

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF
KENTUCKY, CENTRAL DIVISION

Meghan A. Muncy v. David Matthew Muncy, et al.

Muncy · No. 5:24-272-DCR · Decided April 20, 2026

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the Eastern District of Kentucky denied Plaintiff Meghan Muncy’s motion under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 59(e) to alter or amend the judgment dismissing her claims. The court held that Muncy identified no qualifying basis for relief and merely reasserted arguments concerning her incarceration, address change, and failure to communicate with the court.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the Eastern District of Kentucky, Central Division
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Danny C. Reeves
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the Eastern District of Kentucky, Central Division
DECIDED	April 20, 2026
DOCKET	5:24-272-DCR
DISPOSITION	other
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	Plaintiff moved under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 59(e) to alter or amend the judgment dismissing her claims. The district court denied the motion.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	A Rule 59(e) motion may be granted for a clear error of law, newly discovered evidence, an intervening change in controlling law, or a need to prevent manifest injustice; it may not be used to reargue matters already presented and rejected.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	Nonprecedential district court memorandum order
PARTIES	Meghan A. Muncy v. David Matthew Muncy, Marcus Johnson, Derek Kirunchyk, Kenny Brandenburg, John Doe defendants

TOPICS

[motion for reconsideration](#)

[civil procedure](#)

[sanctions](#)

[remedies](#)

PRACTICE AREAS

[civil procedure](#)

[federal courts](#)

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether Muncy established a basis under Rule 59(e) to alter or amend the judgment dismissing her claims.
2. Whether Muncy's incarceration and the expiration of her post office box constituted a clear error, newly discovered evidence, an intervening change in controlling law, or manifest injustice warranting relief under Rule 59(e).

HOLDINGS

1. Muncy did not establish any recognized basis for altering or amending the judgment under Rule 59(e), and her motion was properly denied.
2. Incarceration does not by itself excuse a party's failure to prosecute a lawsuit diligently, update the court regarding contact information, or otherwise comply with court obligations.

KEY QUOTATIONS

“The Court may alter or amend a judgment under Rule 59(e) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure if there is “(1) a clear error of law; (2) newly discovered evidence; (3) an intervening change in controlling law; or (4) a need to prevent manifest injustice.”” (at 2)

“But the fact that a plaintiff is incarcerated does not absolve the party of the responsibility to prosecute a lawsuit in a diligent manner.” (at 3)

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Muncy's remaining claims were dismissed after she repeatedly failed to comply with Local Rule 5.3, a discovery order, court orders, and motions practice requirements. During her incarceration, her post office box expired, and court orders mailed to her were returned as undeliverable. She argued that her incarceration and loss of access to her mail prevented her from updating her address or communicating with the court, but she offered no new explanation for her complete lack of communication.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

The court dismissed Muncy's remaining claims on February 24, 2026, based on repeated failures to comply with procedural rules and court orders, failure to participate in discovery, failure to respond to motions, and failure to maintain current contact information. The court previously denied her Rule 60(b) motion for relief from judgment. Muncy then filed the present Rule 59(e) motion, which the court denied.

DISPOSITION

other

CASES CITED

- Howard v. Magoffin Cnty. Bd. of Educ., 830 F. Supp. 2d 308, 319 (E.D. Ky. 2011)
- Leisure Caviar, LLC v. U.S. Fish & Wildlife Serv., 616 F.3d 612, 615 (6th Cir. 2010)
- Whitehead v. Bowen, 301 F. App'x 484, 489 (6th Cir. 2008)
- Sault Ste. Marie Tribe of Chippewa Indians v. Engler, 146 F.3d 367, 374 (6th Cir. 1998)
- White v. Hitachi, Ltd., 2008 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 25240, 2008 WL 782565, at *1 (E.D. Tenn. Mar. 20, 2008)

Retrieved from lawtools.ai · <https://lawtools.ai/cases/state/united-states-district-court-for-the-eastern-district-of-kentucky-central-division-united-states-dis/2026/meghan-a-muncy-v-david-matthew-muncy-et-al-59h5sp3d>