

# UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF NEVADA

## Corey Rae Willis v. John “Bob” Faulkner, et al.

Willis · No. 2:22-cv-01154-CDS-BNW · Decided January 13, 2026

### SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the District of Nevada grants defendants’ motion for summary judgment in Corey Rae Willis’s 42 U.S.C. § 1983 action alleging deliberate medical indifference under the Eighth Amendment. The court assumes without deciding that Willis exhausted his claims under the PLRA and concludes that the defendants are entitled to qualified immunity because Willis did not show that they violated a clearly established constitutional right.

### CASE DETAILS

|                       |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                          |
|-----------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| COURT                 | United States District Court for the District of Nevada                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                  |
| WRITING FOR THE COURT | Cristina D. Silva                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                        |
| JURISDICTION          | United States District Court for the District of Nevada                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                  |
| DECIDED               | January 13, 2026                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                         |
| DOCKET                | 2:22-cv-01154-CDS-BNW                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                    |
| DISPOSITION           | other                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                    |
| PROCEDURAL POSTURE    | Plaintiff brought a 42 U.S.C. § 1983 action alleging deliberate medical indifference in violation of the Eighth Amendment. Defendants moved for summary judgment, asserting qualified immunity, failure to exhaust under the PLRA, and lack of entitlement to punitive damages.                                                                                                                          |
| STANDARD OF REVIEW    | Summary judgment is appropriate when, viewing the evidence in the light most favorable to the nonmovant, there is no genuine dispute as to any material fact and the movant is entitled to judgment as a matter of law. For qualified immunity, the court considers whether the facts show a constitutional violation and whether the violated right was clearly established at the time of the conduct. |
| PRECEDENTIAL VALUE    | unpublished                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                              |

### TOPICS

[qualified immunity](#) [section 1983](#) [prisoners rights](#) [cruel and unusual punishment](#) [summary judgment](#)

### PRACTICE AREAS

## QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether defendants were entitled to qualified immunity on Willis's Eighth Amendment deliberate-indifference claim.
2. Whether the evidentiary record presented a genuine dispute of material fact concerning defendants' knowledge of, and responsibility for, the alleged interruption in Willis's medication.
3. Whether the court should reach defendants' arguments concerning PLRA exhaustion and punitive damages after resolving the case on qualified immunity.

## HOLDINGS

1. Defendants were entitled to qualified immunity because Willis failed to identify a sufficiently similar precedent clearly establishing that their alleged conduct violated the Eighth Amendment under the specific circumstances presented.
2. The record did not establish a genuine dispute of material fact because Willis failed to show that defendants knew he had not received his medication or that delivery of the medication was their direct responsibility.

## KEY QUOTATIONS

*“But because the defendants have established that they are entitled to qualified immunity, I grant summary judgment in their favor on that basis and close this case.”* (Opinion at 1)

*“Qualified immunity shields government officials ‘from money damages unless a plaintiff pleads facts showing (1) that the official violated a statutory or constitutional right, and (2) that the right was ‘clearly established’ at the time of the challenged conduct.’”* (Opinion at 4)

*“The dispositive question here is whether the defendants, on these facts, should have known that what they did violated the Eighth Amendment, and Willis has failed to point to any sufficiently similar case that could suggest that the defendants here should have known.”* (Opinion at 6)

## FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Willis alleged that, while incarcerated, he experienced urinary and prostate-related problems and went without prescribed tamsulosin for an extended period after transfers between correctional facilities. Medical records showed that tamsulosin prescriptions were filled, including a refill in May 2021 and a medication sign-out in June 2021, although the record was unclear whether Willis actually received the medication at the rural camp. Willis alleged that the interruption worsened his symptoms and that defendants failed to ensure continuity of care, but he did not identify evidence showing that either defendant directly caused the interruption or knew that he had not received the medication.

## PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Willis initiated the action on July 19, 2022. The original complaint was dismissed without prejudice after screening, with leave to amend the Eighth Amendment claim; Willis then filed an amended complaint against Dr. Gregory K. Bryan and John Faulkner. The district court granted defendants' motion for summary judgment on qualified-immunity grounds, entered judgment, and ordered the case closed without reaching the PLRA exhaustion or punitive-damages arguments.

## DISPOSITION

other

## CASES CITED

- *Richards v. Huthings*, 2024 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 7550, at \*5 n.5 (D. Nev. Jan. 16, 2024)
- *Anderson v. Liberty Lobby, Inc.*, 477 U.S. 242, 248, 250-51 (1986)
- *Harper v. Wallingford*, 877 F.2d 728, 731 (9th Cir. 1989)
- *Musick v. Burke*, 913 F.2d 1390, 1394 (9th Cir. 1990)
- *Sonner v. Schwabe N. Am., Inc.*, 911 F.3d 989, 992 (9th Cir. 2018)
- *Galen v. County of Los Angeles*, 477 F.3d 652, 658 (9th Cir. 2007)
- *Bhan v. NME Hosps., Inc.*, 929 F.2d 1404, 1409 (9th Cir. 1991)
- *Ashcroft v. al-Kidd*, 563 U.S. 731, 735, 741 (2011)
- *Robinson v. York*, 566 F.3d 817, 826 (9th Cir. 2009)
- *Saucier v. Katz*, 533 U.S. 194, 202 (2001)
- *Hamby v. Hammond*, 821 F.3d 1085, 1090-91, 1094 (9th Cir. 2016)
- *Taylor v. Barks*, 575 U.S. 822, 825 (2015)
- *DeFrancesco v. Robbins*, 136 F.4th 933, 939 (9th Cir. 2025)
- *OSU Student Alliance v. Ray*, 699 F.3d 1053, 1069 (9th Cir. 2012)
- *Sandoval v. County of San Diego*, 985 F.3d 657 (9th Cir. 2021)
- *City & County of San Francisco v. Sheehan*, 575 U.S. 600 (2015)
- *Norsworthy v. Espinoza*, 2025 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 114468, at \*6, \*11 (E.D. Cal. June 16, 2025)