

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

Anthony Buczek-Booth v. Kraft Heinz Foods Company

Buczek-Booth · No. 2:24CV97 HEA · Decided April 13, 2026

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the Eastern District of Missouri granted Kraft Heinz Foods Company’s motion for summary judgment in an alleged disability-discrimination action under the Missouri Human Rights Act. The court held that Plaintiff Anthony Buczek-Booth failed to establish that he was disabled or that disability was a motivating factor in his termination for violating the employer’s attendance policy. The opinion was issued per curiam by Judge Henry Edward Autrey.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the Eastern District of Missouri, Northern Division
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Henry Edward Autrey
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the Eastern District of Missouri, Northern Division
DECIDED	April 13, 2026
DOCKET	2:24CV97 HEA
DISPOSITION	other
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	Defendant moved for summary judgment in Plaintiff's disability-discrimination action under the Missouri Human Rights Act.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	Summary judgment is appropriate when there is no genuine dispute as to any material fact and the movant is entitled to judgment as a matter of law. The court views the evidence in the light most favorable to the nonmoving party, gives that party the benefit of reasonable inferences, and does not weigh evidence or determine witness credibility.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	unknown
PARTIES	Anthony Buczek-Booth v. Kraft Heinz Foods Company

TOPICS

- disability discrimination
- summary judgment
- employment law
- civil procedure

PRACTICE AREAS

employment law

disability discrimination

civil procedure

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether Plaintiff presented sufficient evidence to establish that he had, was regarded as having, or had a record of having a disability under the Missouri Human Rights Act.
2. Whether Plaintiff presented sufficient evidence that disability was a motivating factor in Kraft Heinz's decision to terminate his employment.
3. Whether Defendant was entitled to summary judgment under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 56.

HOLDINGS

1. Plaintiff failed to establish that his heart condition or sacroiliac-joint condition constituted a statutory disability because he presented no evidence that either condition substantially limited a major life activity, that he was regarded as having such an impairment, or that he had a record of such an impairment.
2. Plaintiff failed to establish the elements of his MHRA disability-discrimination claim, including that his alleged disability was a motivating factor in his termination.
3. Summary judgment was proper because no genuine dispute of material fact existed and Defendant was entitled to judgment as a matter of law.

KEY QUOTATIONS

“Pursuant to Rule 56 of the federal Rules of Civil Procedure, there exist no genuine disputes as to any material facts. Defendant is entitled to judgment as a matter of law.” (at 17)

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Plaintiff worked for Kraft Heinz from 2017 until his termination on September 28, 2023, after accruing attendance occurrences exceeding the employer's termination threshold. He alleged that a heart condition and sacroiliac-joint surgery made him disabled and that his termination violated the Missouri Human Rights Act. The record showed that Kraft Heinz accommodated documented lifting and rest restrictions, Plaintiff did not identify how either condition substantially limited a major life activity, and he had no restrictions when his employment ended.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Plaintiff filed a state-court petition alleging that Kraft Heinz terminated him because of his disability. Defendant removed the action to federal court based on diversity jurisdiction and moved for summary judgment. Plaintiff proceeded pro se and submitted a supplement but did not file a formal response; the court considered the supported record and granted Defendant's motion.

DISPOSITION

other

CASES CITED

- Williams v. Carter, 10 F.3d 563, 567 (8th Cir. 1993)
- Celotex Corp. v. Catrett, 477 U.S. 317, 322-23 (1986)
- Anderson v. Liberty Lobby, Inc., 477 U.S. 242, 248-50 (1986)
- Hartnagel v. Norman, 953 F.2d 394, 395 (8th Cir. 1992)
- Woods v. DaimlerChrysler Corp., 409 F.3d 984, 990 (8th Cir. 2005)
- Zenith Radio Corp., 475 U.S. 574, 586 (1986)
- Jaurequi v. Carter Mfg. Co., 173 F.3d 1076, 1085 (8th Cir. 1999)
- Reed v. City of St. Charles, 561 F.3d 788, 790 (8th Cir. 2009)
- Kammuegger v. Loomis, Fargo & Co., 383 F.3d 779, 784 (8th Cir. 2004)
- Quick v. Donaldson Co., 90 F.3d 1372, 1377 (8th Cir. 1996)
- Johnson v. Midwest Division - RBH, LLC, 88 F.4th 731, 737 (8th Cir. 2023)
- Ashby v. Woodridge of Mo., Inc., 673 S.W.3d 537, 544 (Mo. Ct. App. 2023)
- Medley v. Valentine Radford Commc'ns, Inc., 173 S.W.3d 315, 321 (Mo. Ct. App. 2005)
- Kirkeberg v. Canadian Pacific Ry., 619 F.3d 898, 903 (8th Cir. 2010)
- Albertson's, Inc. v. Kirkingburg, 527 U.S. 555, 565 (1999)