

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF
MISSOURI, SOUTHEASTERN DIVISION

Judy Arlene Redmond v. Paul Hopkins, et al.

Redmond · No. 1:24CV38 ACL · Decided January 22, 2026

SUMMARY

The court denies Judy Arlene Redmond’s motion for reconsideration of the dismissal of her employment discrimination action and finds her motion to docket and provide public access moot. The court concludes that the motion was untimely under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 59(e) and that the post-dismissal evidence did not support relief under Rule 60(b). The action involved alleged denial of disability accommodations during federal employment and failure to exhaust administrative remedies.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the Eastern District of Missouri, Southeastern Division
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Abbie Crites-Leoni
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the Eastern District of Missouri, Southeastern Division
DECIDED	January 22, 2026
DOCKET	1:24CV38 ACL
DISPOSITION	other
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	Plaintiff moved for reconsideration of the court's prior order dismissing her Title VII and Rehabilitation Act claims and separately moved to docket and make publicly available the dismissal order and related filings.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	Relief under Rule 59(e) is limited to correcting manifest errors of law or fact or considering newly discovered evidence, and a Rule 59(e) motion must be filed within 28 days after entry of judgment. Rule 60(b) relief is available only in exceptional circumstances, and Rule 60(b)(2) applies only to evidence that existed at the time of the judgment and could not have been discovered earlier with reasonable diligence.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	unpublished district court memorandum and order; limited precedential value

PARTIES

Judy Arlene Redmond v. Paul Hopkins, Rebecca Wertenberger, James Monahan, Jeffery Serrano, Wanda Newton, Denis McDonough, Secretary of Veterans Affairs

TOPICS

motion for reconsideration

civil procedure

employment discrimination

disability discrimination

exhaustion of remedies

PRACTICE AREAS

civil procedure

employment law

federal employment law

civil rights

administrative law

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether Redmond's motion for reconsideration was timely under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 59(e).
2. Whether evidence created after the prior dismissal supported relief under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 60(b)(2).
3. Whether Redmond's motion to docket and make the dismissal order and related filings publicly available was moot.

HOLDINGS

1. The motion was untimely because Rule 59(e) required filing within 28 days after the October 17, 2024 judgment, but Redmond did not file until June 27, 2025.
2. Evidence that came into existence after the court's prior decision cannot support relief under Rule 60(b)(2).
3. The motion was moot because the dismissal order and all other filings in the matter had already been docketed and were publicly available.

KEY QUOTATIONS

“Rule 59(e) motions serve the limited function of correcting ‘manifest errors of law or fact or to present newly discovered evidence.’”

“Rule 60(b) authorizes relief in only the most exceptional of cases.”

“There can be no Rule 60(b)(2) relief for evidence which has only come into existence after the trial is over, for the obvious reason that to allow such a procedure could mean the perpetual continuation of all trials.”

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Redmond alleged that defendants denied her reasonable accommodations for physical and mental disabilities during her employment as a purchasing agent for the United States Department of Veterans Affairs. The court previously dismissed her complaint in part because she had not exhausted administrative remedies for a

Rehabilitation Act claim. Redmond's reconsideration motion relied on administrative materials and communications created between February and April 2025, after the court's October 17, 2024 dismissal.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Redmond filed a complaint alleging that she was denied reasonable accommodations for physical and mental disabilities during her employment as a purchasing agent for the Department of Veterans Affairs. On October 17, 2024, the court granted defendants' motion to dismiss, concluding that the Title VII complaint failed to state a claim and that Redmond had failed to exhaust administrative remedies for a Rehabilitation Act claim; the court also denied leave to amend as futile. Redmond filed her motion for reconsideration on June 27, 2025, relying on evidence arising after the dismissal. The court denied reconsideration and found her motion to docket and provide public access moot.

DISPOSITION

other

CASES CITED

- United States v. Metropolitan St. Louis Sewer District, 440 F.3d 930, 933 (8th Cir. 2006)
- Innovative Home Health Care v. P.T.-O.T. Associates of the Black Hills, 141 F.3d 1284, 1286 (8th Cir. 1998)
- Noah v. Bond Cold Storage, 408 F.3d 1043, 1045 (8th Cir. 2005)
- International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers, Local Union No. 545 v. Hope Electric Corp., 293 F.3d 409, 415 (8th Cir. 2002)
- Strategic Energy Concepts, LLC v. Otoka Energy, 120 F.4th 1339, 1345 (8th Cir. 2024)
- N.L.R.B. v. Jacob E. Decker and Sons, 569 F.2d 357, 364 (5th Cir. 1978)