

Summary Judgment Review

Case Name: *Anderson v. Emory Healthcare, Inc.*

Nature of the Order: Order

Magistrate Judge: Alan J. Baverman

District Judge: Clarence Cooper

Claims & Outcomes:

1. **Claim:** Retaliation under participation clause (Title VII)
 - a. **Outcome:** Summary Judgment Granted

Whether R&R Followed: Yes

For Race/Gender Discrimination Cases:

Race of Plaintiff: N/A

Gender of Plaintiff: N/A

Summary

Judge Baverman conducted a de novo review of the issues to which Nazarie Romain Anderson (“Plaintiff”) objected after Judge Cooper recommended that Emory Healthcare, Inc.’s (“Defendant”) motion for summary judgment be granted. The Court determined that Plaintiff’s objections were without merit for the persuasive reasons that Defendant’s Response to Plaintiff’s Objections articulated.

Specifically, the Court determined that Defendant’s good-faith basis for terminating Plaintiff was not one that had to be made by a jury. Defendant’s Response addressed Plaintiff’s failure to reference or cite to any legal authority to support her contention that a jury had to determine whether the decisionmaker had an honest, good faith belief that Plaintiff engaged in misconduct. Rather, she based her objection to the R&R on her unsupported belief that a jury must always make that determination. Moreover, Defendant pointed out that Plaintiff attempted to rely on speculation and multiple inferences to satisfy her burden of showing that Defendant intentionally retaliated against her, which the Court had stated was insufficient.

Judge Baverman overruled Plaintiff’s Objections and granted Defendant’s motion for summary judgment.