

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF
OKLAHOMA

Chanelle Dionne Williams v. Saint Francis Hospital, Inc., Candice
Robbins, and Randy Flatts

Williams v. Saint Francis Hospital · No. 25-CV-0595-CVE-MTS · Decided May 21, 2026

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the Northern District of Oklahoma granted defendants’ partial motion to dismiss in a pro se employment-discrimination case. The court held that the complaint did not plausibly state a claim under 42 U.S.C. § 1983 because it did not identify a constitutional violation or allege that defendants were state actors. The court dismissed the complaint but allowed the plaintiff to file an amended complaint asserting potentially applicable claims under the Americans with Disabilities Act or Family and Medical Leave Act.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the Northern District of Oklahoma
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Claire V. Eagan
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the Northern District of Oklahoma
DECIDED	May 21, 2026
DOCKET	25-CV-0595-CVE-MTS
DISPOSITION	dismissed
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	Defendants moved under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 12(b)(6) to dismiss plaintiff's purported 42 U.S.C. § 1983 claim. Plaintiff opposed dismissal, asserted that her allegations concerned disability and medical-leave discrimination, and requested leave to amend.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	On a Rule 12(b)(6) motion, the court accepts well-pleaded allegations as true and construes them in the light most favorable to the plaintiff, but it need not accept conclusory allegations. A complaint must contain sufficient factual matter to state a claim for relief that is plausible on its face.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	unpublished district court opinion
PARTIES	Chanelle Dionne Williams v. Saint Francis Hospital, Inc., Candice Robbins, Randy Flatts

TOPICS

motions to dismiss

section 1983

ada / disability

family and medical leave act

civil procedure

PRACTICE AREAS

civil procedure

civil rights

employment law

disability discrimination

family and medical leave act

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether plaintiff stated a claim under 42 U.S.C. § 1983 against the hospital and individual defendants.
2. Whether the complaint should be dismissed when it did not allege a constitutional violation or facts establishing that defendants acted under color of state law.
3. Whether plaintiff should be granted leave to amend to assert potentially applicable disability-discrimination or medical-leave claims.

HOLDINGS

1. Plaintiff failed to state a plausible § 1983 claim because she did not allege that defendants violated a federal constitutional right or that any defendant was a state actor.
2. The complaint was properly dismissed for failure to state a claim upon which relief could be granted because its allegations concerning § 1983 were insufficient and conclusory.
3. Plaintiff was permitted to file an amended complaint asserting potentially applicable disability or medical-leave claims in separate counts.

KEY QUOTATIONS

“A complaint must contain enough “facts to state a claim to relief that is plausible on its face”” (at 2)

“The Court will dismiss plaintiff’s complaint in its entirety, but the Court will allow plaintiff to file an amended complaint raising more appropriate claims for her factual allegations.” (at 4)

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Plaintiff worked at Saint Francis Hospital in Tulsa, Oklahoma. She alleged that she requested physician-imposed restrictions and workplace accommodations, that the hospital denied an accommodation after she fell at work, and that a supervisor mocked her medically required restroom breaks. She further alleged that she filed for FMLA leave, was rebuffed when attempting to return to work with restrictions, and was fired approximately two weeks later. Her form complaint identified the action as a § 1983 suit, although her factual allegations appeared to concern disability discrimination and denial of medical leave.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Plaintiff filed a pro se civil-rights complaint identifying the action as one under 42 U.S.C. § 1983. Defendants filed a partial motion to dismiss. The court dismissed the complaint for failure to state a claim but granted plaintiff permission to file an amended complaint asserting more appropriate claims in separate counts by June 22, 2026.

DISPOSITION

dismissed

CASES CITED

- Bell Atlantic Corp. v. Twombly, 550 U.S. 544 (2007)
- Ashcroft v. Iqbal, 556 U.S. 662 (2009)
- Alvarado v. KOB-TV, L.L.C., 493 F.3d 1210, 1215 (10th Cir. 2007)
- Moffett v. Halliburton Energy Servs., Inc., 291 F.3d 1227, 1231 (10th Cir. 2002)
- Erikson v. Pawnee County Board of County Commissioners, 263 F.3d 1151, 1154-55 (10th Cir. 2001)
- Hall v. Bellmon, 935 F.2d 1106, 1109-10 (10th Cir. 1991)
- Haines v. Kerner, 404 U.S. 519, 520 (1972)
- Meade v. Grubbs, 841 F.2d 1512, 1526 (10th Cir. 1988)
- Ogden v. San Juan County, 32 F.3d 452, 455 (10th Cir. 1994)
- Wyatt v. Cole, 504 U.S. 158, 161 (1992)

Retrieved from lawtools.ai · <https://lawtools.ai/cases/state/united-states-district-court-for-the-northern-district-of-oklahoma-united-states-district-court-for/2026/chanelle-dionne-williams-v-saint-francis-hospital-inc-t4pykmc0>