

1. EEOC Case ID#: EE-NY-0151

2. Docket number/Court of each of the related or consolidated cases: 00-CV-07296 and 97-CV-07168 (S.Dist. New York)

3. Related or consolidated? Related

4. Docket entry # (or other location) where consolidation or relation appears: Docket entry #1 on 00-07296. It does not appear on the other docket.

5. Date of consolidation/relation? 10/05/2000

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”): Only statement is “Case accepted as related to 1:97cv 7168.”

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)

00-07296: Plaintiff is EEOC; defendant is Simat, Helliesen & Eichner, Inc.; movant Stacy Hazel; theory for this case is not specifically indicated.

97-07168: Plaintiff is EEOC; defendants are Simat, Helliesen & Eichner, Inc. and Reed Elsevier, Inc.; theory is sexual harassment.

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

00-07296 was filed by EEOC on 9/27/2000 and there was no activity prior to its relation.

97-07168 was filed by EEOC on 9/24/1997 and there is a fair amount of activity prior to relation such as discovery and motions for summary judgment.

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? 97-007168 has a lot more activity subsequent to the relation. 00-07296 has activity, and not all of it is duplicative. The cases have consent decrees entered on the same date, but they are different decrees. 97-007168 is also reopened afterwards and has a subsequent entry for consent judgment.