

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF
ARKANSAS, CENTRAL DIVISION

Mark Tackett v. United States Postal Service

No. 4:24-cv-496-JM (E.D. Ark. Feb. 6, 2026) · No. 4:24-cv-496-JM · Decided February 6, 2026

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the Eastern District of Arkansas granted the United States Postal Service’s motion for summary judgment in Mark Tackett’s pro se employment discrimination and retaliation case. The court held that Tackett failed to establish prima facie claims based on the denial of a promotion, the deactivation of workplace devices during medical leave, a request for medical documentation, and two later denied promotions. The case was dismissed with prejudice.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the Eastern District of Arkansas, Central Division
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the Eastern District of Arkansas, Central Division
DECIDED	February 6, 2026
DOCKET	4:24-cv-496-JM
DISPOSITION	dismissed
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	Defendant moved for summary judgment in the plaintiff’s employment-discrimination action.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	Summary judgment is appropriate when there is no genuine dispute of material fact and the movant is entitled to judgment as a matter of law. The court applied the McDonnell Douglas burden-shifting framework to the discrimination claims and required proof of a protected activity, adverse employment action, and causation for retaliation.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	unpublished district-court order; nonprecedential
PARTIES	Mark Tackett v. United States Postal Service

TOPICS

- employment discrimination
- retaliation
- ada / disability
- age discrimination
- summary judgment

PRACTICE AREAS

employment discrimination

federal employment law

civil rights

disability discrimination

age discrimination

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether the Postal Service was entitled to summary judgment on Tackett's claims that the 2019 failure to promote was based on race, gender, color, age, or retaliation.
2. Whether deactivation of Tackett's work phone and computer while he was on sick leave constituted an adverse employment action supporting disability discrimination or retaliation claims.
3. Whether the Postal Service's request for updated medical documentation during Tackett's leave constituted retaliation.
4. Whether the Postal Service was entitled to summary judgment on Tackett's claims that he was denied two 2021 promotions because of age or retaliation.

HOLDINGS

1. Tackett failed to establish a prima facie case of discrimination or retaliation concerning the 2019 manager position because the selected employee was a white male of the same age and qualifications, and Tackett had not shown discriminatory animus or protected activity attributable to him before the selection.
2. Deactivation of Tackett's work phone and computer while he was on sick leave was, at most, a minor inconvenience and did not constitute an adverse employment action; therefore, his disability-discrimination and retaliation claims based on the deactivation failed as a matter of law.
3. Tackett failed to establish that the Postal Service's request for updated medical documentation was retaliatory or discriminatory because he did not show an adverse action, discriminatory motive, or causation.
4. Tackett failed to establish prima facie claims for age discrimination or retaliation based on the two 2021 positions because he did not meet the minimum qualifications, the selected employees were also over forty, and he showed no causal connection between his protected activity and the selecting official's decisions.

KEY QUOTATIONS

"For the reasons stated above, Defendant's motion for summary judgment (Doc. 29) is GRANTED. The case is dismissed with prejudice." (Conclusion)

"All that being said, the deactivation of the cell phone and computer while on leave amounts, at best, to a minor inconvenience" (Analysis, disability claim)

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Mark Tackett, a white male over forty, worked for the Postal Service and was not selected for a 2019 manager position, which was awarded to a white male of the same age or older. While on extended sick leave, his work

computer, phone, and email access were deactivated, but he continued receiving pay and sick-leave benefits, and access was restored when he returned. In 2021, he applied for two positions but did not meet their minimum qualifications and was not interviewed; the positions went to employees who were also over forty. Tackett alleged that these events constituted discrimination and retaliation based on race, gender, disability, age, and prior EEOC activity.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Tackett, proceeding pro se, sued the United States Postal Service, alleging discrimination and retaliation based on race, gender, disability, and age under Title VII, the Rehabilitation Act, and the ADEA. The Postal Service moved for summary judgment; Tackett responded, and the Postal Service replied. The court deemed the Postal Service's statement of facts admitted because Tackett failed to file the required separate statement under Local Rule 56.1, granted summary judgment, and dismissed the case with prejudice.

DISPOSITION

dismissed

CASES CITED

- Holloway v. Lockhart, 813 F.2d 874, 878 (8th Cir.)
- Anderson v. Liberty Lobby, Inc., 477 U.S. 242, 250 (1986)
- Inland Oil & Transport Co. v. United States, 600 F.2d 725 (8th Cir. 1979), cert. denied, 444 U.S. 991 (1979)
- Counts v. M.K. Ferguson Co., 862 F.2d 1338, 1339 (8th Cir.)
- City of Mt. Pleasant v. Associated Elec. Coop., 838 F.2d 268, 273-274 (8th Cir.)
- Ross v. Kan. City Power & Light Co., 293 F.3d 1041, 1046 (8th Cir.)
- Thomas v. Corwin, 483 F.3d 516, 528 (8th Cir.)
- Philip v. Ford Motor Co., 413 F.3d 766, 768 (8th Cir.)
- DePriest v. Milligan, 823 F.3d 1179, 1187 (8th Cir.)
- Wilkie v. Dep't of Health and Human Serv., 638 F.3d 944, 955 (8th Cir.)
- Kelleher v. Wal-Mart Stores, Inc., 817 F.3d 624, 632 (8th Cir.)
- McDonnell Douglas Corp. v. Green, 411 U.S. 792 (1973)
- Ballard v. Rubin, 284 F.3d 957, 960 n.3 (8th Cir.)
- Lewis v. Johanns, 180 F. App'x 599, *2 (8th Cir.)
- LeBlanc v. McDonough, 39 F.4th 1071, 1077 (8th Cir.)
- Manni v. ORS Nasco, 2006 WL 1715939, *7 (D. Minn. 2006)