

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF
NEW YORK

Oudekerk v. Wanninger et al.

Oudekerk · No. 9:24-CV-113 (AJB/MJK) · Decided November 25, 2025

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the Northern District of New York adopted a magistrate judge's Report and Recommendation in a 42 U.S.C. § 1983 action involving alleged Eighth Amendment excessive force by correctional officers. The court denied the plaintiff's motion for summary judgment because genuine issues of fact remained.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the Northern District of New York
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Anthony J. Brindisi
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the Northern District of New York
DECIDED	November 25, 2025
DOCKET	9:24-CV-113 (AJB/MJK)
DISPOSITION	other
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	Plaintiff moved for summary judgment in a 42 U.S.C. § 1983 action alleging Eighth Amendment excessive force by correction officers. After the magistrate judge recommended denial based on issues of fact and neither party objected, the district court reviewed the recommendation for clear error.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	Clear-error review of an unobjected-to report and recommendation under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 72(b).
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	Unknown; district court order with no reporter citation

TOPICS

- summary judgment
- discovery dispute
- section 1983
- prisoners rights
- civil rights

PRACTICE AREAS

- Civil rights
- Prisoner civil rights
- Federal civil procedure

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

- 1. Whether the magistrate judge's recommendation to deny plaintiff's motion for summary judgment should be accepted after clear-error review.
- 2. Whether summary judgment was appropriate where the record presented issues of fact concerning plaintiff's Eighth Amendment excessive-force claims.

HOLDINGS

- 1. The court accepted and adopted the report and recommendation after reviewing it for clear error.
- 2. Plaintiff's motion for summary judgment was denied because issues of fact existed.

KEY QUOTATIONS

“Upon review for clear error, the R&R will be accepted and adopted.” (at 3)

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Plaintiff alleged that five correction officers used excessive force against him on October 30, 2022, while he was held at Mid-State Correctional Facility under the custody of the New York State Department of Corrections and Community Supervision. After the identities of several Doe defendants were investigated, the surviving claims proceeded against Correction Officers Wanninger and Pekala.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Plaintiff filed suit against five Doe correction officers and was granted leave to proceed in forma pauperis. Following a Valentin inquiry, plaintiff amended the complaint to identify defendants Wanninger and Pekala, while the remaining claims and defendants were dismissed; Wanninger and Pekala answered. Plaintiff later moved to compel discovery and for summary judgment. The magistrate judge granted the discovery motion in part and denied it in part, recommended denying summary judgment because issues of fact existed, and the district court accepted the recommendation after the objection period expired.

DISPOSITION

other

CASES CITED

- Valentin v. Dinkins, 121 F.3d 72 (2d Cir. 1997) (per curiam)

OPINION

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT NORTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK

NICHOLAS OUDEKERK, Plaintiff, -v- 9:24-CV-113 (AJB/MJK) WANNINGER et al., Defendants. _____
APPEARANCES: OF COUNSEL: NICHOLAS OUDEKERK Plaintiff, Pro Se 15509 Warren

County Correctional Facility 1400 State Route 9 Lake George, NY 12845 HON. LETITIA JAMES ALEXANDRA L. GALUS, ESQ.

New York State Attorney General Assistant Attorney General Attorneys for Defendants The Capitol Albany, NY 12224 Hon. Anthony Brindisi, U.S. District Judge: ORDER ON REPORT & RECOMMENDATION On January 23, 2024, pro se plaintiff Nicholas Oudekerk (“plaintiff”) filed this 42 U.S.C. § 1983 action alleging that five John Doe correction officers violated his constitutional rights on October 30, 2022, while he was being held in the custody of the New York State Department of Corrections and Community Supervision (“DOCCS”) at Mid-State Correctional Facility.

Dkt. No. 1. Along with his complaint, plaintiff moved for leave to proceed in forma pauperis (“IFP Application”). Dkt. Nos. 2, 4, 5. The matter was initially assigned to U.S. District Judge David N. Hurd, who granted the IFP Application and concluded that plaintiff’s § 1983 Eighth Amendment excessive force claims survived initial review against the five Doe correction officers.

Dkt. No. 7. Pursuant to *Valentin v. Dinkins*, 121 F.3d 72 (2d Cir. 1997) (per curiam), Judge Hurd requested assistance from the New York State Attorney General’s Office in ascertaining the identities of the Doe defendants who were involved in the use-of-force incident with plaintiff on October 30, 2022. Dkt. No. 7. Thereafter, the Attorney General filed a response, Dkt.

No. 9, and plaintiff submitted an amended complaint that identified four of the five Does: (1) Correction Officer Wanninger; (2) Correction Officer Pekala; (3) Correction Sergeant Congleton; and (4) Deputy Superintendent Burns. Dkt. No. 11. Judge Hurd reviewed plaintiff’s amended complaint, concluded that the § 1983 Eighth Amendment excessive force claims survived initial review against defendants Wanninger and Pekala, ordered service on those defendants, and dismissed the remaining claims.

Dkt. No. 12. After defendants Wanninger and Pekala answered the amended complaint, Dkt. No. 22, and the matter was reassigned to this Court, Dkt. No. 37, plaintiff moved to compel discovery, Dkt. No. 42, and for summary judgment, Dkt. No. 46. Defendants opposed, Dkt. Nos. 44, 59, and plaintiff replied, Dkt. No. 59, 63.

On October 31, 2025, U.S. Magistrate Judge Mitchell J. Katz granted in part and denied in part plaintiff’s motion to compel. Dkt. No. 66. At that time, Judge Katz advised by Report & Recommendation (“R&R”) that plaintiff’s motion for summary judgment should be denied based on the existence of issues of fact. See *id.* Neither party has lodged objections.

The time period in which to do so has expired. See Dkt. No. 66. Upon review for clear error, the R&R will be accepted and adopted. See FED. R. Civ. P. 72(b). Therefore, it is ORDERED that 1. The Report & Recommendation (Dkt. No. 66) is ACCEPTED; and 2. Plaintiff’s motion for summary judgment (Dkt. No. 46) is DENIED.

The Clerk of the Court is directed to terminate the pending motions. IT IS SO ORDERED. Dated:
November 25, 2025 ° Utica, New York. Anthony J. Brindisj U.S. District a -3-

Retrieved from lawtools.ai · <https://lawtools.ai/cases/federal/united-states-district-court-for-the-northern-district-of-ne/2025/oudekerk-v-wanninger-et-al-3sbrnw00>