

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF
INDIANA

Lorenzo R. Taylor v. DHL Excel Supply Chain

Taylor · No. 1:24-cv-01917-MPB-MJD · Decided June 5, 2026

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the Southern District of Indiana granted DHL's motion for summary judgment in a pro se employee's action alleging age and race discrimination under the ADEA and Title VII, and violations of the FMLA. The court held that Taylor failed to establish a prima facie discrimination case or show pretext, and failed to demonstrate that DHL's attendance-credit practices violated the FMLA. Final judgment was ordered to issue separately.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the Southern District of Indiana
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Matthew P. Brookman
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the Southern District of Indiana
DECIDED	June 5, 2026
DOCKET	1:24-cv-01917-MPB-MJD
DISPOSITION	other
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	Plaintiff brought claims under the ADEA, Title VII, and the FMLA arising from his termination. Defendant moved for summary judgment, and plaintiff opposed the motion.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	Summary judgment is proper when the movant shows that there is no genuine dispute as to any material fact and that the movant is entitled to judgment as a matter of law. The court viewed the evidence and drew reasonable inferences in favor of the nonmoving party, but held that speculation or conjecture cannot defeat summary judgment.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	unpublished district court order; precedential status unknown
PARTIES	Lorenzo R. Taylor v. DHL Excel Supply Chain, Exel Inc. d/b/a DHL Supply Chain (USA)

TOPICS

employment discrimination

age discrimination

racial discrimination

family and medical leave act

summary judgment

PRACTICE AREAS

employment law

civil rights

civil procedure

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether DHL was entitled to summary judgment on Taylor's ADEA age-discrimination claim.
2. Whether DHL was entitled to summary judgment on Taylor's Title VII race-discrimination claim.
3. Whether Taylor presented evidence that DHL's stated reason for termination—his negative attendance balance—was pretextual.
4. Whether Taylor's FMLA claim based on allegedly being overlooked because of his FMLA status survived summary judgment when he failed to address it in opposition.
5. Whether DHL violated the FMLA by denying attendance-related incentive credit when Taylor did not meet the attendance goal because of leave.

HOLDINGS

1. Taylor failed to establish a prima facie case under the McDonnell Douglas framework because he did not show that he was meeting DHL's legitimate expectations or identify similarly situated employees outside his protected classes who were treated more favorably.
2. Taylor failed to show that DHL's stated reason for terminating him—his negative attendance balance—was pretextual.
3. Taylor abandoned his claim that DHL repeatedly overlooked him because of his FMLA status by failing to address that claim in opposition to summary judgment.
4. Taylor failed to establish an FMLA violation based on DHL's denial of attendance credit because he did not show that DHL deviated from its policy or practice for employees taking non-FMLA leave.

KEY QUOTATIONS

“Regardless of the path taken, the Court will consider the evidence “as a whole, rather than asking whether any particular piece of evidence proves the case by itself.”” (Discussion, ADEA and Title VII claims)

“Thus, for Plaintiff to establish that DHL violated the FMLA, he would have to show DHL “deviated from its policy or practice for other employees on non[-]FMLA leave.”” (Discussion, FMLA claims)

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Taylor, a fifty-eight-year-old Black man, worked as a forklift operator for DHL beginning in October 2021 under an at-will employment arrangement governed by DHL's attendance and leave policies. His attendance balance declined because of unapproved absences, including absences in November 2023 and September 2024, and he received written and final written attendance notifications. After his balance fell to negative 23.22 hours, DHL

terminated him on September 12, 2024. Taylor claimed that DHL treated younger white employees more favorably by accepting doctors' notes and that DHL violated the FMLA by denying attendance-related incentive credit and overlooking him because of his FMLA status, but the record showed that the identified employees were not permitted to excuse absences with doctors' notes and that Taylor had not properly reported or exhausted available FMLA leave.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Taylor filed suit in October 2024 alleging age discrimination, race discrimination, and FMLA violations. DHL moved for summary judgment. The court granted the motion on all claims and directed that final judgment issue by separate entry.

DISPOSITION

other

CASES CITED

- *Hinterberger v. City of Indianapolis*, No. 1:16-cv-1341, 2019 WL 1439159, at *3 (S.D. Ind. Mar. 30, 2019)
- *Smith v. Lamz*, 321 F.3d 680, 683 (7th Cir. 2003)
- *Jaranowski v. Indiana Harbor Belt Railroad Co.*, 72 F.4th 744, 749 (7th Cir. 2023)
- *Anderson v. Liberty Lobby, Inc.*, 477 U.S. 242, 248 (1986)
- *McDonald v. Hardy*, 821 F.3d 882, 888 (7th Cir. 2016)
- *Dorsey v. Morgan Stanley*, 507 F.3d 624, 627 (7th Cir. 2007)
- *Harney v. Speedway SuperAmerica, LLC*, 526 F.3d 1099, 1104 (7th Cir. 2008)
- *Wrolstad v. Cuna Mutual Insurance Society*, 911 F.3d 450, 454 (7th Cir. 2018)
- *Igasaki v. Illinois Department of Financial and Professional Regulation*, 988 F.3d 948, 957, 960 (7th Cir. 2021)
- *Ortiz v. Werner Enterprises, Inc.*, 834 F.3d 760, 765 (7th Cir. 2016)
- *Purtue v. Wisconsin Department of Corrections*, 963 F.3d 598, 601-02 (7th Cir. 2020)
- *McDonnell Douglas Corp. v. Green*, 411 U.S. 792, 802 (1973)
- *Palmer v. Marion County*, 327 F.3d 588, 597-98 (7th Cir. 2003)
- *Carter v. Chicago State University*, No. 10 C 321, 2013 WL 3975009, at *8 (N.D. Ill. Aug. 1, 2013)