

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF
PENNSYLVANIA

D’Angelo v. The School District of Philadelphia

D’Angelo · No. 25-CV-5330 · Decided November 21, 2025

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania denied or dismissed as moot several motions filed by Guy D’Angelo and denied his motion to proceed under a pseudonym. The court dismissed with prejudice all claims against the individually named defendants and dismissed without prejudice the claims against the School District of Philadelphia. D’Angelo was granted thirty days to file a second amended complaint or to notify the court that he intended to stand on his amended complaint, with failure to respond resulting in a final dismissal order.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Chad F. Kenney
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania
DECIDED	November 21, 2025
DOCKET	25-CV-5330
DISPOSITION	other
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	The district court considered Plaintiff's amended complaint and motions to proceed in forma pauperis, excuse a late filing, and proceed under a pseudonym.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	unknown

TOPICS

- motions to dismiss
- motion to amend
- pleadings
- employment discrimination
- civil procedure

PRACTICE AREAS

- civil procedure
- employment law
- civil rights

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether the plaintiff's motion to proceed in forma pauperis required action when that relief had already been granted.
2. Whether the plaintiff could proceed under a pseudonym.
3. Whether the motion to excuse a late filing presented a live issue.
4. Whether the amended complaint's claims against the individual defendants and the School District should be dismissed, and whether leave to amend should be granted.
5. Whether the plaintiff could be required to file a complete second amended complaint identifying all defendants and stating the factual basis for each claim.

HOLDINGS

1. The motion to proceed in forma pauperis was properly denied because the court had already granted that relief.
2. The motion to proceed under a pseudonym was denied.
3. The motion to excuse late filing was denied as moot.
4. All claims asserted against the individually named defendants were dismissed with prejudice.
5. All claims against the School District were dismissed without prejudice, and the plaintiff was permitted to file a complete second amended complaint within thirty days.
6. If the plaintiff does not file a second amended complaint or a notice stating an intent to stand on the amended complaint within thirty days, the court will treat the inaction as an intent to stand on the amended complaint and will issue a final order dismissing the case.

KEY QUOTATIONS

“If the plaintiff does not desire to amend, he may file an appropriate notice with the district court asserting his intent to stand on the complaint, at which time an order to dismiss the action would be appropriate.”

“The second amended complaint shall be a complete document that does not rely on the initial Complaint, Amended Complaint, or other papers filed in this case to state a claim.”

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

The provided order contains no substantive employment facts underlying D’Angelo’s claims. It reflects that D’Angelo filed an amended complaint naming the School District of Philadelphia and multiple individual defendants, together with motions concerning in forma pauperis status, late filing, and use of a pseudonym. The court directed that the individual defendants be added to the docket, dismissed the claims against them with prejudice, and allowed amendment of the claims against the School District.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

D’Angelo filed an amended complaint and related motions in an employment-discrimination action. The court denied in forma pauperis relief as duplicative because it had already granted that relief, denied pseudonym status, denied the late-filing motion as moot, dismissed all claims against the individually named defendants

with prejudice, and dismissed the claims against the School District without prejudice. The court granted thirty days to file a second amended complaint and warned that failure to respond would result in a final dismissal.

DISPOSITION

other

CASES CITED

- Weber v. McGrogan, 939 F.3d 232, 239-41 (3d Cir. 2019)
- Borelli v. City of Reading, 532 F.2d 950, 951 n.1 (3d Cir. 1976)
- In re Westinghouse Securities Litigation, 90 F.3d 696, 703-04 (3d Cir. 1996)
- Poulis v. State Farm Fire & Casualty Co., 747 F.2d 863 (3d Cir. 1984)
- Elansari v. Altria, 799 F. App'x 107, 108 n.1 (3d Cir. 2020) (per curiam)
- Dickens v. Danberg, 700 F. App'x 116, 118 (3d Cir. 2017) (per curiam)
- Baker v. Accounts Receivables Management, Inc., 292 F.R.D. 171, 175 (D.N.J. 2013)