

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF
OHIO, EASTERN DIVISION

Nielsen v. Seven Seventeen Credit Union, Inc. et al.

Nielsen · No. 4:24-CV-00579 · Decided February 27, 2026

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the Northern District of Ohio grants defendants’ motions for summary judgment in Mandy Nielsen’s employment-discrimination and sexual-harassment action against Seven Seventeen Credit Union and Angelo Locastro. The court concludes that the federal and Ohio sex-discrimination claims lack evidence of an adverse employment action because of sex, that the quid pro quo harassment claim was inadequately pleaded and unsupported, and that the hostile-work-environment claim was abandoned. The court also considers the effect of discovery sanctions excluding certain evidence.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the Northern District of Ohio, Eastern Division
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Benita Y. Pearson
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the Northern District of Ohio, Eastern Division
DECIDED	February 27, 2026
DOCKET	4:24-CV-00579
DISPOSITION	other
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	Defendants moved for summary judgment under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 56 on Plaintiff's remaining federal and Ohio sex-discrimination and sexual-harassment claims.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	Summary judgment is appropriate when the pleadings, discovery, and disclosed materials show no genuine dispute of material fact and the moving party is entitled to judgment as a matter of law. The evidence is viewed in the light most favorable to the nonmoving party, which must identify specific admissible evidence supporting a genuine factual dispute.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	unpublished

PARTIES

Mandy Nielsen v. Seven Seventeen Credit Union, Inc., Angelo Locastro

TOPICS

title vii sexual harassment hostile work environment summary judgment civil procedure

PRACTICE AREAS

employment law civil rights civil procedure

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether Nielsen presented a genuine dispute of material fact supporting a Title VII sex-discrimination claim based on a materially adverse employment action because of sex.
2. Whether Nielsen sufficiently pleaded and supported a quid pro quo sexual-harassment claim.
3. Whether Nielsen abandoned her adequately pleaded hostile-work-environment claim by failing to address it in opposition to summary judgment.
4. Whether Nielsen's Ohio sex-discrimination claim failed for the same reasons as her Title VII claim.
5. Whether Locastro was entitled to judgment because the remaining claims were asserted against the credit union rather than against him.

HOLDINGS

1. Nielsen failed to show that her termination or any other tangible employment action was caused by her sex or by Locastro's alleged harassment, and she identified no similarly situated nonprotected employee treated more favorably. Summary judgment was therefore proper on the federal sex-discrimination claim.
2. Nielsen did not sufficiently plead a quid pro quo harassment claim and could not raise the claim for the first time in opposition to summary judgment. In any event, the record did not establish a genuine factual dispute that the alleged conduct was unwelcome or conditioned employment benefits on submission to sexual demands.
3. Nielsen abandoned her hostile-work-environment claim by failing to address it in response to the summary-judgment motion. The claim therefore failed without a merits analysis; alternatively, the court stated that the claim failed because the alleged conduct was not shown to be unwelcome.
4. The Ohio sex-discrimination claim failed for the same reasons as the Title VII sex-discrimination claim because Ohio's sex-discrimination jurisprudence is analyzed analogously to Title VII.
5. Locastro was entitled to summary judgment because the remaining federal and state sex-discrimination and hostile-work-environment claims were asserted against the credit union, not against him.

KEY QUOTATIONS

“a plaintiff is deemed to have abandoned a claim when a plaintiff fails to address it in response to a motion for summary judgment.” (Section III.B.2)

“An ipse dixit quid pro quo allegation is insufficient to constitute a legal cause of action under Twombly and Iqbal.” (Section III.B.1)

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Nielsen and Angelo Locastro had a longstanding flirtatious relationship that included sexually explicit messages and later worked together at Seven Seventeen Credit Union, where Locastro became Nielsen's supervisor. In 2022, an anonymous report led the credit union to audit Nielsen's work hours; the audit showed that she worked fewer than the required forty hours during two weeks, and she was terminated for time theft. Nielsen later asserted that Locastro had sexually harassed her, but the human-resources decisionmaker testified that he lacked notice of those allegations and that Locastro played no role in the termination decision.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Nielsen filed suit in the Northern District of Ohio after exhausting administrative requirements. Several claims were dismissed or voluntarily dismissed, discovery-related sanctions excluded specified evidence, and Defendants moved for summary judgment. The court granted both motions and ordered that a separate entry of judgment issue.

DISPOSITION

other

CASES CITED

- Johnson v. Karnes, 398 F.3d 868, 873 (6th Cir. 2005)
- Scott v. Harris, 550 U.S. 372, 380 (2007)
- Matsushita Elec. Indus. Co. v. Zenith Radio Corp., 475 U.S. 574, 587-88 (1986)
- Cox v. Ky. Dep't of Transp., 53 F.3d 146, 150 (6th Cir. 1995)
- Guarino, 980 F.2d at 403
- Corell v. CSX Transp., Inc., 378 F. App'x 496, 501 (6th Cir. 2010)
- Peltier v. United States, 388 F.3d 984, 987 (6th Cir. 2004)
- Kauffman v. Allied Signal, Inc., 970 F.2d 178, 182 (6th Cir. 1992)
- Clark v. United Parcel Serv., Inc., 400 F.3d 341, 347 (6th Cir. 2005)
- Williams v. Gen. Motors Corp., 187 F.3d 553, 560-61 (6th Cir. 1999)
- Ladd v. Grand Trunk W.R.R., Inc., 552 F.3d 495, 502 (6th Cir. 2009)
- McDonnell Douglas Corp. v. Green, 411 U.S. 792 (1973)
- Friel v. Mnuchin, 474 F. Supp. 3d 673, 692 (E.D. Pa. 2020), aff'd, No. 20-2714, 2021 WL 6124314 (3d Cir. Dec. 28, 2021)
- Oncale v. Sundowner Offshore Servs., Inc., 523 U.S. 75, 80-81 (1998)

- La Day v. Catalyst Tech., Inc., 302 F.3d 474, 478 (5th Cir. 2002)
- Faragher v. City of Boca Raton, 524 U.S. 775, 788 (1998)
- Bostock v. Clayton Cnty., Georgia, 590 U.S. 644, 655 (2020)
- Hodges v. City of Grand Rapids, 139 F.4th 495, 504 (6th Cir. 2025)
- Ashcroft v. Iqbal, 556 U.S. 662, 678 (2009)
- Bell Atl. Corp. v. Twombly, 550 U.S. 544 (2007)
- Papasan v. Allain, 478 U.S. 265, 286 (1986)
- Tucker v. Union of Needletrades, Indus. & Textile Emps., 407 F.3d 784, 788 (6th Cir. 2005)
- Brown v. VHS of Michigan, Inc., 545 F. App'x 368, 372 (6th Cir. 2013)
- Hicks v. Concorde Career Coll., 449 F. App'x 484, 487 (6th Cir. 2011)
- Vehar v. Cole Nat. Grp., Inc., 251 F. App'x 993, 1002 (6th Cir. 2007)
- Plumbers & Steamfitters Joint Apprenticeship Comm. v. Ohio C.R. Comm'n, 66 Ohio St. 2d 192, 421 N.E.2d 128, 131 (1981)