

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF
INDIANA, HAMMOND DIVISION AT LAFAYETTE

Mapes v. Home Depot, et al.

Mapes · No. 4:26-CV-15-PPS-JEM · Decided May 5, 2026

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the Northern District of Indiana grants Ted Decker and Teresa Wynn Roseborough’s motion for judgment on the pleadings in Eric J. Mapes’s Title III Americans with Disabilities Act action. The court concludes that the complaint does not allege that either defendant discriminated against Mapes on the basis of disability and dismisses the claims against them with prejudice. The case remains pending against the other defendants.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the Northern District of Indiana, Hammond Division at Lafayette
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Philip P. Simon
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the Northern District of Indiana
DECIDED	May 5, 2026
DOCKET	4:26-CV-15-PPS-JEM
DISPOSITION	other
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	Defendants Ted Decker and Teresa Wynn Roseborough moved for judgment on the pleadings under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 12(c). The court granted the motion and dismissed the claims against them with prejudice, while the action remained pending against other defendants.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	A motion for judgment on the pleadings under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 12(c) is reviewed under the same standard as a Rule 12(b) (6) motion. The court accepts well-pleaded allegations as true, draws reasonable inferences in favor of the nonmoving party, and should not grant the motion unless it appears beyond doubt that the nonmoving party cannot prove facts sufficient to support the claim.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	Unknown
PARTIES	Eric J. Mapes v. Ted Decker, Teresa Wynn Roseborough

TOPICS

motion for judgment on the pleadings

public accommodations discrimination

ada / disability

civil procedure

PRACTICE AREAS

Civil procedure

Americans with Disabilities Act

Federal courts

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether Decker and Roseborough were entitled to judgment on the pleadings because the complaint failed to allege that either defendant discriminated against Mapes on the basis of disability.
2. Whether the claims against Decker and Roseborough should be dismissed with prejudice rather than allowing Mapes an opportunity to amend.

HOLDINGS

1. Judgment on the pleadings was proper because Mapes failed to allege facts showing that Decker or Roseborough discriminated against him on the basis of his disability. Sending the defendants a notice alleging ADA violations did not constitute an allegation that they themselves discriminated against him.
2. The court dismissed the claims against Decker and Roseborough with prejudice because amendment appeared futile.

KEY QUOTATIONS

“A prima facie case under Title III of the ADA consists of three elements: (1) the plaintiff was disabled within the meaning of the ADA; (2) the defendant owned, leased, or operated a place of public accommodation; and (3) the plaintiff was discriminated against on the basis of his or her disability.”

“At base, none of the allegations of disability discrimination relate whatsoever to Decker and Roseborough.”

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Mapes ordered a stove from Home Depot with delivery, installation, and removal of his old stove. The delivery agency declined to complete the delivery and installation after identifying a problem with the gas shut-off valve, and the order was later canceled and refunded. Mapes alleged that the incident violated Title III of the Americans with Disabilities Act, but his only allegations concerning Decker and Roseborough were that he sent them notices alleging ADA violations; he did not allege that either individual participated in or caused disability discrimination.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Mapes filed the action in state court, and Home Depot removed it to the federal district court under federal-question jurisdiction. Decker and Roseborough answered and then moved for judgment on the pleadings. After Mapes failed to respond by the court-ordered deadline, the court ruled on the motion summarily and dismissed the claims against those defendants with prejudice.

DISPOSITION

other

CASES CITED

- Flenner v. Sheahan, 107 F.3d 459, 461 (7th Cir. 1997)
- R.J. Corman Derailment Servs., LLC v. Int'l Union of Operating Eng'rs, Local Union 150, 335 F.3d 643, 647 (7th Cir. 2003)
- Housing Auth. Risk Retention Group, Inc. v. Chicago Housing Auth., 378 F.3d 596, 600 (7th Cir. 2004)
- Forseth v. Village of Sussex, 199 F.3d 363, 368 (7th Cir. 2000)
- Erickson v. Pardus, 551 U.S. 89, 94 (2007)
- Scherr v. Marriott Int'l, 703 F.3d 1069, 1076 (7th Cir. 2013)
- Stewart v. Parkview Hosp., Inc., No. 1:16-CV-138-TLS, 2017 WL 4764349, *2 (N.D. Ind. Oct. 20, 2017)
- A.H. by Holzmüller v. Illinois High Sch. Ass'n, 881 F.3d 587, 593 (7th Cir. 2018)
- Runnion ex rel. Runnion v. Girl Scouts of Greater Chicago & Nw. Indiana, 786 F.3d 510, 519 (7th Cir. 2015)
- Luevano v. Wal-Mart Stores, Inc., 722 F.3d 1014, 1022 (7th Cir. 2013)
- In re: Eric Joshua Mapes, No. 25-3200 (7th Cir. Dec. 30, 2025)
- Milwaukee Police Ass'n v. Flynn, 863 F.3d 636, 640 (7th Cir. 2017)