

NONPRECEDENTIAL DISPOSITION

To be cited only in accordance with FED. R. APP. P. 32.1

United States Court of Appeals

For the Seventh Circuit

Chicago, Illinois 60604

Submitted August 11, 2026

Decided August 26, 2026

Before

FRANK H. EASTERBROOK, *Circuit Judge*

THOMAS L. KIRSCH II, *Circuit Judge*

JOHN Z. LEE, *Circuit Judge*

No. 26-1937

FIKRETA CENANOVIC,
Plaintiff-Appellant,
v.

Appeal from the United States District
Court for the Northern District of Illinois,
Eastern Division.

HAMDARD CENTER for HEALTH and
HUMAN SERVICES,
Defendant-Appellee.

No. 1:20-cv-7612

Edmond E. Chang,
Judge.

ORDER

Fikreta Cenanovic sued her former employer, Hamdard Center for Health and Human Services, for, among other things, disability discrimination and retaliation under the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA), 42 U.S.C. §§ 12101–12213. Hamdard moved for summary judgment, which the district court granted. Cenanovic appealed, and we affirmed because she failed to meet her burden to show that she is a qualified individual under the ADA or that Hamdard retaliated against her for claiming benefits. *Cenanovic v. Hamdard Ctr. for Health and Human Servs.*, No. 24-1743 (Nov. 20, 2024).

Cenanovic filed a petition for rehearing en banc and attached a modified work form that her own physician had signed and purportedly faxed to Travelers—a form that had not been part of the record. The undisputed evidence in the summary

judgment record had established that Hamdard faxed a modified work form to Cenanovic's workers' compensation representative, but Cenanovic's physician never signed and returned the form. No sitting judge voted to hear the case en banc, and the petition was denied.

Undeterred, Cenanovic moved before the district court under Fed. R. Civ. P. 60(b)(3) and (d)(3). She argued that Hamdard committed fraud on the court by not turning over that modified work form during discovery, which, according to her, required that the judgment be vacated.

The district court denied the motion. In the court's assessment, nothing in the record indicated that Hamdard had possessed the document during discovery. And, even if Hamdard had possessed and failed to disclose the form, such conduct did not rise to the level of fraud, given that Cenanovic's own physician signed and possessed the form and Cenanovic could have obtained it easily.

Finally, the court concluded that it would have granted summary judgment in Hamdard's favor even if the modified work form had been disclosed. Assuming that Cenanovic had sent the modified work form signed by her physician in September 2018, the court reasoned, she continued to insist that she could not return to work for the next several months, and additional evidence corroborated as much. Thus, no reasonable jury could find that Cenanovic was a qualified individual under the ADA. *See McAllister v. Innovation Ventures, LLC*, 983 F.3d 963, 971 (7th Cir. 2020) ("Inability to work for a multi-month period removes a person from the class protected by the ADA.") (internal quotation marks omitted).

In this successive appeal, Cenanovic argues that the district court abused its discretion in denying the Rule 60(b)(3) motion. We review such a denial under "an 'extremely deferential' abuse of discretion standard." *Eskridge v. Cook County*, 577 F.3d 806, 808 (7th Cir. 2009) (quoting *Easley v. Kirmsee*, 382 F.3d 693, 697 (7th Cir. 2004)). Given that "relief under Rule 60(b) is an extraordinary remedy and is granted only in exceptional circumstances, a district court abuses its discretion only when no reasonable person could agree with the decision to deny relief." *Id.* (citation modified).

We find no abuse of discretion here. The district court's decision denying Rule 60(b)(3) relief was thorough and well-reasoned. Cenanovic's evidence did not create a reasonable inference that Hamdard possessed the signed modified form during discovery. And, because she could have easily obtained the signed form on her own, Cenanovic failed to show that Hamdard prevented her from fully and fairly presenting her claims. Nor was she prejudiced by the omission of the form from the summary judgment record because, even if it had been included, no rational jury could find in her

favor on her ADA claims for the reasons the district court discussed.

The judgment is AFFIRMED.