

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF
TEXAS, HOUSTON DIVISION

Doreatha Long-Walker v. KIPP Texas, et al.

No. 4:25-CV-00403, United States District Court for the Southern District of Texas, Houston Division (February 9, 2026)

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the Southern District of Texas denied Plaintiff Doreatha Long-Walker’s motion for a permanent injunction seeking reinstatement, granted leave to file a Third Amended Complaint, and denied as moot the pending motion to dismiss and motion to expedite. The court also denied Plaintiff’s motion for entry of default, concluding that Defendants had appeared and defended the action. The order concerns allegations of race and disability discrimination, retaliation, and related claims against KIPP Texas and individual defendants.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the Southern District of Texas, Houston Division
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Andrew S. Hanen
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the Southern District of Texas, Houston Division
DECIDED	February 9, 2026
DOCKET	4:25-CV-00403
DISPOSITION	other
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	The court ruled on the plaintiff's motion for a permanent injunction, motion for leave to file a third amended complaint, motion to expedite, motion for entry of default, and the defendants' motion to dismiss.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	A permanent injunction requires satisfaction of the four-factor equitable-relief test identified in eBay Inc. v. MercExchange, L.L.C. Leave to amend is generally granted absent substantial reasons such as undue delay, bad faith, dilatory motive, repeated failure to cure deficiencies, or undue prejudice. Entry of default under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 55 requires failure to plead or otherwise defend.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	unpublished, nonprecedential district-court order

TOPICS

injunctions

motion to amend

default

pleadings

civil procedure

PRACTICE AREAS

civil procedure

employment law

civil rights

disability discrimination

racial discrimination

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether Plaintiff was entitled to a permanent injunction reinstating her to her position.
2. Whether Plaintiff should be granted leave to file a Third Amended Complaint adding facts concerning her termination.
3. Whether Plaintiff was entitled to entry of default because Defendants did not respond to her motion to expedite.
4. Whether Defendants' motion to dismiss and Plaintiff's motion to expedite should be denied as moot in light of the amendment ruling.

HOLDINGS

1. Plaintiff was not entitled to a permanent injunction because she failed to demonstrate the four required elements: irreparable injury, inadequacy of legal remedies, a balance of hardships favoring equitable relief, and consistency with the public interest.
2. The court granted Plaintiff leave to file a Third Amended Complaint, while warning that it would not look favorably on further requests to amend.
3. Plaintiff was not entitled to entry of default because Defendants had appeared and filed pleadings defending the case.
4. The defendants' motion to dismiss and Plaintiff's motion to expedite were denied as moot because the court granted leave to amend.

KEY QUOTATIONS

“According to well-established principles of equity, a plaintiff seeking a permanent injunction must satisfy a four-factor test before a court may grant such relief.” (Analysis A)

“The plaintiff must demonstrate: “(1) that it has suffered an irreparable injury; (2) that remedies available at law, such as monetary damages, are inadequate to compensate for that injury; (3) that, considering the balance of hardships between the plaintiff and defendant, a remedy in equity is warranted; and (4) that the public interest would not be disserved by a permanent injunction.”” (Analysis A)

“When a party against whom a judgment for affirmative relief is sought has failed to plead or otherwise defend, and that failure is shown by affidavit or otherwise, the clerk must enter the party’s default.” (Analysis C)

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Plaintiff was employed as a second-grade teacher by KIPP Texas, a charter school in the Houston area. She alleged that KIPP Texas and individual employees discriminated and retaliated against her based on race and disability, denied approved accommodations, changed the terms and conditions of her employment, and created a hostile work environment. KIPP Texas terminated her on March 12, 2025, after which she sought reinstatement through a permanent injunction and sought to amend her complaint to add termination-related facts.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Plaintiff proceeded pro se and filed a Second Amended Complaint asserting claims under the Rehabilitation Act, 42 U.S.C. §§ 1981 and 1983, the First Amendment, and for emotional and mental distress. After her termination, she moved for a permanent injunction seeking reinstatement and later sought leave to file a Third Amended Complaint adding termination-related facts. The court denied the permanent-injunction motion and motion for entry of default, granted leave to amend, and denied the motion to dismiss and motion to expedite as moot.

DISPOSITION

other

CASES CITED

- eBay Inc. v. MercExchange, L.L.C., 547 U.S. 388, 391 (2006)
- Dussouy v. Gulf Coast Investment Corp., 660 F.2d 594, 598 (5th Cir. 1981)