

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF
OKLAHOMA

Airia Browning v. MHM Support Services

Browning · No. CIV-24-18-D · Decided March 9, 2026

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the Western District of Oklahoma considered MHM Support Services’ motion for summary judgment in Airia Browning’s claims under Title VII and the Oklahoma Anti-Discrimination Act. The court granted summary judgment on the racial discrimination and retaliation claims, but held that evidence of alleged sexual and race-based harassment created triable issues on the hostile work environment claim. The motion was therefore granted in part and denied in part.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the Western District of Oklahoma
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Timothy D. DeGiusti
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the Western District of Oklahoma
DECIDED	March 9, 2026
DOCKET	CIV-24-18-D
DISPOSITION	other
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	Defendant moved for summary judgment on Plaintiff's Title VII racial-discrimination, Oklahoma Anti-Discrimination Act, retaliation, and hostile-work-environment claims.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	Summary judgment is proper when the movant shows that no genuine dispute of material fact exists and the movant is entitled to judgment as a matter of law. The evidence and reasonable inferences are viewed in the light most favorable to the nonmovant. The Court applied the McDonnell Douglas burden-shifting framework to the Title VII discrimination and retaliation claims.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	unpublished
PARTIES	Airia Browning v. MHM Support Services

TOPICS

employment discrimination

title vii

hostile work environment

retaliation

summary judgment

PRACTICE AREAS

employment law

civil rights

civil procedure

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether allegations predating October 14, 2022, were time-barred for all claims or could be considered as part of the hostile-work-environment claim.
2. Whether the McDonnell Douglas burden-shifting framework governed Plaintiff's Title VII racial-discrimination and retaliation claims.
3. Whether Defendant was entitled to summary judgment on Plaintiff's Title VII racial-discrimination and OADA claims for lack of evidence that Defendant's stated reason was pretextual.
4. Whether Defendant was entitled to summary judgment on Plaintiff's retaliation claim for lack of evidence supporting a prima facie case or pretext.
5. Whether the evidence created a triable issue on whether Plaintiff was subjected to a sufficiently severe or pervasive hostile work environment.

HOLDINGS

1. Allegations predating October 14, 2022, could be considered in evaluating Plaintiff's hostile-work-environment claim, but could not be used to establish Plaintiff's discrete racial-discrimination and retaliation claims.
2. The McDonnell Douglas burden-shifting framework applies to Plaintiff's Title VII racial-discrimination and retaliation claims.
3. Defendant was entitled to summary judgment on Plaintiff's Title VII racial-discrimination claim and OADA claim because Plaintiff failed to present evidence from which a reasonable factfinder could find that Defendant's stated reason for the employment decision was pretextual.
4. Defendant was entitled to summary judgment on Plaintiff's retaliation claim because Plaintiff failed to establish pretext.
5. Defendant was not entitled to summary judgment on Plaintiff's hostile-work-environment claim because the summary-judgment record presented minimally sufficient evidence for a jury to decide whether the workplace was sufficiently severe or pervasive.

KEY QUOTATIONS

“For a hostile environment claim to survive a summary judgment motion, ‘a plaintiff must show that a rational jury could find that the workplace is permeated with discriminatory intimidation, ridicule, and insult, that is sufficiently severe or pervasive to alter the conditions of the victim’s employment and create an abusive working environment.’” (Discussion § III)

“For the reasons explained above, Defendant’s Motion for Summary Judgment [Doc. No. 40] is GRANTED in part and DENIED in part.” (Conclusion)

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Airia Browning, an African American Medical Assistant I, worked for MHM from approximately November 2021 until June 2023 and was the only African American and only male employee in that position at the relevant locations. Browning alleged that supervisor Zach Green and coworker Jacquayla McGlothlin made repeated sexual and race-related comments and that MHM denied a raise or promotion. MHM attributed the denial to Browning's lack of the required certification, and Green treated a draft resignation letter as Browning's resignation. Browning alleged that harassment occurred repeatedly over the course of his employment, while the record specifically identified several comments and text messages.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Plaintiff filed suit in Oklahoma County state court on November 13, 2023. Defendant removed the action to the Western District of Oklahoma on January 8, 2024. On Defendant's motion for summary judgment, the Court granted judgment on the racial-discrimination, OADA, and retaliation claims but denied judgment on the hostile-work-environment claim.

DISPOSITION

other

CASES CITED

- Anderson v. Liberty Lobby, Inc., 477 U.S. 242, 248, 251-52, 255 (1986)
- Celotex Corp. v. Catrett, 477 U.S. 317, 322, 324 (1986)
- Adler v. Wal-Mart Stores, Inc., 144 F.3d 664, 671 (10th Cir. 1998)
- Sylvia v. Wisler, 875 F.3d 1307, 1328 (10th Cir. 2017)
- Nat'l R.R. Passenger Corp. v. Morgan, 536 U.S. 101, 103, 109-10, 115 (2002)
- Alexander v. Gardner-Denver Co., 415 U.S. 36, 47 (1974)
- Duncan v. Manager, Dep't of Safety, City & Cnty. of Denver, 397 F.3d 1300, 1308-09 (10th Cir. 2005)
- Foster v. Ruhrpumpen, Inc., 365 F.3d 1191, 1194 (10th Cir. 2004)
- Martinez v. Potter, 347 F.3d 1208, 1210 (10th Cir. 2003)
- Hansen v. SkyWest Airlines, 844 F.3d 914, 923 (10th Cir. 2016)
- Tademy v. Union Pac. Corp., 614 F.3d 1132, 1138, 1146 (10th Cir. 2010)
- Markley v. U.S. Bank Nat'l Ass'n, 59 F.4th 1072 (10th Cir. 2023)
- Smothers v. Solvay Chems., Inc., 740 F.3d 530, 538 (10th Cir. 2014)
- MacKenzie v. City & Cnty. of Denver, 414 F.3d 1266, 1274 (10th Cir. 2005)
- Walkingstick Dixon v. Okla. ex rel. Reg'l Univ. Sys. of Okla. Bd. of Regents, 125 F.4th 1321, 1334 (10th Cir. 2025)

- Kendrick v. Penske Transp. Servs., Inc., 220 F.3d 1220, 1227, 1231, 1233 (10th Cir. 2000)
- Annett v. Univ. of Kan., 371 F.3d 1233, 1237 (10th Cir. 2004)
- Burlington Indus., Inc. v. Ellerth, 524 U.S. 742, 761 (1998)
- Hiatt v. Colo. Seminary, 858 F.3d 1307, 1317 n.10 (10th Cir. 2017)
- Anderson v. Coors Brewing Co., 181 F.3d 1171, 1179 (10th Cir. 1999)
- Hardy v. S.F. Phosphates Ltd. Co., 185 F.3d 1076, 1083 (10th Cir. 1999)
- Giannopoulos v. Brach & Brock Confections, Inc., 109 F.3d 406, 411 (7th Cir. 1997)
- Stover v. Martinez, 382 F.3d 1064, 1071 (10th Cir. 2004)
- Jones v. Barnhart, 349 F.3d 1260, 1269 (10th Cir. 2003)
- Bacy v. Chickasaw Nation Indus., Inc., No. CIV-19-512-G, 2020 WL 2225365, at *8 (W.D. Okla. May 7, 2020)
- Cunninham v. Skilled Trade Servs., Inc., No. CIV-15-803-D, 2015 WL 6442826, at *3 (W.D. Okla. Oct. 23, 2015)
- Penry v. Fed. Home Loan Bank of Topeka, 155 F.3d 1257, 1261 (10th Cir. 1998)
- Hernandez v. Valley View Hosp. Ass'n, 684 F.3d 950, 958 (10th Cir. 2012)
- Davis v. U.S. Postal Servs., 142 F.3d 1334, 1341 (10th Cir. 1998)