

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE SIXTH CIRCUIT

**Michael Victor v. Kimberly Reynolds; Advanced Correctional
Healthcare, Inc.**

Victor v. Reynolds · No. 25-1317 · Decided January 23, 2026

SUMMARY

The United States Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit affirmed judgment as a matter of law for Advanced Correctional Healthcare in a detainee’s deliberate-indifference and Monell action arising from the failure to provide anti-seizure medication. The court held that witness testimony expressing a lack of recollection did not establish that jail officers contacted an ACH medical provider, and that the plaintiff’s hearsay testimony did not supply sufficient evidence of such contact. The court also declined to review issues rendered moot by the judgment and rejected the plaintiff’s challenge concerning discovery sanctions.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Eric E. Murphy; Ronald Lee Gilman; Richard Allen Griffin
JURISDICTION	United States Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit
DECIDED	January 23, 2026
DOCKET	25-1317
DISPOSITION	affirmed
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	Victor appealed after the district court granted Advanced Correctional Healthcare judgment as a matter of law following a jury verdict for Victor on his Monell claim and denied Victor's request for discovery sanctions and default judgment.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	The grant of judgment as a matter of law is reviewed de novo. The court asks whether a reasonable jury had a legally sufficient evidentiary basis to find for the nonmoving party, resolving evidentiary conflicts and drawing reasonable inferences in that party's favor. A district court's decision whether to impose discovery sanctions is reviewed for abuse of discretion.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	Published; recommended for publication and precedential under Sixth Circuit I.O.P. 32.1(b), subject to applicable publication rules.

PARTIES

Michael Victor v. Kimberly Reynolds, Advanced Correctional Healthcare, Inc.

TOPICS

section 1983 prisoners rights evidence motion for directed verdict sanctions

PRACTICE AREAS

civil rights constitutional torts prisoner and detainee medical care evidence civil procedure

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether Victor presented legally sufficient evidence from which a reasonable jury could find that a jail officer contacted an ACH employee about his medication, thereby establishing the causation component of his Monell claim.
2. Whether Victor's testimony about what an officer allegedly told him supplied admissible and sufficient evidence that an ACH employee had been contacted.
3. Whether the district court abused its discretion by denying Victor's motion for discovery sanctions and default judgment.

HOLDINGS

1. Testimony that witnesses lack recollection of whether a call occurred, without corroborating evidence, does not satisfy a plaintiff's affirmative burden to prove that the call more likely than not occurred.
2. Victor did not present sufficient evidence that ACH's policy or custom directly caused the failure to provide his medication because he did not prove that any jail officer alerted an ACH employee to his medical need.
3. Victor's statement that he understood an officer had contacted a nurse and that the nurse denied his medication was inadmissible hearsay and could not support the judgment; his separate statement that an officer intended to contact a nurse was admissible to show intent but, without corroboration, was insufficient to prove that the call occurred.
4. The district court did not abuse its discretion in finding that ACH had not violated its discovery orders and in denying sanctions and default judgment.

KEY QUOTATIONS

"We agree with the district court that their "I have no recollection" testimony does not satisfy Victor's burden to show that a call occurred." (at 1)

"We hold that their "lack of memory" does not suffice to withstand ACH's motion for judgment as a matter of law." (at 10)

"Thus, without additional evidence that the call occurred, this lone statement of intent does not suffice." (at 12)

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Michael Victor was detained overnight in the Otsego County Jail after drinking alcohol and being arrested for disorderly conduct and resisting an officer. Victor's mother delivered his anti-seizure medication to the jail, but he did not receive it before his release the next morning and suffered a seizure shortly afterward. The jail had contracted with Advanced Correctional Healthcare to provide medical care, and its procedures required officers to contact an ACH on-call practitioner before administering medication. No illness report, jail log, or phone record documented a call, and the officers and ACH personnel either denied making or receiving a call or could not remember one.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Victor sued ACH and Kimberly Reynolds under 42 U.S.C. § 1983, alleging deliberate indifference to his serious medical needs and Monell liability based on ACH's policies or customs. The district court initially denied summary judgment to ACH and Reynolds, and the case proceeded to trial. The jury found for Reynolds but for Victor against ACH and awarded compensatory and punitive damages. The district court then granted ACH judgment as a matter of law, alternatively granted a conditional new trial, and denied Victor's motion for discovery sanctions and default judgment. The Sixth Circuit affirmed.

DISPOSITION

affirmed

CASES CITED

- Reeves v. Sanderson Plumbing Products, Inc., 530 U.S. 133, 150 (2000)
- Monday v. Oullette, 118 F.3d 1099, 1102 (6th Cir. 1997)
- Lowe v. Walbro, LLC, 147 F.4th 601, 607 (6th Cir. 2025)
- Lawler ex rel. Lawler v. Hardeman County, 93 F.4th 919, 926-28 (6th Cir. 2024)
- Winkler v. Madison County, 893 F.3d 877, 890 (6th Cir. 2018)
- Hehrer v. County of Clinton, 161 F.4th 955, 967 (6th Cir. 2025)
- Gambrel v. Knox County, 25 F.4th 391, 408 (6th Cir. 2022)
- Board of County Commissioners of Bryan County v. Brown, 520 U.S. 397, 405 (1997)
- Thomas v. City of Chattanooga, 398 F.3d 426, 429 (6th Cir. 2005)
- Hemphill v. State Farm Mutual Automobile Insurance Co., 805 F.3d 535, 541 (5th Cir. 2015)
- Boykin v. Family Dollar Stores of Michigan, LLC, 3 F.4th 832, 839, 841 (6th Cir. 2021)
- Larsen v. Citibank FSB, 871 F.3d 1295, 1308 (11th Cir. 2017)
- Harriman v. Hancock County, 627 F.3d 22, 34 (1st Cir. 2010)
- Shawmut Bank N.A. v. Kress Associates, 33 F.3d 1477, 1501 (9th Cir. 1994)
- Pineda v. Hamilton County, 977 F.3d 483, 491 (6th Cir. 2020)
- Pratt v. Brown Machine Co., 855 F.2d 1225, 1233 (6th Cir. 1988)
- Wysong v. City of Heath, 260 F. App'x 848, 857 (6th Cir. 2008)

- Victor v. Advanced Correctional Healthcare, Inc., 771 F. Supp. 3d 912, 919-20, 922-32 (E.D. Mich. Feb. 28, 2025)
- Weisgram v. Marley Co., 528 U.S. 440, 454 (2000)
- Sardis v. Overhead Door Corp., 10 F.4th 268, 279 (4th Cir. 2021)
- Jacklyn v. Schering-Plough Healthcare Products Sales Corp., 176 F.3d 921, 926-27 (6th Cir. 1999)
- Cincinnati Fluid Power, Inc. v. Rexnord, Inc., 797 F.2d 1386, 1394-95 (6th Cir. 1986)
- Mutual Life Insurance Co. of New York v. Hillmon, 145 U.S. 285, 296 (1892)
- United States v. Washington Water Power Co., 793 F.2d 1079, 1082 n.4 (9th Cir. 1986)
- United States v. Moore, 571 F.2d 76, 82 (2d Cir. 1978)
- Grote v. Kenton County, 85 F.4th 397, 414 (6th Cir. 2023)
- Epps v. Lauderdale County, 45 F. App'x 332, 335 (6th Cir. 2002) (Cole, J., concurring)
- Hanover American Insurance Co. v. Tattooed Millionaire Entertainment, LLC, 974 F.3d 767, 780-81 (6th Cir. 2020)
- Massachusetts v. United States, 333 U.S. 611, 639-40 (1958) (Jackson, J., dissenting)
- Freeland v. Amigo, 103 F.3d 1271, 1277 (6th Cir. 1997)
- Prime Rate Premium Finance Corp. v. Larson, 930 F.3d 759, 768 (6th Cir. 2019)