

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF
OKLAHOMA

Dalton Gage Hill, Administrator and Personal Representative of the
Estate of Jeffery Allen Hill, deceased v. Oklahoma County Criminal
Justice Authority, et al.

Hill · No. CIV-24-1298-D · Decided December 4, 2025

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the Western District of Oklahoma adopted a magistrate judge’s Report and Recommendation concerning sanctions against plaintiff’s counsel for citing non-existent cases and using generative artificial intelligence without verifying the resulting authorities. The court ordered counsel to pay defendants’ reasonable fees and costs for attending a hearing, disclose and certify future generative-AI use, and complete specified continuing legal education.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the Western District of Oklahoma
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Timothy D. DeGiusti
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the Western District of Oklahoma
DECIDED	December 4, 2025
DOCKET	CIV-24-1298-D
DISPOSITION	other
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	Plaintiff brought a 42 U.S.C. § 1983 action. After the magistrate judge ordered Plaintiff's counsel to show cause why he should not be sanctioned under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 11 and the court's inherent authority for citing nonexistent cases, the magistrate judge issued a Report and Recommendation recommending sanctions. No timely objection was filed, and the district court adopted the Report and Recommendation and imposed sanctions on counsel.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	The district court reviewed the magistrate judge's Report and Recommendation after the period for objections expired and adopted it upon review of the record. The opinion states that failure to object waives appellate review of factual and legal issues under Moore v. United States.

PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	limited
PARTIES	Dalton Gage Hill, Administrator and Personal Representative of the Estate of Jeffery Allen Hill, deceased v. Oklahoma County Criminal Justice Authority, et al.

TOPICS

sanctions attorney fees section 1983 civil rights civil procedure

PRACTICE AREAS

civil procedure civil rights legal ethics sanctions attorney fees

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether the district court should adopt the magistrate judge's recommendation to sanction Plaintiff's counsel for citing nonexistent cases and related filing misconduct.
2. What sanctions were appropriate under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 11 and the court's inherent authority.

HOLDINGS

1. Because no timely objection was filed and the court's review of the record supported the recommendation, the district court adopted the magistrate judge's Report and Recommendation in its entirety.
2. The court ordered counsel to pay defendants' reasonable attorneys' fees and costs incurred for attending the hearing, disclose and certify any use of generative AI in future pleadings, and complete at least three hours of continuing legal education in ethics or legal technology, including at least one hour concerning generative AI in the legal context.

KEY QUOTATIONS

“Despite this case’s history of pitfalls and myriad of filing issues, Mr. McBride appeared unconcerned with the repeated filings of ‘rough’ drafts, citations to non-existent cases, and how his use of artificial intelligence (AI)-generated arguments and citations negatively impacts the integrity of his legal practice and the judicial system.” (Doc. No. 134 at 6)

“shall disclose in all future pleadings whether generative AI was used, the specific AI tool that was used, and shall certify in the document that he has checked the accuracy of any portion of the document drafted by generative AI, including all citations and legal authority”

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Plaintiff's counsel, Michael McBride, used ChatGPT to draft a response to a motion and filed citations to nonexistent cases. The magistrate judge also identified repeated missed deadlines, filing of defendants' motions

instead of plaintiff's responses, repeated filing of rough drafts, and a general lack of care. The court concluded that this conduct warranted sanctions directed at counsel.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

The action was referred to Magistrate Judge Suzanne Mitchell under 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(B) and (C). Following a show-cause proceeding concerning counsel's use of nonexistent, AI-generated citations and other filing deficiencies, the magistrate judge recommended monetary, disclosure, and continuing-legal-education sanctions. The district court found no timely objection, adopted the Report and Recommendation in its entirety, and ordered counsel to comply with the sanctions, modifying the compliance period for the continuing-education requirement from 60 to 90 days.

DISPOSITION

other

CASES CITED

- Moore v. United States, 950 F.2d 656, 659 (10th Cir. 1991)