

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF CONNECTICUT

Melvin Rodriguez v. GalaxE.Solutions, Inc.

No. 3:24-cv-1737 (SRU), United States District Court for the District of Connecticut (April 6, 2026)

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the District of Connecticut granted GalaxE.Solutions, Inc.’s motion for summary judgment in Melvin Rodriguez’s ADA and CFEPA employment-discrimination, failure-to-accommodate, and retaliation claims. The court held that Rodriguez failed to provide medical evidence establishing a disability and failed to show that he requested a reasonable accommodation or that his termination was causally connected to protected activity. The Clerk was instructed to close the case.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the District of Connecticut
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Stefan R. Underhill
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the District of Connecticut
DECIDED	April 6, 2026
DOCKET	3:24-cv-1737 (SRU)
DISPOSITION	other
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	Defendant's motion for summary judgment on plaintiff's ADA and CFEPA disability-discrimination, failure-to-accommodate, and retaliation claims.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	Summary judgment is appropriate when there is no genuine dispute as to any material fact and the movant is entitled to judgment as a matter of law. The court construes the record in the nonmoving party's favor, but the nonmoving party must present sufficient probative evidence to establish a genuine issue of material fact and may not rely on conclusory allegations or a complete failure of proof on an essential element.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	unpublished district-court order; precedential status unknown
PARTIES	Melvin Rodriguez v. GalaxE.Solutions, Inc.

TOPICS

ada discrimination

disability discrimination

reasonable accommodation

retaliation

summary judgment

PRACTICE AREAS

employment law

disability discrimination

civil rights

civil procedure

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether Rodriguez presented sufficient evidence that he was disabled under the ADA or physically disabled under the CFEPA to support his disability-discrimination claims.
2. Whether Rodriguez presented sufficient evidence that he requested a reasonable accommodation and that GalaxE refused to provide one.
3. Whether Rodriguez presented sufficient evidence of protected activity, including a request for reasonable accommodation, and a causal connection between that activity and his termination.
4. Whether GalaxE was entitled to summary judgment on all ADA and CFEPA claims.

HOLDINGS

1. GalaxE was entitled to summary judgment on Rodriguez's ADA and CFEPA discrimination claims because Rodriguez failed to provide medical or other corroborating evidence establishing that his bladder condition constituted a disability under the ADA or a chronic physical disability under the CFEPA.
2. GalaxE was entitled to summary judgment on Rodriguez's ADA and CFEPA failure-to-accommodate claims because Rodriguez failed to establish that he was disabled and, independently, failed to show that he actually requested additional bathroom breaks or clearly communicated his condition and accommodation need to GalaxE.
3. GalaxE was entitled to summary judgment on Rodriguez's ADA and CFEPA retaliation claims because he failed to show that he engaged in protected activity by requesting an accommodation and, even assuming such a request, failed to establish a causal connection between the request and his termination.

KEY QUOTATIONS

“Summary judgment is appropriate when the record demonstrates that “there is no genuine dispute as to any material fact and the movant is entitled to judgment as a matter of law.”” (II)

“Without any concrete evidence that Rodriguez requested an accommodation, there is not even “a mere ‘scintilla’ of evidence” in support of his Complaint’s conclusory allegations.” (III.c)

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

GalaxE hired Rodriguez as a Service Desk Agent and assigned him to a Cigna-related team. Rodriguez claimed that a lifelong bladder condition required frequent and urgent bathroom use, but he had no formal medical diagnosis or medical documentation. During mandatory training and subsequent call work, trainers documented repeated performance and conduct deficiencies, including turning off his camera, leaving his computer without permission, using his phone, and failing to communicate with trainers. After Rodriguez discussed bathroom

access and OSHA regulations with GalaxE personnel, but expressly declined to pursue an accommodation when asked, Cigna requested his removal from the contract, and GalaxE terminated him based on documented performance and behavior issues.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Rodriguez filed administrative charges with the CHRO and EEOC, received a CHRO release of jurisdiction and an EEOC right-to-sue letter, and filed this action on October 31, 2024. After discovery, GalaxE moved for summary judgment on all six counts. The court granted the motion in full and directed the Clerk to close the case.

DISPOSITION

other

CASES CITED

- *Anderson v. Liberty Lobby, Inc.*, 477 U.S. 242, 247-50, 255-56 (1986)
- *Matsushita Elec. Indus. Co. v. Zenith Radio Corp.*, 475 U.S. 574, 587 (1986)
- *Adickes v. S.H. Kress & Co.*, 398 U.S. 144, 158-59 (1970)
- *Aldrich v. Randolph Cent. Sch. Dist.*, 963 F.2d 520, 523 (2d Cir. 1992)
- *Celotex Corp. v. Catrett*, 477 U.S. 317, 322-23, 327 (1986)
- *Colon v. Coughlin*, 58 F.3d 865, 872 (2d Cir. 1995)
- *Bryant v. Maffucci*, 923 F.2d 979, 982 (2d Cir. 1991)
- *Suburban Propane v. Proctor Gas, Inc.*, 953 F.2d 780, 788 (2d Cir. 1992)
- *Goenaga v. March of Dimes Birth Defects Found.*, 51 F.3d 14, 18 (2d Cir. 1995)
- *Paiva v. City of Bridgeport*, 2019 WL 3842400, at *6 (D. Conn. Aug. 15, 2019)
- *Sista v. CDC Ixis North America, Inc.*, 445 F.3d 161, 169 (2d Cir. 2006)
- *Hopkins v. New Eng. Health Care Emps. Welfare Fund*, 985 F. Supp. 2d 240, 256 (D. Conn. 2013)
- *Dawson v. Sec. Servs. of Conn., Inc.*, 2022 WL 17477601, at *12-13 (D. Conn. Dec. 6, 2022)
- *Capobianco v. City of N.Y.*, 422 F.3d 47, 56 (2d Cir. 2005)
- *Gaube v. Day Kimball Hosp.*, 2015 WL 1347000, at *6 (D. Conn. Mar. 14, 2015)
- *Weixel v. Bd. of Educ. of City of N.Y.*, 287 F.3d 138, 147 (2d Cir. 2002)
- *Wanamaker v. Westport Bd. of Educ.*, 899 F. Supp. 2d 193, 212 (D. Conn. 2012)
- *Haggerty v. Kaycan, Ltd.*, 2021 WL 1518415, at *4-5 (D. Conn. Apr. 15, 2021)
- *Buotote v. Illinois Tool Works, Inc.*, 815 F. Supp. 2d 549, 557 (D. Conn. 2011)
- *Fasan v. McRoberts Protective Agency, Inc.*, 2015 WL 1285909, at *4 (E.D.N.Y. Mar. 20, 2015)
- *Morgan v. Golub Corp.*, 2020 WL 5215414, at *5-6 (D. Conn. Aug. 31, 2020)
- *Holcomb v. Iona Coll.*, 521 F.3d 130, 137 (2d Cir. 2008)
- *Keithan v. Lakeside Env't Consultants, LLC*, 2025 WL 2053412 (D. Conn. July 22, 2025)

- *Tafolla v. Heilig*, 80 F.4th 111, 125 (2d Cir. 2023)
- *Havey v. Homebound Mortgage, Inc.*, 547 F.3d 158, 163 (2d Cir. 2008)

Retrieved from lawtools.ai · <https://lawtools.ai/cases/federal/united-states-district-court-for-the-district-of-connecticut/2026/melvin-rodriguez-v-galaxe-solutions-inc-0kgbcs4g>