

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS  
SHERMAN DIVISION**

**DANA BOWMAN**

**PLAINTIFF**

v.

**CAUSE NO. 4:15CV272-LG-CMC**

**RJM CENTER, LLC, and  
LINKS CONSTRUCTION, LLC**

**DEFENDANTS**

**MEMORANDUM OPINION AND ORDER  
DENYING DEFENDANTS' MOTION TO DISMISS**

**BEFORE THE COURT** is the Joint Motion to Dismiss [4] filed by the defendants RJM Center, LLC, and Links Construction, LLC. After the Motion to Dismiss was filed, the plaintiff, Dana Bowman, filed a First Amended Complaint and a response in opposition to the Motion to Dismiss. The defendants did not file a reply or otherwise address the First Amended Complaint. After reviewing the submissions of the parties, the record in this matter, and the applicable law, the Court finds that the Motion to Dismiss should be denied.

**FACTS**

In his First Amended Complaint<sup>1</sup>, Bowman asserts that he lost both of his legs while serving in the United States Army. (1st Am. Compl. at 3, ECF No. 5). Bowman asserts that he visited Centre Place Apartments in October of 2014, and he “personally encountered various barriers to accessibility, including the complete

---

<sup>1</sup> The Court finds that Bowman’s First Amended Complaint was timely filed pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 15(a)(1)(B). “An amended complaint supersedes the original complaint and renders it of no legal effect unless the amended complaint specifically refers to and adopts or incorporates by reference the earlier pleading.” *King v. Dogan*, 31 F.3d 344, 346 (5th Cir. 1994). As a result, the Court will only address Bowman’s First Amended Complaint in this opinion.

absence of handicapped-accessible parking.” (*Id.* at 7). He further claims that he “observed that there were numerous accessibility problems that would interfere with his ability to navigate his wheelchair through the apartments and otherwise access the facilities.” (*Id.*) He claims these “barriers and the lack of accessible features and adaptive design deterred [him] from renting an apartment at the Property.” (*Id.*) According to Bowman, Centre Place was designed and constructed by the defendants RJM Center and Links Construction. (*Id.* at 3, 7).

Bowman asserts the following causes of action pursuant to the Fair Housing Act (FHA): (1) the defendants “discriminated in the rental of, or otherwise made unavailable or denied, dwelling to persons because of their disabilities in violation of 42 U.S.C. § 3604(f)(1);” (2) the defendants “discriminated against persons because of their disabilities in the terms, conditions, or privileges of rental of a dwelling, or in the provision of services or facilities in connection with the rental of a dwelling, in violation of 42 U.S.C. § 304(f)(2);” and (3) the defendants “failed to design and construct dwellings in compliance with the requirements mandated by 42 U.S.C. § 3604(f)(3)(C) and the applicable regulations, 24 C.F.R. Part 100.205 (2008).” (*Id.* at 11). Bowman seeks a declaratory judgment, injunctive relief, monetary damages, punitive damages, costs, and attorneys’ fees. (*Id.* at 11-12).

Prior to the filing of the First Amended Complaint, the defendants had filed a Joint Motion to Dismiss that concerned Bowman’s original Complaint. The defendants seek dismissal pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 12(b)(1) and Fed. R. Civ. P.

12(b)(6). The defendants have not presented any arguments related to the First Amended Complaint; however, in an effort to conserve time and resources, the Court will consider the defendants' arguments in relation to the First Amended Complaint.

## DISCUSSION

### I. The Defendants' Rule 12(b)(1) Motion

#### A. Standing

The defendants first argue that subject matter jurisdiction is lacking, because Bowman does not have standing to pursue this lawsuit pursuant to Article III of the United States Constitution. While Bowman claims that the defendants violated the FHA, most of the arguments and authority raised by the defendants concern standing pursuant to a separate statute, the Americans with Disabilities Act. Nevertheless, it appears that the defendants claim that Bowman lacks standing because Bowman never alleged that he intended to rent an apartment at Centre Place. The defendants have produced evidence that Bowman owns a home worth over \$500,000 that is located fifty-three miles from Centre Place. They further claim that Bowman has filed eighty FHA lawsuits in three different states in less than two years; thus, they assert that he is a "tester" who never had any interest in renting an apartment at Centre Place and never suffered an injury by being denied access to an apartment.<sup>2</sup>

---

<sup>2</sup> The Supreme Court has defined "testers" as "individuals who, without an intent to rent or purchase a home or apartment, pose as renters or purchasers for

In order to establish standing, a “plaintiff must have suffered an injury in fact – an invasion of a legally protected interest which is (a) concrete and particularized . . . and (b) actual or imminent, not conjectural or hypothetical.” *Lujan v. Defenders of Wildlife*, 504 U.S. 555, 560 (1992) (internal citations and quotation marks omitted). “Second, there must be a causal connection between the injury and the conduct complained of – the injury has to be fairly . . . traceable to the challenged action of the defendant, and not the result of the independent action of some third party not before the court.” *Id.* “Third, it must be likely, as opposed to merely speculative, that the injury will be redressed by a favorable decision.” *Id.* at 561. “At the pleading stage, general factual allegations of injury resulting from the defendant’s conduct may suffice, for on a motion to dismiss we presume that general allegations embrace those specific facts that are necessary to support the claim.” *Id.*

Although the defendants attached evidence in support of their Rule 12(b)(1) Motion, they assert that their Motion constitutes a “facial attack” on Bowman’s Complaint. The Fifth Circuit has explained:

A motion to dismiss for lack of subject matter jurisdiction, Rule 12(b)(1), can be based on the lack of jurisdiction on the face of the complaint. If so, the plaintiff is left with safeguards similar to those retained when a Rule 12(b)(6) motion to dismiss for failure to state a claim is raised – the court must consider the allegations in the plaintiff’s complaint as true.

---

the purpose of collecting evidence.” *Havens Realty Corp. v. Coleman*, 455 U.S. 363, 373 (1982).

*Williamson v. Tucker*, 645 F.2d 404, 412 (5th Cir. 1981). Thus, a dismissal pursuant to Rule 12(b)(1) is proper only if it appears certain, taking all facts as true and resolving all inferences and doubts in the plaintiff's favor, that the plaintiff's claim would not entitle him to relief. *See Benton v. United States*, 960 F.2d 19, 21 (5th Cir. 1992).

Bowman alleges that he observed numerous barriers to accessibility at Centre Place that deterred him from renting an apartment there. Thus, it must reasonably be inferred that Bowman intended to rent an apartment at Centre Place. Because the defendants have made a facial challenge of Bowman's Complaint, the Court must accept Bowman's allegations and the inferences from those allegations as truthful. Therefore, Bowman's allegations are sufficient to grant him standing to pursue this lawsuit, and it is not necessary for the Court to consider at this time whether testers have standing to pursue claims under 42 U.S.C. § 3604(f).<sup>3</sup> *See Elmowitz v. Exec. Towers at Lido, LLC*, 571 F. Supp. 2d 370, 376 (E.D. N.Y. 2008) (holding that a plaintiff stated a plausible claim for relief pursuant to the FHA because he alleged he was disabled and that he was prevented from renewing his apartment lease). The issues presented by the defendants' motion must be fleshed out through discovery and summary judgment, not in a facial attack at the pleadings stage. As a result, the defendants' Motion to Dismiss for lack of standing is denied.

---

<sup>3</sup> Bowman's attorney has also represented to the Court that Bowman is not a "tester." (Pl.'s Resp. at 17, ECF No. 10).

# 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.