



1998) (quoting Price Waterhouse v. Hopkins, 490 U.S. 228, 277 (1989) (O'Connor, J. concurring)). At this stage, I am unable to disagree. The statements raise the inference that Dr. Knowlton's unilateral decision to terminate Plaintiff's employment was undertaken due to her national origin.

Similarly, when the timing of Plaintiff's termination is considered, it is possible for Plaintiff to cast serious doubt upon Defendant's alternative reasons for abruptly ending Plaintiff's employment. While Plaintiff was not necessarily a model employee, her immediate supervisors had expressed an interest in working with her to improve her performance problems. Yet, immediately after Dr. Knowlton's first significant exposure to Plaintiff, she was discharged. As a result, it appears that Plaintiff may have sufficient evidence to overcome Defendant's explanations.

As I have concluded that Plaintiff has presented sufficient evidence creating a material issue of fact worthy of trial, the Motion for Summary Judgment will be denied.

An appropriate Order follows.

