

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF
ILLINOIS, EASTERN DIVISION

Ashley Roberts v. Thomas Hanrahan, et al.

Roberts · No. 24-cv-2020 · Decided March 31, 2026

SUMMARY

The court grants in part the City of Chicago and Sergeant Thomas Hanrahan’s motion to dismiss claims arising from police officers’ mistaken, warrantless entry and search of Ashley Roberts’s apartment. The court dismisses state-law claims to the extent they were asserted against the City Defendants, rejects theories of vicarious liability and respondeat superior against the City, dismisses the City as a defendant, and dismisses the Fourth Amendment invasion-of-privacy claim as duplicative of the unreasonable-search claim. The Fourth Amendment claim otherwise remains pending.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the Northern District of Illinois, Eastern Division
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Steven C. Seeger
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the Northern District of Illinois, Eastern Division
DECIDED	March 31, 2026
DOCKET	24-cv-2020
DISPOSITION	other
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	Defendants City of Chicago and Sergeant Thomas Hanrahan moved under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 12(b)(6) to dismiss portions of Roberts's amended complaint. The court granted the partial motion to dismiss, dismissed the City, dismissed claims to the extent they asserted state-law claims against the City Defendants or vicarious liability and respondeat superior against the City, and dismissed Count II as duplicative of Count I.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	On a Rule 12(b)(6) motion, the court accepts well-pleaded factual allegations as true, draws reasonable inferences in the plaintiff's favor, and asks whether the complaint provides fair notice and states a facially plausible claim.

PRECEDENTIAL VALUE

Unspecified district court memorandum opinion; no precedential designation appears in the source.

TOPICS

motions to dismiss

pleadings

civil procedure

fourth amendment

PRACTICE AREAS

civil procedure

constitutional law

civil rights

municipal law

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether the state-law claims in Counts III and IV could be maintained against the City Defendants.
2. Whether the City could be held liable under theories of vicarious liability or respondeat superior for the officers' conduct.
3. Whether Count II, labeled an invasion-of-privacy claim under the Fourth Amendment, was duplicative of Count I's Fourth Amendment unreasonable-search claim.

HOLDINGS

1. Counts III and IV were dismissed to the limited extent that they could be read to assert claims against Sergeant Hanrahan or the other City Defendants.
2. The claims were dismissed to the extent they sought to impose vicarious liability or respondeat superior liability on the City, and the City was dismissed from the case.
3. A claim alleging invasion of privacy under the Fourth Amendment was duplicative of a Fourth Amendment unreasonable-search claim where both claims arose from the same police entry and search, alleged the same injury, and required proof of essentially the same elements.

KEY QUOTATIONS

“Claims that involve the same operative facts and same injury, and that require proof of essentially the same elements, are duplicative as opposed to alternative.” (Analysis § II)

“The Fourth Amendment does not protect privacy writ large, but it does protect private abodes.” (Analysis § II)

“Count II (the Fourth Amendment claim about an invasion of property) is dismissed as duplicative of Count I (the Fourth Amendment claim). Count I otherwise remains pending.” (Conclusion)

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Chicago police officers responding to a trespassing report at 4838 West Van Buren Street mistakenly entered Roberts's apartment at 4830 West Van Buren Street with guns drawn and conducted a search. Roberts alleged that the officers forced entry, blocked her movement, and entered while she was insufficiently clothed and using

the bathroom. She sued the officers, the City of Chicago, Sergeant Hanrahan, Joseph Debela, and DSK LLC, asserting Fourth Amendment and state-law claims.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Roberts initially filed suit pro se against the City of Chicago, Sergeant Hanrahan, unknown Chicago police officers, Joseph Debela, and DSK LLC. After retaining counsel, she filed an amended complaint asserting Fourth Amendment claims against the City Defendants and state-law claims against the Private Defendants. The City and Hanrahan moved to dismiss portions of the amended complaint, and Roberts conceded or clarified several points. The court granted the partial motion to dismiss while allowing Count I to remain pending.

DISPOSITION

other

CASES CITED

- Lett v. City of Chicago, 946 F.3d 398, 399 (7th Cir. 2020)
- Savory v. Cannon, 947 F.3d 409, 412 (7th Cir. 2020)
- Gibson v. City of Chicago, 910 F.2d 1510, 1520 (7th Cir. 1990)
- AnchorBank, FSB v. Hofer, 649 F.3d 610, 614 (7th Cir. 2011)
- Ashcroft v. Iqbal, 556 U.S. 662, 678 (2009)
- Bell Atl. Corp. v. Twombly, 550 U.S. 544, 555 (2007)
- Barrow v. Blouin, 38 F. Supp. 3d 916, 919-20 (N.D. Ill. 2014)
- Beringer v. Standard Parking O'HARE Joint Venture, 2008 WL 4890501, at *4 (N.D. Ill. 2008)
- Taybron v. Baker, 2018 WL 4489602, at *7 (N.D. Ill. 2018)
- Lonzo v. Blanco, 2022 WL 1211483, at *1 (N.D. Ill. 2022)
- Robinson v. City of Chicago, 2024 WL 3161662, at *2 (N.D. Ill. 2024)
- FDIC v. Saphir, 2011 WL 3876918, at *9 (N.D. Ill. 2011)
- Walker v. Considine, 2014 WL 6820130, at *4 (N.D. Ill. 2014)
- Wade v. Collier, 783 F.3d 1081, 1088 (7th Cir. 2015)
- Sutterfield v. City of Milwaukee, 751 F.3d 542, 550 (7th Cir. 2014)
- Auto-Owners Ins. Co. v. Websolv Computing, Inc., 580 F.3d 543, 549 (7th Cir. 2009)
- Griswold v. Connecticut, 381 U.S. 479, 486 (1965)
- Lange v. California, 594 U.S. 295, 303 (2021)
- Byrd v. United States, 584 U.S. 395, 404 (2018)
- Florida v. Jardines, 569 U.S. 1, 6 (2013)