

United States District Court
EASTERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS
SHERMAN DIVISION

DEMARCUS SULLIVAN	§	
	§	
v.	§	Civil Action No. 4:20-cv-662
	§	Judge Mazzant
SCHLUMBERGER LIMITED,	§	
SCHLUMBERGER TECHNOLOGY	§	
CORPORATION, AND ELWOOD	§	
STAFFING SERVICES, INC.	§	

MEMORANDUM OPINION AND ORDER

Pending before the Court is Defendants Schlumberger Limited and Schlumberger Technology Corporation’s Motion to Dismiss Plaintiff’s First Amended Complaint Under Rule 12(b)(6) (Dkt. #15). Having considered the motion and the relevant pleadings, the Court finds that the motion should be **DENIED**.

BACKGROUND

On September 1, 2020, DeMarcus Sullivan (“Sullivan”) sued Defendants under 42 U.S.C. § 1981 for discrimination and retaliation (Dkt. #1). On October 16, 2020, Sullivan filed an amended complaint (Dkt. #11). On October 30, 2020, Schlumberger Limited and Schlumberger Technology Corporation moved to dismiss the amended complaint under 12(b)(6) (Dkt. #15). On November 20, 2020, Sullivan responded (Dkt. #18). On November 30, 2020, Schlumberger Limited and Schlumberger Technology Corporation replied (Dkt. #19).

LEGAL STANDARD

The Federal Rules of Civil Procedure require that each claim in a complaint include a “short and plain statement . . . showing that the pleader is entitled to relief.” FED. R. CIV. P. 8(a)(2). Each

claim must include enough factual allegations “to raise a right to relief above the speculative level.” *Bell Atl. Corp. v. Twombly*, 550 U.S. 544, 555 (2007).

A Rule 12(b)(6) motion allows a party to move for dismissal of an action when the complaint fails to state a claim upon which relief can be granted. FED. R. CIV. P. 12(b)(6). When considering a motion to dismiss under Rule 12(b)(6), the Court must accept as true all well-pleaded facts in the plaintiff’s complaint and view those facts in the light most favorable to the plaintiff. *Bowlby v. City of Aberdeen*, 681 F.3d 215, 219 (5th Cir. 2012). The Court may consider “the complaint, any documents attached to the complaint, and any documents attached to the motion to dismiss that are central to the claim and referenced by the complaint.” *Lone Star Fund V (U.S.), L.P. v. Barclays Bank PLC*, 594 F.3d 383, 387 (5th Cir. 2010). The Court must then determine whether the complaint states a claim for relief that is plausible on its face. “A claim has facial plausibility when the plaintiff pleads factual content that allows the [C]ourt to draw the reasonable inference that the defendant is liable for the misconduct alleged.” *Gonzalez v. Kay*, 577 F.3d 600, 603 (5th Cir. 2009) (quoting *Ashcroft v. Iqbal*, 556 U.S. 662, 678 (2009)). “But where the well-pleaded facts do not permit the [C]ourt to infer more than the mere possibility of misconduct, the complaint has alleged—but it has not ‘show[n]’—‘that the pleader is entitled to relief.’” *Iqbal*, 556 U.S. at 679 (quoting FED. R. CIV. P. 8(a)(2)).

In *Iqbal*, the Supreme Court established a two-step approach for assessing the sufficiency of a complaint in the context of a Rule 12(b)(6) motion. First, the Court should identify and disregard conclusory allegations, for they are “not entitled to the assumption of truth.” *Iqbal*, 556 U.S. at 664. Second, the Court “consider[s] the factual allegations in [the complaint] to determine if they plausibly suggest an entitlement to relief.” *Id.* “This standard ‘simply calls for enough facts to raise a reasonable expectation that discovery will reveal evidence of the necessary claims

or elements.” *Morgan v. Hubert*, 335 F. App’x 466, 470 (5th Cir. 2009) (citation omitted). This evaluation will “be a context-specific task that requires the reviewing court to draw on its judicial experience and common sense.” *Iqbal*, 556 U.S. at 679.

Thus, “[t]o survive a motion to dismiss, a complaint must contain sufficient factual matter, accepted as true, to ‘state a claim to relief that is plausible on its face.’” *Id.* at 678 (quoting *Twombly*, 550 U.S. at 570).

ANALYSIS

After reviewing the Motion, the relevant pleadings, and briefing, the Court finds that Plaintiff Sullivan stated plausible claims for purposes of defeating a Rule 12(b)(6) motion.

CONCLUSION

It is therefore **ORDERED** that Defendants Schlumberger Limited and Schlumberger Technology Corporation’s Motion to Dismiss Plaintiff’s First Amended Complaint Under Rule 12(b)(6) (Dkt. #15) is hereby **DENIED**.

SIGNED this 8th day of December, 2020.


AMOS L. MAZZANT
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE