave to File Reply in Support of
Motion for Summary Judgment (ECF No. 65) is **GRANTED;** and
5. Plaintiff's Motion for Leave to File Sur-reply in Opposition
to Motion for Summary Judgment (ECF No. 68) is **GRANTED.**¹

AND IT IS SO ORDERED.

/s/ Eduardo C. Robreno
EDUARDO C. ROBRENO, J.

¹ Although Defendants' Motions to File Reply Briefs (ECF Nos. 64 & 65) were untimely, the Court also considered Plaintiff's untimely Sur-reply Brief (ECF No. 68). Thus, the parties were given a full opportunity to be heard and there is no prejudice to any party.