

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF
MICHIGAN, SOUTHERN DIVISION

Dominique Maclin-Shelton v. Angel’s Place

Case No. 24-10092 · No. 4:24-cv-10092 · Decided January 14, 2026

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the Eastern District of Michigan addresses Angel’s Place’s motion for summary judgment in Dominique Maclin-Shelton’s action alleging race and age discrimination, harassment, and retaliation under federal and Michigan law. The court grants summary judgment on the racial discrimination claims, concluding that Maclin-Shelton did not establish a similarly situated comparator, and analyzes the remaining age and retaliation claims in the opinion.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the Eastern District of Michigan, Southern Division
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Shalina D. Kumar
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the Eastern District of Michigan, Southern Division
DECIDED	January 14, 2026
DOCKET	4:24-cv-10092
DISPOSITION	other
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	Defendant moved for summary judgment on all claims in plaintiff's employment-discrimination, harassment, and retaliation action.
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 court views the evidence and draws reasonable inferences in favor of the nonmoving party, but the nonmoving party must present specific, significant probative evidence of a genuine issue for trial.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	unpublished district court opinion
PARTIES	Angel’s Place v. Dominique Maclin-Shelton

TOPICS

employment discrimination

racial discrimination

age discrimination

retaliation

summary judgment

PRACTICE AREAS

employment law

employment discrimination

civil rights

civil procedure

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether plaintiff established a prima facie case of race discrimination under 42 U.S.C. § 1981, Title VII, and ELCRA.
2. Whether plaintiff established a prima facie case of age discrimination under the ADEA and ELCRA.
3. Whether plaintiff produced evidence of a severe or pervasive hostile work environment based on race or age under Title VII and ELCRA.
4. Whether plaintiff engaged in protected activity sufficient to support her race-based retaliation claims under § 1981, Title VII, and ELCRA.
5. Whether plaintiff's report of the alleged age-based remark constituted protected activity for purposes of her ELCRA age-retaliation claim.
6. Whether the court should exercise supplemental jurisdiction over the remaining state-law retaliation claim after dismissal of the federal claims.

HOLDINGS

1. Plaintiff failed to establish a prima facie case of racial discrimination because she did not show that a similarly situated nonprotected employee was treated more favorably.
2. Plaintiff failed to establish a prima facie case of age discrimination because she did not identify a younger replacement or a similarly situated younger employee treated more favorably, and the isolated age-related remark did not support an inference that age caused her termination.
3. Plaintiff failed to establish a hostile work environment because the alleged conduct was neither severe nor pervasive enough to alter the conditions of employment.
4. Plaintiff's race-based retaliation claims failed because her complaints that the supervisor was a bully and power-hungry did not constitute protected activity opposing race discrimination.
5. Plaintiff's ELCRA age-retaliation claim survived the merits portion of the summary-judgment motion because reporting the alleged statement that a coworker was too old to work constituted protected activity.

KEY QUOTATIONS

"The Court GRANTS IN PART AND DENIES IN PART defendant's motion for summary judgment (ECF No. 21)." (33)

"Because Maclin-Shelton's complaints contained no 'specter of a claim of unlawful [race] discrimination,' id., her complaints cannot be considered 'protected activity' required for her to succeed on the race-based retaliation claims asserted under Title VII, § 1981, and ELCRA." (32)

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Maclin-Shelton worked for Angel's Place as a direct-care worker at a residential home serving people with developmental disabilities. Before her termination, she received multiple corrective actions and a work-improvement plan for performance and safety-related issues. On August 8, 2022, a resident accessed food through an open pantry door and Maclin-Shelton was involved in a medication-timing violation; Angel's Place terminated her two days later, citing those incidents. Maclin-Shelton also complained that her supervisor was a bully and reported hearing the supervisor say that coworker Renee Calvin was too old to work there.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Maclin-Shelton filed an eight-count complaint on January 11, 2024, after filing an EEOC charge and receiving a right-to-sue letter. Angel's Place moved for summary judgment. The court granted the motion as to the race-discrimination, race-retaliation, and age-discrimination claims; denied it as to the age-based ELCRA retaliation claim, but dismissed that remaining state-law claim without prejudice after declining supplemental jurisdiction.

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, 322–23 (1986)
- *Codrington v. Dolak*, 142 F.4th 884, 890 (6th Cir. 2025)
- *Baker v. Blackhawk Mining, LLC*, 141 F.4th 760, 766 (6th Cir. 2025)
- *InterRoyal Corp. v. Sponseller*, 889 F.2d 108, 111 (6th Cir. 1989)
- *Baker v. City of Trenton*, 936 F.3d 523, 529 (6th Cir. 2019)
- *Matsushita Elec. Indus. Co. v. Zenith Radio Corp.*, 475 U.S. 574, 586 (1986)
- *Walden v. GE Int'l, Inc.*, 119 F.4th 1049, 1057 (6th Cir. 2024)
- *Green Genie, Inc. v. City of Detroit*, 63 F.4th 521, 526 (6th Cir. 2023)
- *Johnson v. Memphis Light Gas & Water Div.*, 777 F.3d 838, 843 (6th Cir. 2015)
- *Rogers v. Henry Ford Health Sys.*, 897 F.3d 763, 771, 775 (6th Cir. 2018)
- *Jackson v. Quanex Corp.*, 191 F.3d 647, 658 (6th Cir. 1999)
- *Wright v. Murray Guard, Inc.*, 455 F.3d 702, 707 (6th Cir. 2006)
- *DiCarlo v. Potter*, 358 F.3d 408, 415 (6th Cir. 2004)
- *Harris v. Giant Eagle Inc.*, 133 F. App'x 288, 293 (6th Cir. 2005)
- *Kline v. Tenn. Valley Auth.*, 128 F.3d 337, 348 (6th Cir. 1997)
- *Ercegovich v. Goodyear Tire & Rubber Co.*, 154 F.3d 344, 352–53 (6th Cir. 1998)
- *Jackson v. VHS Detroit Receiving Hosp., Inc.*, 814 F.3d 769, 777 (6th Cir. 2016)
- *Mitchell v. Toledo Hosp.*, 964 F.2d 577, 583 n.5 (6th Cir. 1992)

- *Berry v. City of Pontiac*, 269 F. App'x 545, 549 (6th Cir. 2008)
- *Quinn-Hunt v. Bennett Enterprises, Inc.*, 211 F. App'x 452, 454, 458 (6th Cir. 2006)
- *Gross v. FBL Fin. Servs., Inc.*, 557 U.S. 167, 178 (2009)
- *Drews v. Berrien Cty.*, 839 F. App'x 1010, 1012 (6th Cir. 2021)
- *Hecht v. National Heritage Academies, Inc.*, 886 N.W.2d 135, 146 (Mich. 2016)
- *Rouch World, LLC v. Dep't of Civil Rights*, 987 N.W.2d 501, 512 (Mich. 2022)
- *Tilley v. Kalamazoo Cty. Road Comm'n*, 777 F.3d 303, 307 (6th Cir. 2015)
- *Geiger v. Tower Auto.*, 579 F.3d 614, 620, 622–23 (6th Cir. 2009)
- *Provenzano v. LCI Holdings, Inc.*, 663 F.3d 806, 813, 818 (6th Cir. 2011)
- *Warren v. Hollingsworth Mgt. Services, LLC*, 2022 WL 18542504, at *3 (6th Cir. Dec. 19, 2022)
- *Vaughn v. Watkins Motor Lines, Inc.*, 291 F.3d 900, 907 (6th Cir. 2002)
- *Blair v. Henry Filters, Inc.*, 505 F.3d 517, 529 (6th Cir. 2007)
- *Smith v. Leggett Wire Co.*, 220 F.3d 752, 759 (6th Cir. 2000)
- *Bush v. Dictaphone Corp.*, 161 F.3d 363, 369 (6th Cir. 1998)
- *Davis v. Ineos ABS (USA) Corp.*, 2011 WL 1114409, at *4 (S.D. Ohio Mar. 24, 2011)
- *Quinn-Hunt v. Bennett Enterprises, Inc.*, 2005 WL 2174053, at *3 (N.D. Ohio Sept. 7, 2005)
- *Mugno v. Wal-Mart Stores, Inc.*, 2009 WL 737107, at *4 (E.D. Tenn. Mar. 20, 2009)
- *Khalaf v. Ford Motor Co.*, 973 F.3d 469, 472 (6th Cir. 2020)
- *Phillips v. UAW Int'l*, 854 F.3d 323, 327–28 (6th Cir. 2017)
- *Quinto v. Cross & Peters Co.*, 451 Mich. 358, 369 (1996)
- *CBOCS West, Inc. v. Humphries*, 553 U.S. 442, 454–55 (2008)
- *Laster v. City of Kalamazoo*, 746 F.3d 714, 730 (6th Cir. 2014)
- *Kovacs v. Univ. of Tol.*, 711 F. Supp. 3d 697, 706 (N.D. Ohio 2024)
- *Jackson*, 999 F.3d at 344–45
- *Barrett v. Kirkland Cmt. Coll.*, 245 Mich. App. 306, 319–20 (2001)
- *United Mine Workers of Am. v. Gibbs*, 383 U.S. 715, 726 (1966)