

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF
LOUISIANA

Sean Michael Tiller v. Capital One, National Association

Tiller · No. 25-1658 · Decided February 5, 2026

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the Eastern District of Louisiana grants Capital One’s Rule 12(b)(6) motion to dismiss Sean Michael Tiller’s amended employment-discrimination complaint. The court holds that Tiller’s allegations of ADA discrimination, retaliation, and hostile work environment fail to satisfy Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 8. The court denies further leave to amend and dismisses the claims with prejudice.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the Eastern District of Louisiana
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Barry W. Ashe
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the Eastern District of Louisiana
DECIDED	February 5, 2026
DOCKET	25-1658
DISPOSITION	dismissed
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	Defendant moved under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 12(b)(6) to dismiss a pro se plaintiff's amended employment-discrimination complaint. The court granted the motion and dismissed the claims with prejudice.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	On a Rule 12(b)(6) motion, the court accepts well-pleaded factual allegations as true, disregards conclusory allegations, and determines whether the complaint states a facially plausible claim for relief. The court's review is generally limited to the complaint, documents attached to it, and documents attached to the motion that are central to the claim and referenced by the complaint.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	unpublished district court order; persuasive authority only

TOPICS

- motions to dismiss
- ada discrimination
- hostile work environment
- retaliation
- civil procedure

PRACTICE AREAS

employment law

civil procedure

disability discrimination

ada / disability

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether Tiller's amended complaint satisfied Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 8 and plausibly stated an ADA hostile-work-environment claim.
2. Whether Tiller's amended complaint plausibly stated an ADA discrimination claim.
3. Whether Tiller's amended complaint plausibly stated an ADA retaliation claim.
4. Whether Tiller should receive leave to file a second amended complaint.
5. Whether the court needed to decide whether Tiller exhausted administrative remedies for his hostile-work-environment claim.

HOLDINGS

1. The amended complaint failed to satisfy Rule 8 because it did not identify the specific harassment, explain how the alleged harassment was disability-based, allege that it affected a term, condition, or privilege of employment, or allege that Capital One knew or should have known of the harassment and failed to take prompt remedial action.
2. The amended complaint failed to satisfy Rule 8 and did not plausibly state an ADA discrimination claim because it did not allege facts showing that Tiller was qualified for his job, the nature of his job, or the circumstances connecting his termination to his disability.
3. The amended complaint failed to satisfy Rule 8 and did not plausibly state an ADA retaliation claim because it did not explain what protected activity Tiller engaged in, to whom he reported it, what conduct led to the alleged increased scrutiny, or how the protected activity caused his termination.
4. The court denied leave to amend because Tiller had already been given one opportunity to amend and the amended complaint still failed to state any viable claim under Rule 8.
5. The court did not reach the administrative-exhaustion issue because all claims were independently subject to dismissal for failure to satisfy Rule 8.

KEY QUOTATIONS

“Rule 8 “does not require ‘detailed factual allegations,’ but it demands more than an unadorned, the-defendant-unlawfully-harmed-me accusation.”” (Section III.A)

“A court will squint at pro se filings to discern what may be there – but it will not see things that are not there.” (Section III.B)

“IT IS ORDERED that Capital One’s Rule 12(b)(6) motion to dismiss Tiller’s amended complaint (R. Doc. 21) is GRANTED, and Tiller’s claims are DISMISSED WITH PREJUDICE.” (Section IV)

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Tiller, proceeding pro se, alleged that he has epilepsy and that Capital One knew of his condition. He alleged that management and coworkers treated him differently, that he reported harassment and discrimination, and that he was subjected to increased scrutiny, written up, and terminated after reporting. He did not provide sufficient details about the alleged harassment, his job qualifications, the nature and circumstances of his termination, or the protected activity underlying his retaliation claim.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Tiller filed a form employment-discrimination complaint against his former employer. The court previously dismissed the original complaint for failure to provide the short and plain statement required by Rule 8, but allowed one amendment. The court construed Tiller's subsequent motion and memorandum as an amended complaint, then dismissed the amended complaint with prejudice because it failed to plead sufficient facts supporting ADA discrimination, retaliation, or hostile-work-environment claims. The court denied further leave to amend.

DISPOSITION

dismissed

CASES CITED

- In re Enron Corp. Sec., Derivative & ERISA Litig., 761 F. Supp. 2d 504, 566 (S.D. Tex. 2011)
- Ashcroft v. Iqbal, 556 U.S. 662 (2009)
- Bell Atl. Corp. v. Twombly, 550 U.S. 544 (2007)
- Conley v. Gibson, 355 U.S. 41, 47 (1957)
- Body by Cook, Inc. v. State Farm Mut. Auto. Ins., 869 F.3d 381, 385 (5th Cir. 2017)
- Doe ex rel. Magee v. Covington Cty. Sch. Dist., 675 F.3d 849, 854 (5th Cir. 2012)
- Lone Star Fund V (U.S.), L.P. v. Barclays Bank PLC, 594 F.3d 383, 387 (5th Cir. 2010)
- Collins v. Morgan Stanley Dean Witter, 224 F.3d 496, 498-99 (5th Cir. 2000)
- United States v. Davis, 629 F. App'x 613, 618 (5th Cir. 2015)
- Thorn v. McGary, 684 F. App'x 430, 433 (5th Cir. 2017)
- Brown v. Brown, 2025 WL 1811326, at *3 (N.D. Tex. July 1, 2025)
- Smith v. Barrett Daffin Frappier Turner & Engel, L.L.P., 735 F. App'x 848, 851 (5th Cir. 2018)
- Taylor v. Principal Fin. Grp., Inc., 93 F.3d 155, 161 (5th Cir. 1996)
- Flowers v. S. Reg'l Physician Servs. Inc., 247 F.3d 229, 233, 235-36 (5th Cir. 2001)
- Cannon v. Jacobs Field Servs. N. Am., Inc., 813 F.3d 586, 590 (5th Cir. 2016)
- EEOC v. LHC Grp., Inc., 773 F.3d 688, 697 (5th Cir. 2014)
- Clark v. Champion Nat'l Sec., Inc., 952 F.3d 570, 588 (5th Cir. 2020)