

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE CENTRAL DISTRICT OF
ILLINOIS, PEORIA DIVISION

Chelsey Simmons v. OSF Healthcare Systems and Jomel Labayog

Simmons · No. 2:26-cv-2039 · Decided May 12, 2026

SUMMARY

The court granted Defendant Jomel Labayog’s motion to dismiss claims under the Illinois Human Rights Act and Illinois Gender Violence Act. After dismissing the federal Title VII claim, the court relinquished supplemental jurisdiction and dismissed the remaining state-law claims without prejudice, allowing the plaintiff fourteen days to amend.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the Central District of Illinois, Peoria Division
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Jonathan E. Hawley
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the Central District of Illinois, Peoria Division
DECIDED	May 12, 2026
DOCKET	2:26-cv-2039
DISPOSITION	dismissed
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	Defendant Jomel Labayog moved to dismiss the plaintiff’s complaint. The court considered the motion after the plaintiff filed a timely response and granted it, dismissing the remaining state-law claims without prejudice for lack of subject matter jurisdiction.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	The court reviewed the motion to dismiss and determined whether subject matter jurisdiction remained over the supplemental state-law claims after dismissal of the federal claim.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	Unpublished federal district court order

TOPICS

- subject matter jurisdiction
- motions to dismiss
- title vii
- civil procedure

PRACTICE AREAS

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether the district court should retain supplemental jurisdiction over the Illinois Human Rights Act and Illinois Gender Violence Act claims after dismissal of the sole federal claim.
2. Whether Labayog's motion to dismiss should be granted without reaching his other arguments.

HOLDINGS

1. When all federal claims are dismissed before trial, the district court should generally relinquish supplemental jurisdiction over the remaining state-law claims and dismiss them without prejudice.
2. The court need not reach Labayog's other arguments because it lacked subject matter jurisdiction over the remaining claims.

KEY QUOTATIONS

"the general rule is that, when all federal claims are dismissed before trial, the district court should relinquish jurisdiction over pendent state-law claims rather than resolving them on the merits." (Section II)

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Simmons alleged that she was sexually harassed by Jomel Labayog while working for OSF Healthcare Systems. She asserted claims under Title VII against OSF, the Illinois Human Rights Act against Labayog, and the Illinois Gender Violence Act against both defendants. The court had already dismissed the sole federal claim under Title VII without prejudice.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Chelsey Simmons filed a three-count complaint alleging sexual harassment while employed by OSF Healthcare Systems. OSF previously moved to dismiss, and the court dismissed the Title VII claim without prejudice for failure to state a claim and dismissed the Illinois Gender Violence Act claim for lack of subject matter jurisdiction. The court granted Labayog's motion to dismiss the remaining Illinois Human Rights Act and Illinois Gender Violence Act claims without prejudice and allowed Simmons fourteen days to amend.

DISPOSITION

dismissed

CASES CITED

- Leggette v. Dr Pepper/Seven Up, Inc., No. 22 CV 2376, 2022 WL 6750261, at *2 (N.D. Ill. Oct. 11, 2022)
- Arbaugh v. Y&H Corp., 546 U.S. 500, 514 (2006)
- Wright v. Associated Insurance Cos., Inc., 29 F.3d 1244, 1250 (7th Cir. 1994)
- Jauquet v. Green Bay Area Catholic Education, Inc., 996 F.3d 802, 812 (7th Cir. 2021)

OPINION

Simmons

PER CURIAM.

IN THE

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

CENTRAL DISTRICT OF ILLINOIS

PEORIA DIVISION

CHELSEY SIMMONS,

Plaintiff, v. Case No. 2:26-cv-2039

OSF HEALTHCARE SYSTEMS and

JOMEL LABAYOG,

Defendant. Order Now before the Court is the Defendant, Jomel Labayog's Motion to Dismiss Complaint (D. 11).¹ For the reasons set forth below, the Defendant's Motion is GRANTED. I On January 30, 2026, the Plaintiff, Chelsey Simmons, filed her three-count Complaint. (D. 1). On April 3, 2026, Dr. Labayog filed the pending Motion to Dismiss. (D. 11). On April 24, 2026, Mrs. Simmons timely filed her response. (D. 16). The Motion is therefore ripe for disposition. II This case centers on the Plaintiff's allegations that, while working for co- Defendant OSF Healthcare Systems, she was sexually harassed by Dr. Labayog. To address her alleged harm, the Plaintiff filed a three-count complaint: Count One (Title VII, against OSF); Count Two (Illinois Human Rights Act ("IHRA")) 1 Citations to the electronic docket are abbreviated as "D. ____ at ECF p. ____." against Dr. Labayog); and Count Three (Illinois Gender Violence Act ("IGVA"), against both Defendants). Prior to the pending Motion, OSF filed its own motion to dismiss. (D. 7). In the order granting that motion, the Court dismissed the Plaintiff's Title VII claim without prejudice for failure to state a claim. (D. 17). In turn, because Title VII is the only basis for federal jurisdiction in this case, the Court also dismissed Count Three for lack of subject matter jurisdiction. Here, for the same reasons, Dr. Labayog's Motion is due to be granted. Both of the claims Dr. Labayog seeks to dismiss are state-law claims: Count Two is under the IHRA, and Count Three is under the IGVA. "With the ... federal claim dismissed, this court has discretionary jurisdiction over the supplemental state- law claims." *Leggette v. Dr Pepper/Seven Up, Inc.*, No. 22 CV 2376, 2022 WL 6750261, at *2 (N.D. Ill. Oct. 11, 2022) (citing *Arbaugh v. Y&H Corp.*, 546 U.S. 500, 514 (2006)). In this circumstance, "the general rule is that, when all federal claims are dismissed before trial, the district court should relinquish jurisdiction over pendent state-law claims rather than resolving them on the merits." *Wright v. Associated Insurance Cos., Inc.*, 29 F.3d 1244, 1250 (7th Cir. 1994). Consequently, we dismiss without prejudice Counts Two and Three. See *Jauquet v. Green Bay Area Cath. Educ., Inc.*, 996 F.3d 802, 812 (7th Cir. 2021) ("Without a federal claim in the case, the district court appropriately dismissed Plaintiffs' state law claims without prejudice, thereby relinquishing subject matter jurisdiction over the remaining claims."). Of course, if the Plaintiff timely files an amended complaint, the Defendant may again raise the other arguments it includes

in this Motion to Dismiss. But for now, the Court need not reach those arguments, because the Court lacks subject matter jurisdiction over the claims.

III

For the reasons set forth above, the Defendant's Motion to Dismiss (D. 11) is GRANTED. The Plaintiff shall have fourteen days to amend her Complaint consistent with this Order. It is so ordered. Entered on May 12, 2026 s/Jonathan E. Hawley

U.S. DISTRICT JUDGE