

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF IDAHO

Michelle Oropeza v. Human Good, Inc., a California corporation
d/b/a The Terraces of Boise

Oropeza · No. 1:25-cv-00577-DCN · Decided February 4, 2026

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the District of Idaho conducted an initial review of Michelle Oropeza’s complaint against Human Good, Inc. alleging sex and pregnancy discrimination, retaliation, hostile work environment, and violations of the Pregnant Workers Fairness Act. The court concluded that the complaint satisfied Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 8(a) and allowed the claims to proceed. Because Oropeza had not reported service of process, the court ordered her to file a service-status notice within 30 days or risk dismissal without prejudice.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the District of Idaho
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the District of Idaho
DECIDED	February 4, 2026
DOCKET	1:25-cv-00577-DCN
DISPOSITION	other
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	The court conducted an initial sua sponte review of a fee-paid pro se employment-discrimination complaint under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 12(b)(6), while also addressing the plaintiff’s failure to report service under Rule 4(m) and District of Idaho Local Civil Rule 4.1.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	On its own motion, the court may dismiss a fee-paid complaint under Rule 12(b)(6) when the plaintiff cannot possibly obtain relief; at the pleading stage, the court accepts factual allegations as true but does not accept legal conclusions and asks whether the complaint states a plausible claim for relief.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	Unknown; memorandum decision and order from a federal district court.

TOPICS

pleadings

service of process

civil procedure

employment discrimination

pregnancy discrimination

PRACTICE AREAS

employment law

civil rights

employment discrimination

civil procedure

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether the complaint stated plausible claims for sex and pregnancy discrimination, retaliation, and hostile work environment under Title VII and a claim under the Pregnant Workers Fairness Act.
2. Whether the court should dismiss the action because the plaintiff had not shown that the defendant was served within ninety days under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 4(m).

HOLDINGS

1. The complaint satisfied Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 8(a) and alleged sufficient facts to plausibly support Oropeza's Title VII and Pregnant Workers Fairness Act claims; the claims therefore survived the court's initial review.
2. The court did not dismiss the action immediately, but required Oropeza to file, within thirty days, a notice stating whether service had been completed; failure to do so could result in dismissal without prejudice.

KEY QUOTATIONS

“Plaintiff must comply with Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 4(m) and District of Idaho Local Civil Rule 4.1 by filing a notice that service has been completed within thirty (30) days of the date of this Order.”

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Oropeza alleged that Human Good discriminated against her based on sex and pregnancy, denied requested pregnancy-related accommodations, disciplined her for making those requests, retaliated after she complained to an employment agency and the EEOC, and terminated her employment in January 2025. She also alleged that Human Good retaliated by appealing her award of unemployment benefits, resulting in an obligation to repay benefits and a lien against property in Idaho. The complaint included detailed factual allegations and supporting communications, and alleged claims under Title VII and the Pregnant Workers Fairness Act.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Michelle Oropeza filed a complaint against Human Good, Inc. alleging sex and pregnancy discrimination, retaliation, hostile work environment, and violations of the Pregnant Workers Fairness Act. More than ninety days passed without a notice indicating that Human Good had been served, and Human Good had not appeared. The court concluded that the complaint satisfied the pleading requirements and allowed the claims to proceed, but ordered Oropeza to file a notice concerning service within thirty days, warning that failure could result in dismissal without prejudice.

DISPOSITION

other

CASES CITED

- Omar v. Sea-Land Serv., Inc., 813 F.2d 986, 991 (9th Cir. 1987)
- Neitzke v. Williams, 490 U.S. 319 (1989)
- United States v. W.R. Grace, 526 F.3d 499, 508-09 (9th Cir. 2008)
- Swierkiewicz v. Sorema N.A., 534 U.S. 506, 512 (2002)
- Ashcroft v. Iqbal, 556 U.S. 662, 667, 678 (2009)
- Bell Atl. Corp. v. Twombly, 550 U.S. 544, 555 (2007)

Retrieved from lawtools.ai · <https://lawtools.ai/cases/state/united-states-district-court-for-the-district-of-idaho-united-states-district-court-for-the-district/2026/michelle-oropeza-v-human-good-inc-a-california-corporation-1m3sg5k2>