

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF
OKLAHOMA

Allyson Greenroyd v. Michelle Shelton, et al.

Greenroyd · No. CIV-25-1299-R · Decided February 18, 2026

SUMMARY

The court denied without prejudice several motions to dismiss because the plaintiff had filed an amended complaint superseding the original complaint. The court also denied as moot motions to clarify and certain withdrawn requests for preliminary injunctive relief and expedited discovery.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the Western District of Oklahoma
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the Western District of Oklahoma
DECIDED	February 18, 2026
DOCKET	CIV-25-1299-R
DISPOSITION	other
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	Defendants moved to dismiss the original complaint. While those motions were pending, Plaintiff filed an amended complaint and withdrew several motions and related filings.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	Unknown
PARTIES	Allyson Greenroyd v. Michelle Shelton, et al.

TOPICS

- motions to dismiss
- pleadings
- injunctions
- discovery dispute
- civil procedure

PRACTICE AREAS

- civil procedure
- civil rights
- injunctive relief
- discovery

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

- Whether Defendants' motions to dismiss the original complaint remained operative after Plaintiff filed an amended complaint.
- Whether Plaintiff's voluntary notice under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 41(a)(1)(A)(i) dismissed the action or merely withdrew the specified motions and filings.

3. Whether the withdrawn motions and the motions to clarify should be denied as moot.

HOLDINGS

1. An amended complaint supersedes the original complaint and renders it of no legal effect; therefore, motions directed at the original complaint were denied without prejudice to resubmission, if appropriate.
2. Although Plaintiff cited Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 41(a)(1)(A)(i), the notice was construed as withdrawing the identified motions and filings rather than dismissing the action.
3. The emergency motion for preliminary injunction, the motion for preservation order and expedited targeted discovery, and Defendants' motions to clarify were denied as moot.

KEY QUOTATIONS

“This Amended Complaint “supersedes the original and renders it of no legal effect.””

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Plaintiff filed a civil action and an original complaint, followed by several motions concerning emergency injunctive relief, preservation of evidence, expedited targeted discovery, and the scope of requested relief. Defendants filed six motions to dismiss the original complaint. During the pendency of those motions, Plaintiff filed an amended complaint and then submitted a voluntary notice withdrawing several motions and related filings.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

The Court considered six motions to dismiss, two motions to clarify, an emergency motion for preliminary injunction, a motion for a preservation order and expedited targeted discovery, related filings, and Plaintiff's voluntary notice of withdrawal. Because the amended complaint superseded the original complaint, the Court denied the pending motions to dismiss without prejudice to refiling. The Court construed Plaintiff's notice as withdrawing specified motions and filings rather than dismissing the action, and denied the preliminary-injunction and preservation/discovery motions and the motions to clarify as moot.

DISPOSITION

other

CASES CITED

- Davis v. TXO Production Corp., 929 F.2d 1515, 1517 (10th Cir. 1991)

OPINION

Greenroyd

PER CURIAM.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

WESTERN DISTRICT OF OKLAHOMA

ALLYSON GREENROYD,)

) Plaintiff,)) vs.) Case No. CIV-25-1299-R) MICHELLE SHELTON, et al.,)) Defendants.)

ORDER

Before the Court are several Motions to Dismiss [Doc. Nos. 20, 23, 26, 27, 28, 29] Plaintiff's Complaint [Doc. No. 1]. During the pendency of the Motions, Plaintiff filed an Amended Complaint [Doc. No. 30]. This Amended Complaint "supersedes the original and renders it of no legal effect." Davis v. TXO Prod. Corp., 929 F.2d 1515, 1517 (10th Cir. 1991) (internal quotation omitted). Defendants' Motions to Dismiss [Doc. Nos. 20, 23, 26, 27, 28, 29] are therefore DENIED without prejudice to resubmission, if appropriate. Also before the Court are two Motions to Clarify [Doc. Nos. 21, 25] what Plaintiff seeks with her filings Emergency Motion for Preliminary Injunction [Doc. No. 4], Supplement to Emergency Motion for Preliminary Injunction [Doc. No. 13], Motion for Preservation Order and for Expedited, Targeted Discovery [Doc. No. 14], and Notice Clarifying Scope of Relief [Doc. No. 15]. Plaintiff has since filed a Voluntary Notice of Withdrawal of Doc. Nos. 4, 13, 14, and 15 [Doc. No. 31] pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 41(a)(1)(A)(i), which states that a Plaintiff may "dismiss an action without a court order... before the opposing party serves either an answer or a motion for summary judgment." Though she cites Rule 41, Plaintiff does not appear to seek dismissal of this action. The Court instead construes her Voluntary Notice of Withdrawal as merely withdrawing the Motions and other filings listed in her Notice and accordingly, Plaintiff's Emergency Motion for Preliminary Injunction [Doc. No. 4] and Motion for Preservation Order and for Expedited, Targeted Discovery [Doc. No. 14] are DENIED as MOOT. Defendants' Motions to Clarify [Doc. Nos. 21, 25] are also DENIED as MOOT. IT IS SO ORDERED this 18" day of February, 2026.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE