

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

Michael Edward Allen v. Lakita Davis, et al.

Allen · No. 4:24-cv-00175-JM-ERE · Decided January 20, 2026

SUMMARY

This Recommended Disposition addresses Defendants’ motion for summary judgment in Michael Edward Allen’s 42 U.S.C. § 1983 action alleging deliberate indifference to serious medical needs. The magistrate judge concludes that the record does not show constitutionally inadequate medical care by Defendants Davis, Bolling, or Carter and recommends granting summary judgment, dismissing the claims with prejudice, and closing the case. Objections were permitted within 14 days.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the Eastern District of Arkansas, Central Division
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the Eastern District of Arkansas, Central Division
DECIDED	January 20, 2026
DOCKET	4:24-cv-00175-JM-ERE
DISPOSITION	other
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	A magistrate judge issued a recommended disposition on Defendants' motion for summary judgment in a pro se prisoner's 42 U.S.C. § 1983 medical deliberate-indifference action. The recommendation was submitted to the district judge for review and permitted objections within fourteen days.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	Summary judgment is appropriate when, viewing the record in the light most favorable to the nonmoving party, there is no genuine dispute as to any material fact and the moving party is entitled to judgment as a matter of law. On a medical deliberate-indifference claim, the prisoner must produce evidence showing a serious medical need and that the defendant knew of and deliberately disregarded a substantial risk of harm; negligence or medical malpractice is insufficient.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	nonprecedential recommended disposition

PARTIES

Michael Edward Allen v. Lakita Davis, Shannon Hollie Bolling, Lasha Carter

TOPICS

section 1983 prisoners rights civil rights summary judgment health law

PRACTICE AREAS

civil rights prisoner medical care constitutional litigation federal civil procedure

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether Defendants Davis, Bolling, and Carter were entitled to summary judgment on Allen's individual-capacity claims for deliberate indifference to serious medical needs under the Eighth Amendment.
2. Whether Allen produced sufficient evidence of causation, including verifying medical evidence or expert testimony, to create a genuine dispute concerning alleged permanent heart damage, reduced life expectancy, or increased risk of stroke or heart attack.
3. Whether the court should decline supplemental jurisdiction over any state-law medical-malpractice claim after dismissal of the federal claims.

HOLDINGS

1. Summary judgment should be granted because Allen failed to present evidence from which a reasonable factfinder could conclude that Davis, Bolling, or Carter acted with deliberate indifference to his serious medical needs.
2. Summary judgment should be granted for Carter because no reasonable factfinder could conclude on the record that she violated Allen's constitutional rights.
3. Summary judgment should be granted for Bolling because Allen failed to show that she knowingly disregarded a substantial risk of harm or that her conduct caused the alleged injuries.
4. Summary judgment should be granted for Davis because the evidence showed that she appropriately monitored and treated Allen and no reasonable factfinder could find deliberate indifference.

KEY QUOTATIONS

"Summary judgment is appropriate when the record, viewed in a light most favorable to the nonmoving party, demonstrates that there is no genuine dispute as to any material fact, and the moving party is entitled to judgment as a matter of law." (Section III.A)

"deliberate indifference to serious medical needs of prisoners constitutes the unnecessary and wanton infliction of pain." (Section III.D)

"Defendants' motion for summary judgment (Doc. 40) be GRANTED." (Section IV)

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Allen, formerly an Arkansas Division of Correction inmate, had significant medical conditions including a history of myocardial infarction, hypertension, congestive heart failure, chronic obstructive pulmonary disease, and hepatitis. The record showed repeated examinations, medication adjustments, monitoring, diagnostic testing, specialist consultations, hospital transfers for chest pain and shortness of breath, and treatment for other complaints by ADC medical personnel. Allen alleged that the defendants failed to provide adequate care, ignored or falsified blood-pressure readings, and caused permanent cardiac damage, but he provided no verifying medical evidence or expert testimony connecting the alleged injuries to the defendants' conduct.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Allen filed an amended § 1983 complaint concerning medical care while in Arkansas Division of Correction custody. The court dismissed claims against other defendants and official-capacity claims for damages, leaving individual-capacity medical deliberate-indifference claims against Davis, Bolling, and Carter. Defendants moved for summary judgment, supplemented their briefing and factual statement to cover medical care through March 2024, and Allen did not respond to the supplemental materials. The recommended disposition advises granting summary judgment, dismissing the remaining claims with prejudice, entering judgment for the defendants, and closing the case.

DISPOSITION

other

CASES CITED

- Celotex Corp. v. Catrett, 477 U.S. 317, 322-23 (1986)
- Anderson v. Liberty Lobby Inc., 477 U.S. 242, 249-50 (1986)
- Torgerson v. City of Rochester, 643 F.3d 1031, 1042 (8th Cir. 2011)
- Odom v. Kaizer, 864 F.3d 920, 921 (8th Cir. 2017)
- Estelle v. Gamble, 429 U.S. 97, 104 (1976)
- Johnson v. Leonard, 929 F.3d 569, 575-76 (8th Cir. 2019)
- Farmer v. Brennan, 511 U.S. 825, 835 (1994)
- Dulany, 132 F.3d at 1240-1241
- Smith v. Jenkins, 919 F.2d 90, 93 (8th Cir. 1990)
- Jackson v. Buckman, 756 F.3d 1060, 1065-66 (8th Cir. 2014)
- Laughlin v. Schriro, 430 F.3d 927, 929 (8th Cir. 2005)
- Crowley v. Hedgepeth, 109 F.3d 500, 502 (8th Cir. 1997)
- Corwin v. City of Independence, MO, 829 F.3d 695 (8th Cir. 2016)
- Roberson v. Bradshaw, 198 F.3d 645, 648 (8th Cir. 2001)
- Robinson v. Hager, 292 F.3d 560, 564 (8th Cir. 2002)
- Turner v. Iowa Fire Equip. Co., 229 F.3d 1202, 1210 (8th Cir. 2000)

- Smith v. Lisenbe, 73 F.4th 596, 660 (8th Cir. 2023)
- Cejvanovic v. Ludwick, 923 F.3d 503, 508 (8th Cir. 2019)
- Nelson v. Shuffman, 603 F.3d 439, 449 (8th Cir. 2010)

Retrieved from lawtools.ai · <https://lawtools.ai/cases/federal/united-states-district-court-for-the-eastern-district-of-ark/2026/michael-edward-allen-v-lakita-davis-et-al-91x8wco0>