

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF SOUTH
CAROLINA, FLORENCE DIVISION

Stephon Alexander v. ADSC Holdings, Inc.

No. 4:25-04839-JD, United States District Court for the District of South Carolina, Florence Division (March 17, 2026)

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the District of South Carolina adopted a magistrate judge’s Report and Recommendation and granted ADSC Holdings, Inc.’s motion to dismiss Stephon Alexander’s ADA complaint. The court held that the alleged termination for disability-related misconduct, involving flashing a gun, did not state a plausible ADA discrimination, retaliation, or failure-to-accommodate claim under controlling Fourth Circuit precedent. The complaint was dismissed with prejudice without leave to amend because amendment would be futile.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the District of South Carolina, Florence Division
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Joseph Dawson, III
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the District of South Carolina, Florence Division
DECIDED	March 17, 2026
DOCKET	4:25-04839-JD
DISPOSITION	dismissed
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	Plaintiff objected to a magistrate judge's Report and Recommendation recommending dismissal under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 12(b) (6). The district court conducted de novo review, overruled the objections, adopted the Report, granted the motion to dismiss, and dismissed the ADA complaint with prejudice without leave to amend.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	De novo review of the portions of the Report and Recommendation to which specific objections were made; the court applied the Rule 12(b) (6) plausibility standard and accepted the complaint's factual allegations as true.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	Unknown; federal district court order with no reporter citation in the source.

PARTIES

Stephon Alexander v. ADSC Holdings, Inc.

TOPICS

ada discrimination

disability discrimination

motions to dismiss

reasonable accommodation

civil procedure

PRACTICE AREAS

Employment law

Disability discrimination

Civil procedure

Americans with Disabilities Act

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether the complaint plausibly stated an ADA claim when the employer allegedly terminated the plaintiff for misconduct involving the flashing of a gun, even if the misconduct was related to a disability.
2. Whether the plaintiff's ADA retaliation and failure-to-accommodate theories were adequately pleaded.
3. Whether the district court should decline to dismiss at the pleading stage pending discovery concerning uniform enforcement, job relatedness, and business necessity.
4. Whether the complaint should be dismissed with prejudice without leave to amend because amendment would be futile.

HOLDINGS

1. The ADA does not provide an actionable claim when an employer discharges an employee for misconduct, even if the misconduct is related to the employee's disability. The complaint therefore failed to state a plausible ADA discrimination claim based on Alexander's termination for allegedly flashing a gun.
2. Discovery was not necessary before dismissal because conclusory assertions that the employer may not have uniformly enforced its conduct policies did not satisfy Rule 12(b)(6)'s plausibility requirement.
3. The failure-to-accommodate theory failed because the complaint did not allege that Alexander requested a reasonable accommodation before his termination, and disability-related misconduct itself did not require accommodation under controlling authority.
4. The retaliation theory failed because the complaint did not identify factual allegations plausibly stating a retaliation claim independent of the misconduct-based termination.
5. The complaint was dismissed with prejudice without leave to amend because amendment would be futile under settled Fourth Circuit precedent governing disability-related misconduct, and the plaintiff neither proposed an amended complaint nor identified additional facts that would cure the deficiency.

KEY QUOTATIONS

“The pleading stage does not unlock the doors of discovery for a plaintiff armed with nothing more than speculation.” (Section D)

“Plaintiff’s Complaint is dismissed with prejudice, and no amendment shall be permitted, as an amendment would be futile under controlling Fourth Circuit precedent.” (Conclusion)

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

ADSC Holdings employed Stephon Alexander as a bus driver transporting members of Active Day. After Alexander experienced a mental-health episode, was hospitalized, and took leave, he obtained a note authorizing him to return to work on May 15, 2024. Before his return, the employer questioned him about allegedly flashing a gun while coworkers observed abnormal behavior and terminated his employment. Alexander alleged that the termination was disability-related and asserted ADA discrimination, retaliation, and failure-to-accommodate theories.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Stephon Alexander filed an ADA complaint against his former employer on June 4, 2025. ADSC Holdings moved to dismiss or, alternatively, for summary judgment. The magistrate judge declined to convert the motion to summary judgment and recommended dismissal without leave to amend. After Alexander filed objections, the district court conducted de novo review, adopted the recommendation, and dismissed the complaint with prejudice because amendment would be futile.

DISPOSITION

dismissed

CASES CITED

- Mathews v. Weber, 423 U.S. 261, 270-71 (1976)
- Jones v. American Postal Workers Union, 192 F.3d 417, 429 (4th Cir. 1999)
- Pence v. Tenneco Automotive Operating Co., 169 F. App'x 808, 811 (4th Cir. 2006)
- United States v. Schronce, 727 F.2d 91, 94 & n.4 (4th Cir. 1984)
- Diamond v. Colonial Life & Accident Insurance Co., 416 F.3d 310, 315 (4th Cir. 2005)
- Thomas v. Arn, 474 U.S. 140, 147 (1985)
- Camby v. Davis, 718 F.2d 198, 199 (4th Cir. 1983)
- Den Hartog v. Wasatch Academy, 129 F.3d 1076, 1086 (10th Cir. 1997)