



of the claim showing that the pleader is entitled to relief.” Fed. R. Civ. P. 8(a)(2). To satisfy Rule 8(a), “the statement need only ‘give the defendant fair notice of what the . . . claim is and the grounds upon which it rests.’” *Erickson v. Pardus*, 551 U.S. 89, 93 (2007) (quoting *Bell Atl. Corp. v. Twombly*, 550 U.S. 544, 555 (2007)).

Further, the Seventh Circuit has clearly and specifically stated that a plaintiff alleging employment discrimination “may allege these claims quite generally.” *Tamayo v. Blagojevich*, 526 F.3d 1074, 1081 (7th Cir. 2008). In *Swanson v. Citibank, N.A.*, 614 F.3d 400, 404 (7th Cir. 2010), the Seventh Circuit held that the plaintiff’s discrimination complaint satisfied Rule 8 because it identified the type of discrimination the plaintiff thought occurred (racial), by whom (a bank), and when (in connection with her efforts to obtain a home equity loan). *Id.* at 405. According to the Seventh Circuit, “[t]his was all that was needed to put in the complaint.” *Id.* Under *Swanson*, a plaintiff alleging discrimination need only allege “how, in the plaintiff’s mind at least, the dots should be connected.” *Id.* at 405.

In this case, plaintiff has alleged facts sufficient to satisfy Rule 8 and *Swanson*. Specifically, plaintiff has alleged that she was discriminated against and ultimately terminated on the basis of her race, age, and status as whistleblower by defendant in May 2017. This was “all that was needed to put in the complaint.” *Swanson*, 614 F.3d at 405. Accordingly, defendant’s motion to dismiss (DE # 18) is **DENIED**. A previous version of the same motion (DE # 6) is **DENIED as moot**.

**SO ORDERED.**

Date: September 25, 2018

s/James T. Moody \_\_\_\_\_  
JUDGE JAMES T. MOODY  
UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT