



## Jenna A. Agatep Slater

Associate

[jenna.agatep@wilsonelser.com](mailto:jenna.agatep@wilsonelser.com)

New York, NY – 212.915.5298

Jenna Agatep Slater represents clients in matters at the agency, state and federal level involving discrimination, harassment, retaliation and contract disputes. She also advises clients on best practices for employment policies, contracts, and diversity and inclusion issues. Additionally, Jenna has an established benefits practice with experience in counseling and litigation related to ERISA-covered plans. She has counseled plan trustees on plan design, administration, and compliance and regulatory issues. Jenna has extensive experience establishing, maintaining and dissolving for-profit and nonprofit organizations.

Prior to joining Wilson Elser, Jenna was an associate for boutique law firms in Boston and New York representing employees and unions, offering employer clients an advantageous perspective during litigation and day-to-day counseling. Through her varied career thus far, Jenna learned to foster strong, communicative relationships with her clients by developing a thorough understanding of the issues affecting them, always alert to changes in laws and regulations.

During law school, Jenna served as a teaching and research assistant in Criminal Law, and for the Community Business Clinic. In addition, Jenna was a judicial intern for the Honorable Denise J. Casper of the United States District Court for the District of Massachusetts.

### Education

- Northeastern University School of Law (J.D., 2021)
  - Editor, Northeastern University Law Review
  - Asian American Law Fund of New York Public Interest Scholar
  - Filipino American Lawyers Association of New York, Robin Mangaser Tizon

### Services

- Employment & Labor
- Life, Health, Disability & ERISA

Memorial Award Recipient

- Denise Carty-Bennia Memorial Award Recipient
- Fordham University School of Law (M.S.L Fashion Law, 2017)
- Marist College (B.A. Political Science, *cum laude*, 2014)
  - Istituto Lorenzo de' Medici, Italy, Study Abroad, Italian Language and International Law & Politics

## Bar Admissions

- New York

## Court Admissions

- U.S. District Court, Eastern District of New York
- U.S. District Court, Southern District of New York

## Professional Affiliations

- Filipino American Lawyers Association of New York, President, 2025-2026
- National Filipino American Lawyers Association
- National Asian Pacific American Bar Association
- Asian American Bar Association of New York
- American Bar Association
- New York City Bar Association

## Awards & Honors

Selected for inclusion in *New York Metro Super Lawyers® Rising Stars™* in the Employment and Labor category, 2025

## Languages

- Italian

# Client Wins

## Wright & Agatep Obtain “No Probable Cause” Findings and Case Dismissals from the NYS Division of Human Rights in Four Cases

Nancy Wright (Partner-New York, NY) and Jenna Agatep (Associate-New York, NY) obtained four “no probable cause” findings and case dismissals from the New York State Division of Human Rights (DHR) for the firm’s education clients: two colleges, a charter school, and a private school.

- In the first case, a security guard sued the firm’s college client for retaliation after he was

removed from campus to another location, for allegedly reporting sexual harassment involving two other security guards. Nancy and Jenna argued that (1) the college was not the complainant's employer as he was hired and placed by a security firm at the college; (2) the college, upon receiving complainant's actual employer's investigative notes regarding the reported incident, uncovered that complainant and one of the security guards had participated in the very sexual harassment incident complainant raised, and requested that complainant's employer remove the guards from its premises due to the investigation findings. The employer complied and, it appeared, later terminated complainant's employment. In its Determination and Order After Investigation, the DHR agreed with the college's arguments and dismissed the complaint for lack of probable cause to support discrimination.

•

In the second case, an applicant for a teaching position sued the firm's charter school client for age discrimination and retaliation after she was not selected for the position. Nancy and Jenna argued that (1) complainant did not proffer any evidence connecting her age or opposition to discrimination to the school's hiring decision; (2) complainant was not qualified for the position, having performed poorly during her in-person interview and mock presentation, giving the school a legitimate business reason for not selecting her; and (3) the candidate actually selected for the role was in his 50s – the same protected age group as the complainant thereby negating any inference of age discrimination. The DHR once again agreed and dismissed the complaint for lack of probable cause.

•

In the third case, a prospective male applicant to a film festival hosted by an all-women's college sued the program for gender discrimination. The complainant alleged that the program discriminates against male screenwriters and filmmakers by not allowing them to apply based on the language on their website. Nancy and Jenna argued that (1) the festival does not prohibit anyone from applying based on their gender and, more importantly, (2) the complainant had not even applied to the program and therefore could not have been denied entry. After investigation, the DHR agreed and dismissed the complaint.

•

In the final case, an attorney candidate for a part-time swim instructor position with minor students sued the firm's private school client for discrimination based on his arrest/conviction record. Complainant was offered conditional employment but after a background check returned certain convictions including sexual offenses, the client rescinded its offer pending further investigation. Once the school concluded its investigation and found the results were erroneous, it reinstated the complainant's offer. However, the complainant was irate and refused to accept the offer, voiced his indignation, demanded apologies from the head of the school, and stated his intent to file suit. Nancy and Jenna argued, and the DHR agreed, that the school had a legitimate non-discriminatory business reason for rescinding complainant's job offer; the rescindment was ultimately voided in a matter of days and the offer was then reinstated and refused. As a result, the DHR dismissed the case finding no probable cause to support discrimination.

# Publications

February 2026

**Employment Tip of the Month – February 2026**