

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE MIDDLE DISTRICT OF
PENNSYLVANIA

Shawna Beard v. White Deer Run, LLC

Beard · No. 1:24-CV-1176 · Decided March 16, 2026

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the Middle District of Pennsylvania adopted a magistrate judge's recommendation to dismiss Shawna Beard's amended complaint and considered her latest proposed complaint. The court held that Beard failed to adequately allege discriminatory acts within the scope of her EEOC charge and therefore failed to state a Title VII claim. The complaint was dismissed with prejudice, and the case was closed.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the Middle District of Pennsylvania
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Keli M. Neary
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the Middle District of Pennsylvania
DECIDED	March 16, 2026
DOCKET	1:24-CV-1176
DISPOSITION	dismissed
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	The district court reviewed a magistrate judge's Report and Recommendation recommending dismissal without prejudice of Beard's second amended complaint. Beard filed another amended complaint instead of specific objections. The district court adopted the recommendation as to the second amended complaint and dismissed the latest complaint with prejudice.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	De novo review of contested portions of a magistrate judge's report and recommendation, with reasoned consideration of uncontested portions; the latest complaint was reviewed for failure to state a claim.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	nonprecedential
PARTIES	Shawna Beard v. White Deer Run, LLC

TOPICS

exhaustion of remedies

title vii

racial discrimination

retaliation

pleadings

PRACTICE AREAS

civil procedure

employment law

civil rights

administrative law

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether the district court should adopt the magistrate judge's recommendation to dismiss Beard's second amended complaint.
2. Whether Beard's latest complaint stated a Title VII claim when she did not attach a specific EEOC charge to it and the charge previously filed with her original complaint did not identify specific discriminatory acts.
3. Whether further amendment would be futile.

HOLDINGS

1. Because Beard did not specifically object to the recommendation and instead filed another complaint, the district court adopted the recommendation to dismiss the second amended complaint, giving reasoned consideration to the uncontested recommendation.
2. A Title VII plaintiff must first file an EEOC charge, and the subsequent lawsuit is limited to discriminatory acts described in the charge or acts fairly within the scope of a reasonable investigation arising from the charge.
3. Beard's latest complaint failed to state a claim because neither the EEOC charge nor the pleadings identified specific discriminatory or retaliatory acts.
4. Further amendment would be futile, so Beard's latest complaint was dismissed with prejudice.

KEY QUOTATIONS

"The purpose of requiring exhaustion is to afford the EEOC the opportunity to settle disputes through conference, conciliation, and persuasion, avoiding unnecessary action in court."

"Critically, this means a plaintiff can only bring a lawsuit about discriminatory acts contained in the original charge or acts fairly within the scope of a reasonable investigation arising from the initial charge."

"Because the original charge itself is devoid of any specific facts to establish discrimination, and because 'the original charge is the touchstone of [the] exhaustion analysis,' Simko, 922 F.3d at 210 (citing Antol, 82 F.3d at 1296), the court concludes Beard's latest complaint fails to state a claim and allowing any further amended would be futile."

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Beard alleged that while employed by White Deer Run she experienced unfair treatment and different terms and conditions than non-Black coworkers beginning in November 2023. She alleged that management told her to keep her head down, that she was sabotaged and set up to fail, and that she faced retaliation, but she did not identify specific discriminatory or retaliatory acts. Her April 2024 EEOC charge was brief, identified only nonspecific events in November 2023, and did not describe the alleged discrimination in sufficient detail.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Magistrate Judge Martin C. Carlson recommended dismissal without prejudice of Beard's second amended complaint. Beard did not file specific objections and instead submitted another amended complaint, which was her fourth complaint in the case. The district court gave de novo review to contested portions and reasoned consideration to uncontested portions, adopted the recommendation, considered the latest complaint, and dismissed it with prejudice for failure to state a claim and because further amendment would be futile.

DISPOSITION

dismissed

CASES CITED

- E.E.O.C. v. City of Long Branch, 866 F.3d 93, 99-100 (3d Cir. 2017)
- Antol v. Perry, 82 F.3d 1291, 1296 (3d Cir. 1996)
- Simko v. United States Steel Corp., 992 F.3d 198, 208-09 (3d Cir. 2021)