

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
EASTERN DISTRICT OF LOUISIANA**

GLAPION, DHCREEION

Plaintiff,

VERSUS

SAKS FIFTH AVENUE LLC

Defendant

* **CIVIL ACTION NO. 24-2232**

*

* **JUDGE :**

*

* **MAG. DIV.**

*

*

*

* **JURY TRIAL REQUESTED**

**COMPLAINT FOR DAMAGES
AND DEMAND FOR TRIAL BY JURY**

COMES NOW, Dhcreeion Glapion (hereinafter referred to as "Plaintiff") , appearing herein through undersigned counsel, respectfully states as follows:

PRELIMINARY STATEMENT

This action is based on discrimination and seeks declaratory, injunctive and equitable relief, back pay, reinstatement (or in lieu thereof, front pay), compensatory damages, punitive damages, attorney's fees, prejudgment interest, and costs for discrimination, harassment, and hostile work environment based on sex.

JURISDICTION AND VENUE

1. This is an individual action authorized and instituted pursuant to Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, as amended, 42 U.S.C. §2000e *et seq.* ("Title VII"), and Louisiana law, La. R.S. 23:301 *et seq.*

2. Damages and other appropriate legal and equitable relief are sought pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 2000e (5)(f) and (5)(g), 42 U.S.C. §1981, La. R.S. 23:301 *et seq* and La. C.C. 2315.
3. Plaintiff has complied fully with all prerequisites and the jurisdiction of this court under Title VII including all administrative procedures through the EEOC and received a right-to sue letter.
4. The unlawful employment practice all occurred within the district of the Eastern District of Louisiana, therefore venue is proper within this district, in accordance with Section 706(f)(3) of Title VII, 42 U.S.C. § 2000e (f)(3) and state law.
5. Jurisdiction of the court is invoked pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §1331 and 1367(a).

PARTIES

6. **Plaintiff, Dhcreion Glapion** (hereinafter, "Plaintiff" or "Ms. Glapion"), a person of the full age of majority, was hired on May 23, 2022 by defendant, and is a resident of the State of Louisiana. Plaintiff filed a discrimination charge against defendant who has allowed a pervasive and severe hostile work environment as a condition of employment.
7. **Defendant, Saks Fifth Avenue, LLC** ("Saks"), a foreign corporation licensed to do business and doing business in New Orleans, Louisiana who hired Ms. Glapion to work in their store at 301 Canal Street, New Orleans, Louisiana.

ALLEGATIONS COMMON TO ALL CAUSES OF ACTION

8. On May 23, 2022 Plaintiff was hired by Saks on a commission basis as a "style advisor" or sales associate.
9. Between September, 2022 and January, 2023, Plaintiff experienced sales issues with her male co-workers who would prevent her from selling to customers they believed were "their"

customers. Plaintiff informed her head manager, Brianna Jardine that the sales floor needed rules and handbooks to no avail.

10. In October, 2022 there were customers near the “Hugo Boss” merchandise area and Plaintiff greeted them and began to assist them. A male co-worker Matt Perkins became upset as it was “his” client and told Plaintiff that her customers think that “she” is his “assistant.”

11. On November 27, 2022 a co-worker posted a disparaging video of Plaintiff calling her a “Goofy Goober.” Plaintiff reported the incident to her manager, Brianne Jardine and nothing was done to remove the video or prevent the co-worker from further disparagement.

12. On January 13, 2023, a customer, Terrell Cargo pulled Plaintiff by her arm in the dressing room and tried to forcibly kiss her. Plaintiff pulled away and asked “what are doing?” and Mr. Cargo responded that he was going to kiss Plaintiff on the forehead not the lips. Plaintiff said “don’t kiss me at all” and Mr. Cargo responded “ if you act right, you could be married by tomorrow.”

13. Plaintiff reported the incident to Brianna Jardine shortly after it occurred. Plaintiff was told to leave the store or take lunch if she saw the customer again. If Plaintiff left the store, she would be unable to make commissions. Plaintiff also told an employee of Asset Protection in hopes that they would warn her when the customer entered the store. The customer was still allowed to enter the store.

14. Mr. Cargo started coming into the store often to interact with the Plaintiff. Plaintiff would avoid Mr. Cargo to the best of her ability. However, Mr. Cargo was still allowed to enter the store and interact with the Plaintiff.

15. On May 9, 2023, Terrell Cargo followed Plaintiff around the store, found her downstairs and grabbed her arm and said “Happy Mother’s Day Slim.” Plaintiff reported the incident to Brianna Jardine, her manager, and left the store to avoid the customer. Nevertheless, Mr. Cargo was still allowed to enter the store.

16. On May 22, 2023, Plaintiff sent a photo of Mr. Terrell Cargo to Brianna Jardine in an effort to get her manager to tell Asset Protection to be on the lookout for Mr. Cargo.

17. On June 5, 2023, Quenten Passantino, a convicted felon and co-worker, began yelling and cursing at Plaintiff because Plaintiff inadvertently got a key stuck in a sunglasses case. Passantino called Plaintiff a “Black Bitch.” Plaintiff reported the incident to Brianna Jardine and called the Saks Hotline. Plaintiff decided on her own to take leave so she would not work with Mr. Passantino. Nothing was done to keep Plaintiff from working with Mr. Passantino or to prevent the comments.

18. In July, 2023 Plaintiff reported the history incidents with Mr. Cargo to Human Resources, Letricia Francois. The customer was not trespassed from the store and no steps were taken to protect her but for her own unilateral decision to try and leave the area if he was near her.

19. On October 24, 2023, Terrell Cargo returned to the store again. Plaintiff informed the Store Manager, Kristy Frazier, that she was leaving the store to avoid the customer. Mr. Cargo also left the store at the same time in the direction of the Plaintiff.

20. November 3, 2023, Terrell Cargo returned to the store and was watching the Plaintiff. Plaintiff reported the interaction with her manager Brianna Jiardance who again did nothing to protect Plaintiff. Plaintiff herself sought the assistance of Craig Gagnard, the Asset Protection

guard, to walk her out of the store. Mr. Cargo was waiting for her behind the glass door of the store.

21. As a result of the frequent encounters with Mr. Cargo, Plaintiff filed a police report in November, 2023 as she was in fear of being sexually assaulted again and was offered no protection by the Defendant.

22. On January 11, 2024 Mr. Terrell Cargo came into the store. Mr. Cargo did not purchase anything and instead he talked to everyone on the floor and watched Plaintiff working. Almost an hour later, Mr. Cargo went down stairs and talked to Plaintiff's co-workers. Brianna Jiardine saw Mr. Cargo and started following him but did nothing to trespass the customer, talk to the customer to ask him to stop interacting with the Plaintiff or did anything at all.

23. On January 12, 2024, Plaintiff met with Charles Leininger and Brianna Jiardine about Terrell Cargo. Plaintiff was told she needed more than a police report to keep Mr. Cargo out of the store. Plaintiff was told she had to file a restraining order. Plaintiff was forced to take leave and did take leave starting in February, 2024 as she was severely depressed and in fear of her safety.

24. Plaintiff returned to the store in April, 2024. Plaintiff was informed that the "Shoe" section was off limits to selling and that she could go anywhere else to make sales. However, Plaintiff received conflicting information from another manager, Victor, who told her no area was off limits in the store for sales.

25. On May 26, 2024, Jonathan Falgout, also a male sales associate, went to the shoe section to greet a customer despite Plaintiff being told that the "Shoe" section was off limits to selling. Lilly Morgan, another co-worker, witnessed the incident.

26. On June 2, 2024, Plaintiff reported to the Saks Ethics hotline that her male co-workers, Matt Perkins and Jonathan Falgout were making multiple complaints about the Plaintiff for standing in the Shoe area. She reported that there was conflicting information given to her about whether she could sell in the Shoe area and that her male co-workers could sell there and she could not.

27. On June 3, 2024, Terrell Cargo returned to the area and watched Plaintiff outside the Saks employee entrance from the Louis Vuitton store. Plaintiff walked back into Saks to return the keys and leave for the day when she returned back out the door and Mr. Cargo was standing closer to the door she was positioned at. Craig Gagnard went out of the door first and Plaintiff followed him, avoiding Mr. Cargo. The next day, Craig Gagnard said in a flippant manner to Plaintiff “your stalker is not out there.” Both managers and security knew that Mr. Cargo was acting in a stalking manner towards the Plaintiff and did nothing about it.

28. On June 8, 2024 the Plaintiff was terminated. Plaintiff was told she was terminated because she allegedly entered an area specifically assigned to her male co-workers and assisted their potential clients despite conflicting direction given by leadership.

29. The reason for termination was pretextual as other male co-workers were allowed to enter into all areas as the Plaintiff was told that the Sales Floor was “open” except for the Shoe department.

30. In fact, Plaintiff was terminated due to filing a police report for sexual harassment and for complaining of the sexual harassment to her supervisors.

FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION
UNLAWFUL FEDERAL AND STATE
DISCRIMINATORY EMPLOYMENT PRACTICES

31. Plaintiff repeats and realleges each and every allegation contained in Paragraphs 1 through 30 of this Complaint with the same force and effect as if set herein.

32. The above acts and practices of the Defendant constitute unlawful discriminatory employment practices within the meaning of Federal law and Louisiana Employment Discrimination Law, La. R.S. 23:301 et al based on sex and/or gender. Plaintiff requests supplemental jurisdiction be applied for the state law claim of employment discrimination.

33. In 1980, the EEOC issued guidelines stating, "sexual harassment is a form of sex discrimination that is prohibited by Title VII." The EEOC guidelines explain in detail that sexual harassment could take the form of a hostile "environment" where the sexual conduct has the purpose or effect of unreasonably interfering with an individual's work performance or creating an intimidating, hostile or offensive working environment [29 C.F.R. §1604.11 (a) and *Meritor Sav. Bank, FSB v. Vinson* (1986) 477 U.S. 57, 65, 106 S.Ct. 2399, 2404--2406]. It is important to note that in the United States Supreme Court decision in *Meritor*, the Court held that sexual harassment creating an intimidating or hostile working environment, but not resulting in any tangible loss of job, position, or benefit, still violates Title VII. Thus, Plaintiff's suit is based on a hostile work environment.

34. As a result of Defendant's discriminatory acts, Plaintiff has suffered and will continue to suffer monetary damages and damages for mental anguish and humiliation unless and until this Court grants relief.

35. Plaintiff is currently under the care of a psychiatrist and has ongoing post-traumatic stress syndrome and is taking prescription antidepressants due to this incident sued upon.

SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION
LACK OF POLICY FOR SEXUAL HARASSMENT,

36. Plaintiff repeats and realleges each and every allegation contained in Paragraphs 1 through 35 of this Complaint with the same force and effect as if set herein.

37. Defendants failed to have a viable policy and procedures in place for sexual harassment and sexual discrimination.

38. No actual sex harassment policy was actually implemented in action and any policy Defendant contends existed was a “paper policy” only. The training was non-existent and there was insufficient training of security and supervisors to meaningfully implement any policy in violation of Title VII. Therefore punitive damages are appropriate.

39. As a result of Defendant's discriminatory acts, Plaintiff has suffered and will continue to suffer monetary damages and damages for Defendant not having a viable policy and procedures in place for sexually hostile work environment and for deliberately understaffing security and staff.

40. Plaintiff has suffered and will continue to suffer unless and until this Court grants relief for punitive damages, including reasonable attorneys' fees and costs. *Farragher* is not available as a defense as the policy did nothing to prevent the hostile work environment because the failed to implement any policy. Defendants created an unsafe environment with untrained staff and managers making any enforcement of its paper policy impossible despite the fact that the

Plaintiff filed a police report. This type of behavior is premeditated and unjustifiable. A substantial punitive and compensatory damage award should be awarded to Plaintiff.

THIRD CAUSE OF ACTION
COMPENSATORY AND PUNITIVE DAMAGES UNDER TITLE VII ARE ALLOWED

41. Plaintiff repeats and realleges each and every allegation contained in Paragraphs 1 through 40 of this Complaint with the same force and effect as if set herein.

42. Defendant had more than 300 employees, and therefore Title VII caps on compensatory and punitive damages take effect, but Title VII also allows for recovery of uncapped compensatory damages for state causes of action under La. C.C. 2315, La. C.C. 2320 and for state charges of sexual harassment. Pendant state law discrimination claims in this federal court complaint allows larger amounts of awards than and Title VII cap that would be present.

43. Under Title VII, the total that can be awarded for compensatory and punitive damages may not exceed \$300,000 in cases of employers of 300 employees. Under 42 U.S.C. §1981 a. Damages in Cases of Intentional Discrimination in Employment (b)(3)(A), it should be noted, that back pay and front pay are not treated as compensatory damages, thus are not subject to these damage caps. *Pollard v. E. I. Du Pont de Nemours & Co.*, 532 U.S. 843, 848, 121 S.Ct. 1946, 1949; *Johnson v. Spencer Press of Maine, Inc.* (1st. Cir. 2004) 364 F.3d 368, 378. Note there is no cap under state sexual harassment under La. R.S. 23:301 and for state causes of assault and battery under La. C.C. 2315 and La. C.C. 2322.

44. Plaintiff's damages clearly exceed \$300,000 for compensatory and punitive damages. She has sustained humiliation, pain and suffering, and mental anguish. She has suffered from depression and anxiety.

PLAINTIFF'S DAMAGE ASSESSMENTS

45. Plaintiff repeats and realleges each and every allegation contained in Paragraphs 1 through 44 of this Complaint with the same force and effect as if set herein.

46. The proximate cause--in--fact of Plaintiff's injuries and suffering such damages, was the negligent and intentional conduct of the Defendant, listed above, which are all in violation of Title VII, in violation of La. R.S. 23:301, and La. C.C. 2315, including:

- 1) Sexual Discrimination;
- 2) Sexual Harassment;
- 3) Maintaining a hostile work environment for women;
- 4) Adverse Employment action;
- 5) Sexual assault;
- 6) Failure of Defendant to monitor, investigate and to implement a training of its sexual harassment policy for its employees;
- 7) Negligent supervision, negligent management;.
- 8) Any and all other negligent and intentional acts that may be used at the trial of this matter.

47. As a result of Defendant's discriminatory acts, Plaintiff has suffered a loss of income, employment benefits, emotional distress, pain and humiliation, embarrassment, ridicule, damage to her employment record, past and future mental anguish, and damages due being made to work in a hostile work environment subjecting Plaintiff to the extreme and outrageous conduct of customers.

RELIEF FOR DAMAGES

48. Plaintiff repeats and realleges each and every allegation contained in Paragraphs 1 through 47 of this Complaint with the same force and effect as if set herein.

49. Plaintiff itemizes her damages as follows:

- 1) Past lost wages;
- 2) Future lost wages;
- 3) Past loss of employment benefits;
- 4) Past and future emotional distress;
- 5) Past and future humiliation;
- 6) Past and future embarrassment and ridicule;
- 7) Past and future mental anguish;
- 8) Sexual assault
- 9) Wrongful and retaliatory termination; and
- 10) Punitive damages, including reasonable attorneys' fees and costs.

Pursuant to requirements of La. R.S. 23:303(c) plaintiff provided written notice to defendants through EEOC charges filed in an attempt to amicably settle this matter to no avail. Plaintiff prays for trial by jury and states her damages are reasonable on the premises, and which said damages exceeds the amount required for trial by jury.

PRAYER FOR RELIEF

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff respectfully requests that this Court enter a judgment:

- a) Declaring that the acts and practices complained of herein are in violation of Title VII;
- b) Declaring that the acts and practices complained of herein are in violation of La. R.S. 23:301 *et seq.*, the Louisiana Employment Discrimination law and La. Criminal law of sexual assault;
- c) Enjoining and permanently restraining these violations of Title VII, and requiring Defendants implement a viable sexual harassment policy and training for employees and supervisors to end sexual harassment which endangers female employee's safety and care;
- d) Directing Defendant to take such affirmative action as is necessary to ensure that the effects of these unlawful employment practices are eliminated;
- e) Directing Defendant to place Plaintiff in the position she would have occupied but for Defendant's discriminatory treatment of her, and make her whole for all earnings she would have received but the defendant's discriminatory and retaliatory treatment, including, but not limited to, wages, pension, and lost benefits;
- f) Awarding Plaintiff compensatory and punitive damages;
- g) Awarding Plaintiff costs of this action together with reasonable attorneys' fees as provided by §706(k) of Title VII, 42 U.S.C. §2000e-6(k);
- h) Declaring that the acts and practices complained of herein are in violation of La. R.S. 23: 301;
- i) Directing Defendant to pay plaintiff compensatory damages and damages for her mental anguish and humiliation; and

j) Granting such other and on further relief as this Court deems necessary and proper.

DEMAND FOR TRIAL BY JURY

Pursuant to Rule 38(b) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, Plaintiff demands a trial by jury in this action.

Respectfully Submitted:

VASQUEZ LAW OFFICE

/s/Jessica Vasquez

Jessica Vasquez
400 Poydras Street, Ste. 900
New Orleans, LA 70130
T: 504/571.9582
F: 504/684.1449
jvasquez@vasquezlawoffice.com
Attorney for Dhcrecion Glapion

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
EASTERN DISTRICT OF LOUISIANA**

GLAPION, DHCREEION
Plaintiff,

VERSUS

SAKS FIFTH AVENUE LLC
Defendant

* **CIVIL ACTION NO.** 24-2232

*

* **JUDGE :**

*

* **MAG. DIV.**

*

*

*

* **JURY TRIAL REQUESTED**

VERIFICATION

I, Dhcreeion Glapion, hereby declare and verify under penalty of the perjury of the laws of the United States that the allegations in the Complaint are true and correct to the best of my knowledge.

Date: September 10, 2024


DHCREEION GLAPION

**U.S. District Court
Eastern District of Louisiana (New Orleans)
CIVIL DOCKET FOR CASE #: 2:24-cv-02232-EEF-JVM**

Glaption v. Saks Fifth Avenue, LLC
Assigned to: Judge Eldon E. Fallon
Referred to: Magistrate Judge Janis van Meerveld
Cause: 42:2000e Job Discrimination (Employment)

Date Filed: 09/10/2024
Date Terminated: 09/03/2025
Jury Demand: Plaintiff
Nature of Suit: 442 Civil Rights: Jobs
Jurisdiction: Federal Question

Plaintiff

Dhcrecion Glaption

represented by **Jessica Michelle Vasquez**
Vasquez Law Office
400 Poydras Street
Suite 900
New Orleans, LA 70130
504-571-9582
Email: jvasquez@vasquezlawoffice.com
LEAD ATTORNEY
ATTORNEY TO BE NOTICED

V.

Defendant

Saks Fifth Avenue, LLC

represented by **Claire R. Pitre**
Taylor Wellons Politz and Duhe
1555 Poydras Street
Ste 2000
New Orleans
New Orleans, LA 70122
985-804-2346
Email: cpitre@twpdllaw.com
LEAD ATTORNEY
ATTORNEY TO BE NOTICED

Date Filed	#	Docket Text
09/10/2024	<u>1</u>	COMPLAINT with jury demand against Saks Fifth Avenue LLC (In Forma Pauperis status requested) filed by Dhcrecion Glaption. (Attachments: # <u>1</u> Civil Cover Sheet, # <u>2</u> Summons)Attorney Jessica Michelle Vasquez added to party Dhcrecion Glaption (pty:pla). (Vasquez, Jessica) Modified on 9/13/2024 (gla). (Entered: 09/10/2024)
09/10/2024	<u>2</u>	EXPARTE/CONSENT MOTION for Leave to Proceed in forma pauperis by Dhcrecion Glaption. Motion(s) referred to Janis van Meerveld. (Attachments: # <u>1</u> Exhibit 1, # <u>2</u> Proposed Order)(Vasquez, Jessica) Modified on 9/16/2024 (my). (Entered: 09/10/2024)

09/13/2024	3	Initial Case Assignment to Judge Eldon E. Fallon and Magistrate Judge Janis van Meerveld. (car) (Entered: 09/13/2024)
09/16/2024	4	ORDER: GRANTING 2 Motion for Leave to Proceed in forma pauperis. Signed by Magistrate Judge Janis van Meerveld on 9/16/2024. (lb) (Entered: 09/16/2024)
09/16/2024	5	Summons Issued as to Saks Fifth Avenue, LLC. (lb) (Entered: 09/16/2024)
09/23/2024	6	NOTICE REGARDING LOCAL CIVIL RULE 54.7(lb) (Entered: 09/23/2024)
10/16/2024	7	EXPARTE/CONSENT MOTION for Extension of Time to Answer re 1 Complaint, by Saks Fifth Avenue, LLC. Motion(s) referred to Janis van Meerveld. (Attachments: # 1 Proposed Order)Attorney Claire R. Pitre added to party Saks Fifth Avenue, LLC(pty:dft). (Pitre, Claire) (Entered: 10/16/2024)
10/17/2024	8	ORDER: GRANTING 7 Motion for Extension of Time to Answer re 1 Complaint, as to Saks Fifth Avenue, LLC answer due 11/5/2024. Signed by Magistrate Judge Janis van Meerveld on 10/17/2024. (lb) (Entered: 10/17/2024)
11/04/2024	9	EXPARTE/CONSENT Second MOTION for Extension of Time to Answer re 1 Complaint, by Saks Fifth Avenue, LLC. Motion(s) referred to Janis van Meerveld. (Attachments: # 1 Proposed Order)(Pitre, Claire) (Entered: 11/04/2024)
11/05/2024	10	ORDER: GRANTING 9 Motion for Extension of Time to Answer as to Saks Fifth Avenue, LLC answer due 11/12/2024. Signed by Magistrate Judge Janis van Meerveld on 11/5/2024. (lb) (Entered: 11/05/2024)
11/12/2024	11	MOTION to Dismiss for Failure to State a Claim by Saks Fifth Avenue, LLC. Motion(s) referred to Janis van Meerveld. Motion(s) will be submitted on 12/18/2024. (Attachments: # 1 Memorandum in Support, # 2 Notice of Submission, # 3 Exhibit)(Pitre, Claire) (Entered: 11/12/2024)
11/13/2024	12	Correction of Docket Entry by Clerk re 11 MOTION to Dismiss for Failure to State a Claim . ** Notice of Submission indicates Judge Fallon. Motion set before Magistrate Judge Janis van Meerveld. No further action is necessary.** (my) (Entered: 11/13/2024)
11/13/2024	13	NOTICE REGARDING LOCAL CIVIL RULE 54.7.(my) (Entered: 11/13/2024)
11/19/2024	14	NOTICE OF 636(c) NON CONSENT TO PROCEED BEFORE A MAGISTRATE JUDGE: The undersigned Magistrate Judge has been notified that all parties have not consented to proceed to trial before a Magistrate Judge pursuant to 28 U.S.C. 636(c). The matter is hereby returned to the docket of the District Judge for the scheduling of a preliminary conference and the selection of discovery cut-off, pre-trial conference, and trial dates. Signed by Magistrate Judge Janis van Meerveld on 11/19/2024.(lb)(NEF Sec L) (Entered: 11/19/2024)
11/21/2024	15	Order Vacating Case Referral to Magistrate Judge. Signed by Judge Eldon E. Fallon on 11/20/2024.(gla) Modified on 11/22/2024 (lag). (Entered: 11/21/2024)
12/06/2024	16	NOTICE: Scheduling Conference set for 1/29/2025 10:30 AM before case manager by telephone. By Clerk.(gla) (Entered: 12/06/2024)
12/10/2024	17	RESPONSE/MEMORANDUM in Opposition filed by Dhcreion Glapion re 11 MOTION to Dismiss for Failure to State a Claim . (Vasquez, Jessica) (Entered: 12/10/2024)
12/16/2024	18	REPLY to Response to Motion filed by Saks Fifth Avenue, LLC re 11 MOTION to Dismiss for Failure to State a Claim . (Pitre, Claire) Modified event/text on 12/17/2024 (amj). (Entered: 12/16/2024)

12/17/2024	<u>19</u>	Correction of Docket Entry by Clerk re <u>18</u> Response/Memorandum in Support of Motion. Filing attorney selected incorrect event. Correct event is Reply to Response to Motion. Clerk took corrective action. (amj) (Entered: 12/17/2024)
01/29/2025	<u>20</u>	SCHEDULING ORDER: Final Pretrial Conference set for 8/28/2025 03:30 PM before Judge Eldon E. Fallon. Status Conference set for 3/11/2025 01:30 PM before Judge Eldon E. Fallon. Jury Trial set for 9/15/2025 08:30 AM before Judge Eldon E. Fallon. All discovery must be completed by 7/29/2025. Signed by Judge Eldon E. Fallon on 1/29/2025. (Attachments: # <u>1</u> Pretrial Notice Form)(amj) (Entered: 01/29/2025)
02/14/2025	<u>21</u>	ORDER AND REASONS granting in part and denying in part <u>11</u> Motion to Dismiss for Failure to State a Claim. The motion is GRANTED in that Plaintiff's negligence claims arising under Louisiana Civil Code Article 2315 are dismissed, as Plaintiff concedes. Otherwise, the motion is DENIED as to all other claims. Signed by Judge Eldon E. Fallon on 2/12/2025. (amj) (Entered: 02/14/2025)
03/07/2025	<u>22</u>	ANSWER to <u>1</u> Complaint, by Saks Fifth Avenue, LLC.(Pitre, Claire) (Entered: 03/07/2025)
03/11/2025	<u>23</u>	Minute Entry for proceedings held before Judge Eldon E. Fallon: Telephone Status Conference held on 3/11/2025. (amj) (Entered: 03/13/2025)
06/30/2025	<u>24</u>	Witness and Exhibit List by Dhcrecion Glapion. (Vasquez, Jessica) (Entered: 06/30/2025)
06/30/2025	<u>25</u>	Witness and Exhibit List by Saks Fifth Avenue, LLC. (Pitre, Claire) (Entered: 06/30/2025)
08/25/2025	<u>26</u>	EXPARTE/CONSENT Joint MOTION for Extension of Deadlines by Dhcrecion Glapion, Saks Fifth Avenue, LLC. (Attachments: # <u>1</u> Proposed Order)(Vasquez, Jessica) Modified on 8/26/2025 (amj). (Entered: 08/25/2025)
08/26/2025	<u>27</u>	ORDER: Telephone Status Conference set for 8/27/2025 09:00 AM before Judge Eldon E. Fallon. Signed by Judge Eldon E. Fallon on 8/26/2025.(amj) (Entered: 08/26/2025)
08/27/2025	<u>28</u>	Minute Entry for proceedings held before Judge Eldon E. Fallon: Telephone Status Conference held on 8/27/2025. Telephone Status Conference set for 9/2/2025 01:30 PM before Judge Eldon E. Fallon. (amj) (Entered: 08/27/2025)
09/03/2025	<u>29</u>	ORDER OF DISMISSAL: IT IS ORDERED that this action be and is hereby DISMISSED without cost and without prejudice to the right, upon good cause shown, to reopen the action or to seek summary judgment enforcing the compromise if settlement is not consummated within a reasonable time. IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that the telephone status conference previously set for September 2, 2025, at 1:30 p.m. is hereby CANCELLED. IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that the Joint Motion for Extension of Deadlines, R. Doc. 26, is hereby DENIED AS MOOT. Signed by Judge Eldon E. Fallon on 9/2/2025.(amj) (Entered: 09/03/2025)

PACER Service Center			
Transaction Receipt			
10/23/2026 13:01:30			
PACER Login:	pmondaca	Client Code:	
Description:	Docket Report	Search Criteria:	2:24-cv-02232-EEF-JVM
Billable Pages:	3	Cost:	0.30