

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF
NEW YORK

Ali Muhammad v. Deputy Jayuan Willis, Deputy Demko, Deputy
Cullen, and Deputy Jesse Morns

Muhammad · No. 9:24-cv-872 (BKS/MJK) · Decided January 7, 2026

SUMMARY

The Northern District of New York adopted a magistrate judge’s Report-Recommendation and granted defendants’ Rule 12(b)(6) motion in Ali Muhammad’s 42 U.S.C. § 1983 action arising from his detention at the Onondaga County Justice Center. The court dismissed the amended complaint for failure to plausibly allege personal involvement by certain defendants or deliberate indifference by another defendant, and directed the Clerk to enter judgment and close the case.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the Northern District of New York
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Brenda K. Sannes
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the Northern District of New York
DECIDED	January 7, 2026
DOCKET	9:24-cv-872 (BKS/MJK)
DISPOSITION	dismissed
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	The district court reviewed an unobjected-to magistrate judge's Report-Recommendation under the clear-error standard and granted Defendants' Rule 12(b)(6) motion to dismiss the amended complaint.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	Clear-error review of an unobjected-to magistrate judge's Report-Recommendation.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	unpublished district court memorandum-decision and order
PARTIES	Ali Muhammad v. Deputy Jayuan Willis, Deputy Demko, Deputy Cullen, Deputy Jesse Morns

TOPICS

- motions to dismiss
- prisoners rights
- section 1983
- civil rights
- civil procedure

PRACTICE AREAS

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether the court should review the magistrate judge's Report-Recommendation for clear error when no party filed objections within the prescribed period.
2. Whether the amended complaint plausibly alleged that Defendants Willis, Demko, and Cullen were personally involved in the alleged constitutional violation.
3. Whether the amended complaint plausibly alleged that Defendant Morns acted with deliberate indifference in violation of the Eighth Amendment.

HOLDINGS

1. When no objections are filed to a magistrate judge's Report-Recommendation and the objection period has expired, the district court reviews the recommendation for clear error.
2. The amended complaint failed to plausibly allege personal involvement by Defendants Willis, Demko, and Cullen in the alleged constitutional violation and failed to plausibly allege that Defendant Morns acted with deliberate indifference; dismissal under Rule 12(b)(6) was therefore warranted.

KEY QUOTATIONS

“As no objections to the Report-Recommendation have been filed, and the time for filing objections has expired, the Court reviews the Report-Recommendation for clear error.”

“The Court finds no clear error in that determination and for that reason adopts the recommendation in the Report-Recommendation.”

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Muhammad was detained at the Onondaga County Justice Center and asserted an Eighth Amendment conditions-of-confinement claim under 42 U.S.C. § 1983. The court concluded that the amended complaint did not plausibly allege personal involvement by Defendants Willis, Demko, and Cullen, or deliberate indifference by Defendant Morns.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Muhammad filed a pro se 42 U.S.C. § 1983 action concerning his detention at the Onondaga County Justice Center. After screening under 28 U.S.C. § 1915A, the court allowed an Eighth Amendment conditions-of-confinement claim to proceed against the named defendants and dismissed other claims without prejudice. Defendants moved to dismiss the amended complaint, and Magistrate Judge Mitchell J. Katz recommended dismissal. No objections were filed, so Chief Judge Sannes reviewed the recommendation for clear error, adopted it, granted the motion, dismissed the amended complaint, and directed the Clerk to close the case.

DISPOSITION

dismissed

CASES CITED

- Petersen v. Astrue, 2 F. Supp. 3d 223, 228-29 (N.D.N.Y. 2012)

OPINION

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT NORTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK ALI MUHAMMAD, Plaintiff, 9:24-cv-872 (BKS/MJK) v. DEPUTY JAYUAN WILLIS, DEPUTY DEMKO, DEPUTY CULLEN and DEPUTY JESSE MORNS, Defendants. Appearances: Plaintiff pro se: Ali Muhammad 18-B-2592 Five Points Correctional Facility Caller Box 119 Romulus, NY 14541 Hon. Brenda K. Sannes, Chief United States District Judge: MEMORANDUM-DECISION AND ORDER Plaintiff Ali Muhammad brought this action pro se asserting claims under 42 U.S.C. § 1983 arising out of his detention at the Onondaga County Justice Center.

(Dkt. No. 1, 8). On January 6, 2025, the Court issued an order reviewing the operative amended complaint pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915A. (Dkt. No. 9) The Court ruled that Plaintiff's Eighth Amendment conditions-of-confinement claim against Defendants Willis, Demko, Cullen, and Morns survived its review, and dismissed the remaining claims without prejudice for failure to state a claim.

(Id., at 14). On March 11, 2025, Defendants moved to dismiss the amended complaint under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 12(b)(6) for failure to state a claim. (Dkt. No. 18). Plaintiff opposed the motion, (Dkt. No. 21), and Defendants filed a reply. (Dkt. No. 22). This matter was assigned to United States Magistrate Judge Mitchell J. Katz, who on October 28, 2025 issued a Report- Recommendation, recommending that Defendants' motion be granted and that the amended complaint be dismissed.

(Dkt. No. 26). Magistrate Judge Katz informed the parties that they had fourteen days within which to file written objections to the report under 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1), and that the failure to object to the report within fourteen days would preclude appellate review. (Id. at 16). No objections to the Report-Recommendation have been filed.

As no objections to the Report-Recommendation have been filed, and the time for filing objections has expired, the Court reviews the Report-Recommendation for clear error. See Petersen v. Astrue, 2 F. Supp. 3d 223, 228–29 (N.D.N.Y. 2012); Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(b) advisory committee's note to 1983 amendment.

The Court agrees with Magistrate Judge Katz's determination that the amended complaint fails to plausibly allege that Defendants Willis, Demko and Cullen were personally involved in the alleged

constitutional violation, and fails to plausibly allege that Defendant Morris acted with deliberate indifference. (Dkt. No. 26, at 9-12).

The Court finds no clear error in that determination and for that reason adopts the recommendation in the Report-Recommendation. For these reasons, it is hereby ORDERED that Magistrate Judge Katz's recommendation (Dkt. No. 26) to dismiss the amended complaint is ADOPTED for the reasons set forth above; and it is further ORDERED that that Defendants' Motion to Dismiss (Dkt.

18) is GRANTED; and it is further ORDERED that Plaintiff's Amended Complaint (Dkt. No. 8) is DISMISSED; and it is further ORDERED that the Clerk shall enter judgment and close this case; and it is further ORDERED that the Clerk serve a copy of this Order on Plaintiff in accordance with the Local Rules. IT IS SO ORDERED. Dated: January 7, 2026 Syracuse, New York ☐☐☐ b a C Sennen Brenda K. Sannes Chief U.S. District Judge