

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE CENTRAL DISTRICT OF
ILLINOIS

Victoria C. Voegel v. Obstetrics and Gynecology Care Assoc., S.C.

Voegel v. Obstetrics and Gynecology Care Assoc., S.C., No. 23-cv-1459 (C.D. Ill. Dec. 2, 2025) · No. 1:23-cv-01459 · Decided December 2, 2025

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the Central District of Illinois considers the defendant employer’s motion for summary judgment in an action alleging disability discrimination and retaliation under the Americans with Disabilities Act and the Illinois Human Rights Act. The court denies summary judgment on the discrimination claims, finding genuine disputes regarding causation and pretext, but grants summary judgment on the retaliation claims.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the Central District of Illinois
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Michael M. Mihm
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the Central District of Illinois, Peoria Division
DECIDED	December 2, 2025
DOCKET	1:23-cv-01459
DISPOSITION	other
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	Motion for Summary Judgment
STANDARD OF REVIEW	Summary judgment is appropriate when no genuine dispute as to any material fact exists and the movant is entitled to judgment as a matter of law.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	unpublished

TOPICS

- ada discrimination
- retaliation
- summary judgment
- disability discrimination
- employment law

PRACTICE AREAS

- employment law
- civil rights

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether Defendant is entitled to summary judgment on Plaintiff's claims for disability discrimination under the ADA and IHRA.
2. Whether Defendant is entitled to summary judgment on Plaintiff's claims for retaliation under the ADA and IHRA.

HOLDINGS

1. No. Genuine issues of material fact exist regarding whether Plaintiff's disability was the 'but for' reason for the adverse employment action, based on both direct evidence (an alleged statement by the employer about getting rid of her due to being a 'fall risk') and circumstantial evidence (potential pretext for the business justification).
2. Yes. Plaintiff failed to establish that she engaged in a statutorily protected activity or a causal connection between any such activity and the adverse employment action.

KEY QUOTATIONS

"I specifically overheard this conversation between Laura Wiegand and Dr. Santiago; and I worked with both of them for several years and I recognized and could decipher their voices."

"I heard Dr. Santiago state something to the effect of '...we need to get rid of Vicki because she is a "fall risk" in the office; and a risk for workers' compensation.'"

"This, however, was the first time OB/GYN Care had mentioned a patient quota expectation to Voegel."

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Plaintiff, a physician's assistant, worked for Defendant for over 16 years. She underwent multiple orthopedic surgeries on her lower extremities, which affected her mobility. Defendant was aware of her conditions and accommodated her with assistive devices. In 2019, Defendant hired a second mid-level provider. Plaintiff's revenue generation declined from prior years. In June 2021, Defendant's manager met with Plaintiff about declining revenue and set performance expectations. In November 2021, Plaintiff was presented with an employment proposal that significantly reduced her salary and hours, based on patient volume and revenue concerns. Plaintiff alleged she overheard her employer say they needed to 'get rid of' her because she was a 'fall risk' and workers' compensation liability. Plaintiff also alleged that Defendant's manager and the other provider steered patients away from her.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Plaintiff brought suit alleging disability discrimination and retaliation under the ADA and IHRA. Defendant moved for summary judgment on all claims.

DISPOSITION

other

CASES CITED

- Celotex Corp. v. Catrett, 477 U.S. 317 (1986)
- Wayland v. OSF Healthcare Sys., 94 F.4th 654 (7th Cir. 2024)
- Anderson v. Liberty Lobby, Inc., 477 U.S. 242 (1986)
- Majors v. Gen. Elec. Co., 714 F.3d 527 (7th Cir. 2013)
- Payne v. Pauley, 337 F.3d 767 (7th Cir. 2003)
- Tate v. Dart, 51 F.4th 789 (7th Cir. 2022)
- Fox v. Adams & Assocs., Inc., 2020 IL App (1st) 182470
- A.H. by Holzmueeller v. Ill. High Sch. Ass'n, 881 F.3d 587 (7th Cir. 2018)
- Bunn v. Khoury Enters., 753 F.3d 676 (7th Cir. 2014)
- Costello v. Grundon, 651 F.3d 614 (7th Cir. 2011)
- Sublett v. John Wiley & Sons, Inc., 463 F.3d 731 (7th Cir. 2006)
- Monroe v. Ind. Dep't of Transp., 871 F.3d 495 (7th Cir. 2017)
- Ortiz v. Werner Enters., Inc., 834 F.3d 760 (7th Cir. 2016)
- Gnutek v. Ill. Gaming Bd., 80 F.4th 820 (7th Cir. 2023)
- Rozumalski v. W.F. Baird & Assocs., Ltd., 937 F.3d 919 (7th Cir. 2019)
- Nawrot v. CPC Int'l, 277 F.3d 896 (7th Cir. 2002)
- Povey v. City of Jeffersonville, 697 F.3d 619 (7th Cir. 2012)
- Trahanas v. Northwestern Univ., 64 F.4th 842 (7th Cir. 2023)
- Bruno v. Wells-Armstrong, 93 F.4th 1049 (7th Cir. 2024)
- Dickerson v. Brd. of Trs. of Cmty Coll. Dist. No. 522, 657 F.3d 595 (7th Cir. 2011)
- Lord v. High Voltage Software, Inc., 839 F.3d 556 (7th Cir. 2016)