

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

Jacolby D. Beasley v. St. Louis Roofing Co., Inc.

Beasley · No. No. 4:25-CV-01818 SPM · Decided January 29, 2026

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the Eastern District of Missouri dismisses without prejudice an employment discrimination action as time-barred. The court holds that the plaintiff filed his EEOC charge 21 days beyond the applicable 300-day deadline and declines to apply equitable tolling because the plaintiff's stated reasons did not establish an extraordinary circumstance beyond his control.

CASE DETAILS

|                    |                                                                                                                                                             |
|--------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| COURT              | United States District Court for the Eastern District of Missouri, Eastern Division                                                                         |
| JURISDICTION       | United States District Court for the Eastern District of Missouri, Eastern Division                                                                         |
| DECIDED            | January 29, 2026                                                                                                                                            |
| DOCKET             | No. 4:25-CV-01818 SPM                                                                                                                                       |
| DISPOSITION        | dismissed                                                                                                                                                   |
| PROCEDURAL POSTURE | The district court reviewed Plaintiff's response to an order to show cause why his employment-discrimination action should not be dismissed as time-barred. |
| STANDARD OF REVIEW | The court reviewed whether the pleaded claims were time-barred and whether equitable tolling was warranted based on the facts alleged by Plaintiff.         |
| PRECEDENTIAL VALUE | unpublished district court opinion                                                                                                                          |

TOPICS

- employment discrimination
- title vii
- statute of limitations
- civil procedure

PRACTICE AREAS

- employment law
- civil rights
- civil procedure

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether Plaintiff's employment-discrimination claims were barred because he filed his EEOC charge more than 300 days after the alleged discriminatory occurrence.
2. Whether equitable tolling should extend the EEOC filing deadline based on Plaintiff's classes, appointment delays, and unsuccessful efforts to obtain legal assistance.

## HOLDINGS

1. Plaintiff's EEOC Charge of Discrimination was untimely because it was filed 21 days after the applicable 300-day filing deadline.
2. Equitable tolling was unwarranted because Plaintiff did not show that an extraordinary circumstance beyond his control prevented timely filing.

## KEY QUOTATIONS

*“Equitable tolling is appropriate when the plaintiff exercises diligence but is unable to obtain information bearing on his claim, or some extraordinary circumstance stood in his way.”*

*“Equitable tolling is appropriate only when the circumstances that cause a plaintiff to miss a filing deadline are out of his hands or beyond the plaintiff's control.”*

## FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Plaintiff alleged that his former employer discriminated against him between May 17, 2024, and October 21, 2024, when his employment ended. He signed and filed an EEOC Charge of Discrimination on September 7, 2025, 321 days after the end of his employment and 21 days after the applicable 300-day deadline. Plaintiff attributed the delay to taking classes, rescheduling EEOC appointments, and attempting to obtain legal assistance, but did not identify an extraordinary circumstance preventing timely filing.

## PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Plaintiff filed suit against his former employer alleging discrimination and retaliation. The Court ordered him to show cause because his EEOC charge was filed 321 days after his employment ended, exceeding the applicable 300-day filing period. After reviewing his response and rejecting equitable tolling, the Court dismissed the action without prejudice as time-barred.

## DISPOSITION

dismissed

## CASES CITED

- Henderson v. Ford Motor Co., 403 F.3d 1026, 1033 (8th Cir. 2005)
- Kampschroer v. Anoka Cnty., 935 F.3d 645, 649 (8th Cir. 2019)
- Williams v. Thomson Corp., 383 F.3d 789, 791 (8th Cir. 2004)
- Rodriguez v. Wal-Mart Stores, Inc., 891 F.3d 1127, 1129 (8th Cir. 2018)

