

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF
VIRGINIA, RICHMOND DIVISION

Randolph Satterwhite v. Alyssa Gregory

Civil Action No. 3:25CV329 · No. 3:25CV329 · Decided December 22, 2025

SUMMARY

The court dismissed without prejudice a pro se federal inmate's 42 U.S.C. § 1983 action because the complaint failed to provide fair notice of the facts and legal basis for the defendant's liability. The dismissal followed the plaintiff's failure to file a required particularized complaint or otherwise respond to the court's October 16, 2025 order.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the Eastern District of Virginia, Richmond Division
WRITING FOR THE COURT	John A. Gibney, Jr.
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the Eastern District of Virginia, Richmond Division
DECIDED	December 22, 2025
DOCKET	3:25CV329
DISPOSITION	dismissed
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	A federal inmate proceeding pro se and in forma pauperis filed a 42 U.S.C. § 1983 action. The court ordered him to file a particularized complaint after finding that the existing complaint did not provide fair notice, warned that failure to comply would result in dismissal, and dismissed the action without prejudice when he failed to respond.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	unknown
PARTIES	Randolph Satterwhite v. Alyssa Gregory

TOPICS

- section 1983
- pleadings
- civil procedure
- prisoners rights

PRACTICE AREAS

- civil rights
- civil procedure
- prisoner civil rights

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether the action should be dismissed without prejudice after Plaintiff failed to submit a particularized complaint as ordered by the court.

HOLDINGS

1. The action must be dismissed without prejudice because Plaintiff failed to submit the required particularized complaint or otherwise respond to the court's order within the prescribed thirty-day period.
2. A viable § 1983 claim requires allegations that a person acting under color of state law deprived the plaintiff of a constitutional right or a right conferred by federal law.

KEY QUOTATIONS

“Accordingly, the action will be *DISMISSED WITHOUT PREJUDICE*.”

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Plaintiff was a federal inmate proceeding pro se and in forma pauperis. His complaint asserted a claim under 42 U.S.C. § 1983 but failed to give the defendant fair notice of the factual allegations and legal basis for liability. After the court ordered a particularized complaint and warned of dismissal, Plaintiff failed to comply or respond.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Plaintiff filed a § 1983 complaint. On October 16, 2025, the court directed him to submit a particularized complaint within thirty days and warned that noncompliance would result in dismissal. Plaintiff did not submit the required complaint or otherwise respond, so the court dismissed the action without prejudice.

DISPOSITION

dismissed

CASES CITED

- *Dowe v. Total Action Against Poverty in Roanoke Valley*, 145 F.3d 653, 658 (4th Cir.)

OPINION

RANDOLPH SATTERWHITE v. ALYSSA GREGORY

PER CURIAM.

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF VIRGINIA

Richmond Division

RANDOLPH SATTERWHITE,

Plaintiff, V. Civil Action No. 3:25CV329

ALYSSA GREGORY,

Defendant.

MEMORANDUM OPINION

Plaintiff, a federal inmate proceeding pro se and in forma pauperis, filed this 42 U.S.C. § 1983 action. In order to state a viable claim under 42 U.S.C. § 1983, a plaintiff must allege that a person acting under color of state law deprived him or her of a constitutional right or of a right conferred by a law of the United States. See *Dowe v. Total Action Against Poverty in Roanoke Valley*, 145 F.3d 653, 658 (4th Cir. 1998) (citing 42 U.S.C. § 1983). In his current Complaint, Plaintiff fails to provide the defendant with fair notice of the facts and legal basis upon which her liability rests. Accordingly, by Memorandum Order entered on October 16, 2025, the Court directed Plaintiff to submit a particularized complaint within thirty (30) days of the date of entry thereof. The Court warned Plaintiff that the failure to submit the particularized complaint would result in the dismissal of the action. More than thirty (30) days have elapsed since the entry of the October 16, 2025 Memorandum Order. Plaintiff failed to submit a particularized complaint or otherwise respond to the October 16, 2025 Memorandum Order. Accordingly, the action will be DISMISSED WITHOUT PREJUDICE. An appropriate Order will accompany this Memorandum Opinion. Richmond, Virginia isl John A. Gibney, Jr. Senior United States District Judge