

**1. EEOC Case ID#:** EE-NY-0142

**2. Docket number/Court of each of the related or consolidated cases:** 00-CV-01478 and 01-CV-00062 (N.Dist. New York)

**3. Related or consolidated?** Consolidated

**4. Docket entry # (or other location) where consolidation or relation appears:**  
Docket entry #14 of 00-01478 and docket entry #2 of 01-00062

**5. Date of consolidation/relation?** 01/19/2001

**6. Terms of the consolidation (e.g. “consolidated for purposes of discovery only, trial to be in front of original judge” or “consolidated for purposes of discovery; decision on trial consolidation to be made later”):** 00-01478 is the lead case and “caption in the lead case be amended to show Margaret Schnoop as an intervenor-plaintiff.”

**7. For each case, who are the parties (include charging parties if EEOC is plaintiff) and what is the basic theory of the case? (e.g. sexual harassment, age discrimination)**  
00-01478: Plaintiff is EEOC; Intervenor plaintiffs are Margaret Schnoop, Erin Blair, and Elizabeth Flores; Defendant is Rotary Corporation; Consol defendant Keith Barry; intervenor defendant is Alan Makarwich; theory—sexual harassment.

01-00062: Plaintiff is Margaret Schnoop; Defendants are Rotary Corporation and Keith Barry; theory—sexual harassment.

**8. Briefly describe the procedural history of each case prior to their being related or consolidated.**

00-01478 was filed on 9/29/2000 by EEOC; Margaret Schnoop intervened and that was the only significant activity prior to consolidation of the cases.

01-00062 was filed on 1/16/2001 by Margaret Schnoop with no activity prior to consolidation. Notably, this is after the court in 00-01478 granted her motion to intervene, so this filing seems to be the result of that and probably not intended to be a separate case at all.

**9. After the cases were related/consolidated, what happened? was one case designated the lead case and all subsequent activity appears on that case docket? do both dockets contain lots of subsequent entries and if so, are they mostly or entirely duplicative, or do they indicate different types of activities in the two cases?** 00-01478 is the lead case, and it has the bulk of subsequent activity. 01-00062 has a small amount of subsequent activity, but most of it is duplicative. The cases proceed together to consent decree entered on 8/25/2004.

