

1. EEOC Case ID#: EE-PA-0023

2. Docket number/Court of each of the related or consolidated cases: 00-CV-04867 and 00-CV-05460 (Eastern District of Pennsylvania)

3. Related or consolidated? Consolidated

4. Docket entry # (or other location) where consolidation or relation appears:
Docket entry #2 in 00-04867 and docket entry #4 in 00-05460

5. Date of consolidation/relation? 11/15/2000

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”): 00-04867 is the lead case; “ALL FILINGS IN C.A. 00-5460 ARE TO BE PLACED IN C.A. 00-4867 AND THE CAPTION IS TO BE AMENDED TO REFLECT THE ADDITION OF BARON FRALIN AS AN INTERVENOR-PLAINTIFF.” The cases are consolidated for all purposes.

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)
00-04867: Plaintiff is EEOC; intervenor plaintiff is Baron Fralin; defendants are Best Buy Company, Inc., Sherry Singletary, Michael Bonnelly, Chris Weidner; respondent is Cheryl Singletary; theory—racial discrimination, the only source available for this is the “Cause” heading at the top part of the docket.

00-05460: Plaintiff is Baron Fralin; defendants are Best Buy Company, Inc., Sherry Singletary, Michael Bonnelly, Chris Weidner; theory—no indication on the docket and no other documents available, but this seems to be based on the same events as the other case since it has overlapping parties and is consolidated into that one.

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

00-04867 was filed on 9/26/2000 by the EEOC; nothing happened prior to consolidation.

00-05460 was filed on 10/27/2000 by private plaintiff Fralin; nothing significant happened prior to consolidation.

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? Both cases have activity after consolidation, but 00-04867, the lead case, has substantially more. The small amount of activity after consolidation that is present in the docket for 00-05460 is duplicative of activity in the lead case’s docket.