

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF MAINE

CALVIN LEWIS, JR.,)	
)	
Plaintiff)	
)	
v.)	1:21-cv-00224-GZS
)	
T-MOBILE USA, INC.,)	
)	
Defendant)	

RECOMMENDED DECISION ON MOTION TO DISMISS

Plaintiff alleges Defendant, Plaintiff’s former employer, discriminated against him based on age and disability. (Complaint, ECF No. 1.) Defendant contends Plaintiff has failed to state an actionable claim and moves to dismiss the matter. (Motion, ECF No. 8.)

Following a review of the pleadings and after consideration of the parties’ arguments, I recommend the Court grant in part and deny in part Defendant’s motion.

FACTUAL AND PROCEDURAL BACKGROUND

The following facts are drawn from Plaintiff’s complaint and Plaintiff’s subsequent submissions. *See Waterman v. White Interior Sols.*, No. 2:19-cv-00032-JDL, 2019 WL 5764661, at *2 (D. Me. Nov. 5, 2019) (stating that a court may “consider other filings by a self-represented plaintiff, ‘including [the] response to the motion to dismiss, to understand the nature and basis of [his] claims’” (quoting *Wall v. Dion*, 257 F. Supp. 2d 316, 318 (D. Me. 2003))). A plaintiff’s factual allegations are generally deemed true when evaluating a motion to dismiss. *See McKee v. Cosby*, 874 F.3d 54, 59 (1st Cir. 2017)

(considering a motion to dismiss pursuant to Rule 12(b)(6)); *Merlonghi v. United States*, 620 F.3d 50, 54 (1st Cir. 2010) (considering a motion to dismiss pursuant to Rule 12(b)(1)).

Plaintiff, a former employee of Defendant, worked in Defendant's Oakland, Maine call center. (Plaintiff's Response to Motion to Dismiss at 1, ECF No. 10.) Plaintiff, who was born in 1954, began his employment with Defendant in 2005. (Complaint Exhibit 1 at 1-2, ECF No. 1-1.) In 2007, he was promoted to the position of Coach of Defendant's Customer Care. (Plaintiff's Response at 1.) He was promoted to Coach, Team of Experts (TEX) in 2018, and his duties included managing a team of ten other employees and the team's Key Performance Index (KPI). (*Id.*)

Plaintiff has been diagnosed with post-traumatic stress disorder (PTSD), depressive disorder, generalized anxiety disorder, and panic disorder, for which, beginning in 2012, he requested several leaves of absence from work. (Complaint Exhibit 2 at 1, ECF No. 1-2; Plaintiff's Response at 2.) Defendant and Broadspire, Defendant's employee benefits provider, approved Plaintiff's requests for leave. (Complaint at 1.) In August 2019, Defendant and Broadspire denied Plaintiff's request for short-term benefit pay for a period of leave. (Complaint Exhibit 2 at 1; Plaintiff's Response at 2.)

In June 2020, Plaintiff's TEX team's KPI made Plaintiff the highest-ranking coach in the company. (Complaint Exhibit 1 at 2; Plaintiff's Sur-reply at 2.) On June 29, 2020, Plaintiff's position was eliminated. (*Id.*) He was the oldest of six TEX coach employees eliminated at the Oakland call center. (Plaintiff's Response at 1.) Plaintiff's supervisor informed Plaintiff that his position was eliminated because of Defendant's merger with Sprint earlier that year. (Plaintiff's Response at 3.)

Plaintiff filed a discrimination charge with the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission (EEOC) in January 2020. The EEOC issued a Notice of Suit Rights dated May 10, 2021.¹ (Complaint Exhibit No. 2.)

DISCUSSION

A. Motion to Dismiss Standard

A complaint fails to state a claim upon which relief can be granted if it does not plead “enough facts to state a claim to relief that is plausible on its face.” *Bell Atlantic Corp. v. Twombly*, 550 U.S. 544, 570 (2007). “The relevant question ... in assessing plausibility is not whether the complaint makes any particular factual allegations but, rather, whether ‘the complaint warrant[s] dismissal because it failed *in toto* to render plaintiffs’ entitlement to relief plausible.’” *Rodríguez-Reyes v. Molina-Rodríguez*, 711 F.3d 49, 55 (1st Cir. 2013) (quoting *Twombly*, 550 U.S. at 569 n. 14). In an employment discrimination case such as Plaintiff’s, the plausibility standard is met when a complaint pleads facts that meet the prima facie standard. *Rodríguez-Reyes*, 711 F.3d at 54.

B. ADEA Claim

To state a prima facie claim for age discrimination under the Age Discrimination in Employment Act (ADEA), 29 U.S.C. §§ 621-634, Plaintiff must establish that “(1) he was at least forty years old; (2) his work was sufficient to meet his employer’s legitimate expectations; (3) his employer took adverse employment action against him; and ... (4)

¹ Plaintiff also filed a charge with the Maine Human Rights Commission (MHRC). (Complaint Exhibit 1.) According to Defendant, the MRHC dismissed the charge on February 10, 2021, and notified the parties that it found no reasonable grounds to believe that unlawful discrimination had occurred. (Motion at 2.)

his employer refilled the position, thus demonstrating a continuing need for [his] services and skill.” *Robinson v. Town of Marshfield*, 950 F.3d 21, 25 (1st Cir. 2020); *see also Gomez-Gonzalez v. Rural Opportunities, Inc.*, 626 F.3d 654, 662 (1st Cir. 2010) (same).

Plaintiff has alleged that (1) he was sixty-six years old when his employment ended, (2) he was qualified for his position as reflected by his position of and performance as a TEX team coach, and (3) his employment was terminated. Because his position was eliminated, however, Plaintiff cannot practically allege that his position was filled by a person with approximately the same job qualifications. Where there is a reduction in the work force, a plaintiff “need not show replacement by someone with equivalent job qualifications. Instead, to satisfy element (4), the plaintiff may demonstrate either that the employer did not treat age neutrally or that younger persons were retained in the same position.” *Hidalgo v. Overseas Condado Ins. Agencies, Inc.*, 120 F.3d 328, 333 (1st Cir. 1997) (internal quotation marks and citations omitted). Here, Plaintiff has alleged no facts that would support a finding that age was a factor in the elimination of his position. Rather, Plaintiff essentially concedes the lack of facts to support his age discrimination claim when he attempts to rely on the failure of Defendant to identify the criteria used to eliminate positions “to rule out age discrimination.” (Plaintiff’s Response at 1.) In sum, Plaintiff has not alleged a plausible age discrimination claim against Defendant.

C. ADA Claim

The Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA), 42 U.S.C. §§ 12112-12117, prohibits discrimination against a “qualified individual on the basis of disability in regard to ... [the] terms, conditions, and privileges of employment.” 42 U.S.C. § 12112(a). At the motion

to dismiss stage, a plaintiff must allege a plausible prima facie case of discrimination: “that (1) he suffers from a disability or handicap, as defined by the ADA . . . , and that (2) he was nevertheless able to perform the essential functions of his job, either with or without reasonable accommodation, and that (3) [the defendant] took an adverse employment action against him because of, in whole or in part, his protected disability.” *Tobin v. Liberty Mut. Ins. Co.*, 433 F.3d 100, 104 (1st Cir. 2005). “Adverse employment action” often comes in the form of “not making reasonable accommodations,” upon the employee’s request. *Higgins v. New Balance Athletic Shoe, Inc.*, 194 F.3d 252, 264 (1st Cir. 1999).

Defendant argues that Plaintiff has failed to plead sufficiently that he is disabled. Under the ADA, an individual is disabled “if he (1) has a physical or mental impairment that substantially limits one or more major life activities; (2) has a record of such an impairment; or (3) is regarded as having such an impairment.” *Roman-Oliveras v. P. R. Elec. Power Auth.*, 655 F.3d 43, 48 (1st Cir. 2011). A plaintiff must allege “an actual present or past disability substantially impacting a major life activity.” *Young v. Town of Bar Harbor*, No. 1:14-cv-00146-GZS, 2015 WL 2337868, at *8 (D. Me. Apr. 23, 2015) (*aff’d*, May 13, 2015).

Plaintiff alleges that he has PTSD, depressive disorder, generalized anxiety disorder, and panic disorder, which conditions have caused Plaintiff to request several leaves of absence from his work with Defendant. Defendant asserts that Plaintiff has failed to identify a major life activity impacted by his claimed disability. “Working can be considered a major life activity.” *Ramos-Echevarria v. Pichis, Inc.*, 659 F.3d 182, 188 (1st Cir. 2011). To be “substantially limited in the major life activity of working,” a plaintiff

Explore Litigation Insights

Docket Alarm provides insights to develop a more informed litigation strategy and the peace of mind of knowing you're on top of things.

Real-Time Litigation Alerts



Keep your litigation team up-to-date with **real-time alerts** and advanced team management tools built for the enterprise, all while greatly reducing PACER spend.

Our comprehensive service means we can handle Federal, State, and Administrative courts across the country.

Advanced Docket Research



With over 230 million records, Docket Alarm's cloud-native docket research platform finds what other services can't. Coverage includes Federal, State, plus PTAB, TTAB, ITC and NLRB decisions, all in one place.

Identify arguments that have been successful in the past with full text, pinpoint searching. Link to case law cited within any court document via Fastcase.

Analytics At Your Fingertips



Learn what happened the last time a particular judge, opposing counsel or company faced cases similar to yours.

Advanced out-of-the-box PTAB and TTAB analytics are always at your fingertips.

API

Docket Alarm offers a powerful API (application programming interface) to developers that want to integrate case filings into their apps.

LAW FIRMS

Build custom dashboards for your attorneys and clients with live data direct from the court.

Automate many repetitive legal tasks like conflict checks, document management, and marketing.

FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS

Litigation and bankruptcy checks for companies and debtors.

E-DISCOVERY AND LEGAL VENDORS

Sync your system to PACER to automate legal marketing.