

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

MARY LAROCHELLE, et al.	:	
	:	
Plaintiffs,	:	
	:	CIVIL ACTION
v.	:	
	:	12-CV-5567
WILMAC CORPORATION, et al.	:	
	:	
Defendants.	:	

ORDER

AND NOW, this 21st day of October, 2016, upon consideration of Plaintiffs’ motion for reconsideration in part (Doc. No. 115), and Defendants’ response in opposition to Plaintiffs’ motion for reconsideration in part (Doc. No. 116), **IT IS HEREBY ORDERED** that Plaintiffs’ motion is **DENIED**.

In the interest of clarifying this Court’s memorandum and opinion dated September 27, 2016 (Doc. Nos. 113 and 114), **IT IS FURTHER ORDERED** that:

1. When plaintiff LaRochelle’s Title VII retaliation claim for reporting sexual and racial harassment survived summary judgment, plaintiff LaRochelle’s retaliation claims under the PHRA and Section 1981, based on the same evidence, also survived summary judgment.
2. When plaintiff Vasquez’s Title VII retaliation claim survived summary judgment, plaintiff Vasquez’s retaliation claim under the PHRA, based on the same evidence, also survived summary judgment.

3. When plaintiff Shearer's ADA retaliation claim survived summary judgment, plaintiff Shearer's retaliation claim under the PHRA, based on the same evidence, also survived summary judgment.

BY THE COURT

/s/ Lawrence F. Stengel

LAWRENCE F. STENGEL, J.