

1. EEOC Case ID#: EE-TN-0069

2. Docket number/Court of each of the related or consolidated cases: 03-CV—00088 and 03-CV-00105 (Middle District of Tennessee)

3. Related or consolidated? Consolidated

4. Docket entry # (or other location) where consolidation or relation appears:
Docket entry #6 of 03-00105. The consolidation is not specifically listed on the docket for 03-00088, but the case is referred to as consolidated in that docket's entry #15, two days later.

5. Date of consolidation/relation? 12/01/2003

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”): The consolidation order is not available. The docket entry says “Consolidation may be ordered where common questions of law and fact exist between actions,” and then says that the motion to consolidate is granted. The docket headings indicate that 03-00088 is the lead case and 03-00105 is the member case.

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)
03-00088: Plaintiff is Eric S. King; defendant is LTD Parts, Inc.; theory—not clear from available documents. King had some claims under 42 U.S.C. 1981 and the Tennessee Human Rights Act, but these were dismissed; we do not know what his other claims were.

03-00105: Plaintiff is EEOC; defendant is LTD Parts, Inc.; theory—not clear from available documents.

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

03-00088 was filed by private plaintiff King on 8/21/2003. The only significant activity prior to consolidation was the dismissal of plaintiff King's claims for violation of the 42 U.S.C. 1981 and the Tennessee Human Rights Act, and a Case Management Conference.

03-00105 was filed by EEOC on 9/29/2003. There is no real activity other than the EEOC's motion to consolidate, which is granted.

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? 03-

00088 is the lead case, and after consolidation, no activity whatsoever appears in the docket for 03-00105. All further activity is listed under 03-00088.