

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

RONDA NUNNALLY,)
)
)
 Plaintiff,)
)
 v.) Civil Action No. 08-1464 (PLF)
)
 DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA,)
)
)
 Defendant.)

ORDER

For the reasons set forth in an Opinion issued this same day, it is hereby ORDERED that the District of Columbia’s Objections [Dkt. 130] are OVERRULED IN PART and SUSTAINED IN PART; it is FURTHER ORDERED that Nunnally’s Objections [Dkt. 131] are OVERRULED IN PART and SUSTAINED IN PART; it is FURTHER ORDERED that the Court AFFIRMS IN PART and REVERSES IN PART Magistrate Judge Robinson’s December 19, 2013 Report and Recommendation [Dkt. 127]; it is FURTHER ORDERED that the District of Columbia’s motion for summary judgment [Dkt. 98] is GRANTED with respect to Nunnally’s Title VII and DCHRA claims based on her being required to report to the First District weekly while on sick leave in January 2007; it is

FURTHER ORDERED that the District of Columbia's motion for summary judgment [Dkt. 98] is DENIED with respect to all of Nunnally's other Title VII and DCHRA claims; it is

FURTHER ORDERED that the District of Columbia's motion for summary judgment [Dkt. 98] is GRANTED with respect to Nunnally's DCWPA claim based on retaliation in response to her protected disclosures about MPD's "unethical activities" and "pervasive retaliation" unrelated to her; it is

FURTHER ORDERED that the District of Columbia's motion for summary judgment [Dkt. 98] is DENIED with respect to Nunnally's DCWPA claim based on the three instances of alleged retaliation occurring after May 7, 2008, in response to her protected disclosures about MPD's treatment of her individually; it is

FUTHER ORDERED that Nunnally's motion for sanctions [Dkt. 102] is DENIED with respect to the sanction of a default judgment; and it is

FURTHER ORDERED that Nunnally's motion for sanctions [Dkt. 102] is GRANTED with respect to the sanction of an adverse inference at trial.

SO ORDERED.

/s/

PAUL L. FRIEDMAN
United States District Judge

DATE: March 22, 2017