

United States Court of Appeals
FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA CIRCUIT

No. 25-7090

September Term, 2025

1:24-cv-01275-RC

Filed On: February 18, 2026

Alfreda Turnbow,

Appellant

v.

Sibley Memorial Hospital, also known as
Sibley Memorial Hospital/Johns Hopkins
Medicine,

Appellee

**ON APPEAL FROM THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA**

BEFORE: Millett, Pan, and Garcia, Circuit Judges

J U D G M E N T

This appeal was considered on the record from the United States District Court for the District of Columbia and on the briefs filed by the parties. See Fed. R. App. P. 34(a)(2); D.C. Cir. Rule 34(j). It is

ORDERED AND ADJUDGED that the district court’s June 5, 2025 order be affirmed. Appellant has forfeited any challenge to the district court’s grant of summary judgment to her employer on her failure-to-accommodate claim. Appellant’s bare assertions that the district court resolved disputed factual issues regarding “accommodation breakdowns” in favor of her employer are insufficient to raise such a challenge. See Schneider v. Kissinger, 412 F.3d 190, 200 n.1 (D.C. Cir. 2005) (“It is not enough merely to mention a possible argument in the most skeletal way[.]”) (citation omitted); see also Twin Rivers Paper Co. LLC v. SEC, 934 F.3d 607, 615 (D.C. Cir. 2019) (arguments first raised in reply are forfeited). Additionally, appellant has not shown that the district court abused its discretion in denying her request for discovery or erred in granting summary judgment to her employer on her claim of race discrimination. Appellant argued that her employer’s actions were pretext for discrimination because similarly situated white employees were treated more favorably than her. However, she presented no evidence to support this assertion. Furthermore, appellant did not allege with sufficient particularity that discovery would reveal evidence

United States Court of Appeals
FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA CIRCUIT

No. 25-7090

September Term, 2025

that similarly situated white employees were treated more favorably. See Ikossi v. Dep't of Navy, 516 F.3d 1037, 1045 (D.C. Cir. 2008); see also Joyner v. Morrison & Foerster LLP, 140 F.4th 523, 530 (D.C. Cir. 2025).

Pursuant to D.C. Circuit Rule 36, this disposition will not be published. The Clerk is directed to withhold issuance of the mandate herein until seven days after resolution of any timely petition for rehearing or petition for rehearing en banc. See Fed. R. App. P. 41(b); D.C. Cir. Rule 41.

Per Curiam