

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF
LOUISIANA, ALEXANDRIA DIVISION

Shaundelle Dial v. Brandi Reynolds et al.

Dial · No. 1:25-CV-00543 · Decided January 20, 2026

SUMMARY

This Report and Recommendation addresses pro se Plaintiff Shaundelle Dial’s request for injunctive relief requiring placement in protective custody and transfer from the United States Penitentiary in Pollock, Louisiana. The magistrate judge recommends denying and dismissing the complaint without prejudice because prisoners have no protected right to a particular custodial classification or facility, and Dial’s transfer from the facility rendered the requested injunctive relief moot. The recommendation was signed on January 20, 2026.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the Western District of Louisiana, Alexandria Division
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Joseph H.L. Perez-Montes
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the Western District of Louisiana, Alexandria Division
DECIDED	January 20, 2026
DOCKET	1:25-CV-00543
DISPOSITION	dismissed
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	Report and recommendation in a pro se prisoner's civil action seeking injunctive relief requiring protective custody and transfer to another prison facility.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	The report and recommendation advised that objections could be filed under 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(C) and Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 72(b); the opinion applied substantive standards governing prisoner injunctive-relief claims and mootness.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	nonprecedential
PARTIES	Shaundelle Dial v. Brandi Reynolds et al.

TOPICS

prisoners rights

injunctions

equitable relief

civil procedure

PRACTICE AREAS

prisoner civil rights

injunctive relief

federal civil procedure

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether Dial could obtain injunctive relief requiring prison officials to place him in protective custody or house him at a particular facility.
2. Whether Dial's request for transfer was moot after he was transferred from USP-P.

HOLDINGS

1. Dial could not establish a right to the requested injunctive relief because prisoners have no protected liberty interest in their custodial classification and are not entitled to be housed at a particular facility.
2. Dial's request for injunctive relief was moot because he was no longer imprisoned at USP-P.

KEY QUOTATIONS

"It is well settled that the decision where to house inmates is at the core of prison administrators' expertise."
(at 2)

"The transfer of a prisoner out of an institution often will render his claims for injunctive relief moot." (at 2)

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Dial alleged that he was forced into a Reintegration Housing Unit and wrongfully transferred to USP-P. He asserted that he was repeatedly housed with inmates on the sexual-predators list and subjected to threats and attacks by gang members. He requested protective custody and transfer to a facility he described as non-active. Dial was no longer incarcerated at USP-P when the report and recommendation was issued.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Dial filed a civil action alleging that he was improperly assigned to the United States Penitentiary in Pollock, Louisiana, and exposed to threats and dangerous inmates. He sought an order requiring placement in protective custody at another facility. By the time of the report and recommendation, Dial had been transferred from USP-P. The magistrate judge recommended that the complaint be denied and dismissed without prejudice because Dial was not entitled to the requested relief and the transfer rendered the injunctive claim moot.

DISPOSITION

dismissed

CASES CITED

- 59 F.3d 530, 533 (5th Cir. 1995)

- 599 F. App'x 170, 171 (5th Cir. 2015)
- 2019 WL 3956279, at *3 (E.D. Tex. 2019)
- 2019 WL 3943897 (E.D. Tex. 2019)
- 536 U.S. 24, 39 (2002)
- 276 F.3d 736, 741 (5th Cir. 2002)
- 238 F.3d 660, 665 (5th Cir. 2001)
- 929 F.2d 1078, 1084 (5th Cir. 1991)

OPINION

a UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT WESTERN DISTRICT OF LOUISIANA ALEXANDRIA DIVISION SHAUNDELLE DIAL #57271-060, CIVIL DOCKET NO. 1:25-CV-00543 Plaintiff SEC P VERSUS JUDGE DRELL BRANDI REYNOLDS ET AL, MAGISTRATE JUDGE PEREZ-MONTES Defendants REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION Before the Court is a civil action filed by pro se Plaintiff Shaundelle Dial (“Dial”). Dial alleges that he was improperly assigned to the United States Penitentiary in Pollock, Louisiana (“USP-P”).

He seeks injunctive relief in the form of placement in protective custody at another facility. Because Dial is not entitled to injunctive relief and has been transferred from USP-P, his Complaint (ECF No. 8) should be DENIED and DISMISSED WITHOUT PREJUDICE.

I. Background Dial alleges that he was “forced” into a Reintegration Housing Unit and wrongfully transferred to USP-P. He asserts that he should not be housed at USP-P where he is “constantly” placed in cells “with inmates on the sexual predators list” and subjected to threats and “hits” by gang members. ECF Nos. 1, 8. He asks that the Court order Defendants to place him in protective custody and transfer him to a “non-active prison.” ECF No. 8 at 7.

II. Law and Analysis Prisoners do not have a protected liberty interest in their custodial classification., 59 F.3d 530, 533 (1995);, 599 F. App'x 170, 171 (5th Cir. 2015);, 6:16-CV-1300, 2019 WL 3956279, at *3 (E.D. Tex. 2019);, 2019 WL 3943897 (E.D. Tex. 2019). Nor are prisoners entitled to be housed at a certain facility., 536 U.S. 24, 39 (2002) (“It is well settled that the decision where to house inmates is at the core of prison administrators’ expertise.”);, 2019 WL 3956279, at *3 (“federal courts must be careful not to micromanage prison operations”).

Accordingly, Dial cannot establish his right to protective custody or to be housed at a particular facility. Additionally, a transfer to another prison generally renders a claim for injunctive relief moot., 276 F.3d 736, 741 (5th Cir. 2002) (“The transfer of a prisoner out of an institution often will render his claims for injunctive relief moot.”);, 238 F.3d 660, 665 (5th Cir.

2001) (“Herman’s transfer... rendered his claims for declaratory and injunctive relief moot.”);, 929 F.2d 1078, 1084 (5th Cir. 1991) (“By the time Cooper filed his amended complaint, he was no longer held in the Lubbock County jail.

Thus,... his transfer to another prison has rendered moot these claims for relief.”). Dial alleges that he was wrongfully transferred to USP-P, and should not be housed at that facility. ECF No. 11. Dial is no longer imprisoned at USP-P.

Accordingly, his request for a transfer is moot. II. Conclusion Because Dial is not entitled to the injunctive relief sought, and he is no longer imprisoned at USP-P, IT IS RECOMMENDED that the Complaint (ECF No. 8) be DENIED and DISMISSED WITHOUT PREJUDICE.

Under 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(c) and Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(b), a party may file written objections to this Report and Recommendation within 14 days of service, unless the Court grants an extension of time to file objections under Fed. R. Civ. P. 6(b). A party may also respond to another party’s objections to this Report and Recommendation within 14 days of service of those objections, again unless the Court grants an extension of time to file a response to objections.

No other briefs may be filed without leave of court, which will only be granted for good cause. A party’s failure to timely file written objections to this Report and Recommendation will bar a party from later challenging factual or legal conclusions adopted by the District Judge, except if the challenge asserts “plain error.” SIGNED on Tuesday, January 20, 2026.

7 “ JOSEPH H.L. PEREZ-MONTES UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE