

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE MIDDLE DISTRICT OF
PENNSYLVANIA

Charlie Castillo v. Correction Officer O'Haine, et al.

Castillo · No. 1:22-CV-00417 · Decided March 16, 2026

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the Middle District of Pennsylvania grants Defendant O’Haine’s motion for summary judgment in Charlie Castillo’s action alleging First Amendment retaliation and a Fourteenth Amendment privacy violation. The court concludes that Castillo failed to exhaust available administrative remedies under the Prison Litigation Reform Act and finds no supported basis to excuse that failure. The court denies Castillo’s first summary-judgment motion, deems his second motion withdrawn for failure to file a supporting brief, enters judgment for O’Haine, and closes the case.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the Middle District of Pennsylvania
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Jennifer P. Wilson
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the Middle District of Pennsylvania
DECIDED	March 16, 2026
DOCKET	1:22-CV-00417
DISPOSITION	other
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	The parties filed cross-motions for summary judgment in a prisoner civil-rights action. Defendant O'Haine moved for summary judgment based on failure to exhaust administrative remedies under the Prison Litigation Reform Act.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	Summary judgment is proper when there is no genuine dispute as to any material fact and the movant is entitled to judgment as a matter of law. The court views facts and reasonable inferences in the light most favorable to the nonmoving party and does not weigh evidence. Exhaustion under the PLRA is a question of law for the court, although determining it may require resolving factual issues.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	Nonprecedential district-court memorandum; precedential status not established in the supplied metadata.
PARTIES	Charlie Castillo v. Correction Officer O'Haine

TOPICS

summary judgment

prisoners rights

section 1983

civil rights

civil procedure

PRACTICE AREAS

civil rights litigation

prisoner litigation

federal civil procedure

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether Castillo was entitled to summary judgment when his statement of material facts lacked citations to supporting evidence.
2. Whether Officer O'Haine was entitled to summary judgment because Castillo failed to exhaust available administrative remedies before filing his federal action.
3. Whether Castillo's second motion for summary judgment should be deemed withdrawn because he failed to file a supporting brief within the time required by the local rules.

HOLDINGS

1. A party moving for summary judgment must identify record evidence supporting the asserted undisputed facts; the court will not scour attached documents to locate evidentiary support. Because Castillo's statement of facts lacked record citations, his first motion for summary judgment was denied.
2. Officer O'Haine was entitled to summary judgment because Castillo failed to exhaust available administrative remedies concerning his First Amendment retaliation and Fourteenth Amendment privacy claims before filing suit, and Castillo presented no supported basis for excusing exhaustion.
3. Castillo's second motion for summary judgment was deemed withdrawn because he did not file a supporting brief within the time required by Middle District of Pennsylvania Local Rule 7.5.

KEY QUOTATIONS

"The court finds that the admitted material facts support a finding that Plaintiff did not exhaust his administrative remedies and there is no factually supported basis to excuse his failure to exhaust."

"Therefore, Defendant O'Haine's motion for summary judgment will be granted, judgment will be granted in favor of Defendant O'Haine, and the case will be closed."

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Castillo alleged that Officer O'Haine read portions of his medical chart while Castillo was receiving treatment at a hospital, became upset after Castillo objected, questioned him about his prison status, and filed a false misconduct report in retaliation. Castillo filed several grievances concerning the misconduct proceedings and access to medical records, but none raised the First Amendment retaliation or Fourteenth Amendment privacy claims against O'Haine. The grievances and misconduct appeals were also not properly exhausted through the applicable Pennsylvania Department of Corrections procedures.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Castillo filed an action alleging constitutional violations arising from Officer O'Haine's alleged review of his medical records and subsequent filing of a misconduct report. The court dismissed most claims and allowed a First Amendment retaliation claim and Fourteenth Amendment privacy claim against O'Haine to proceed. After the court denied O'Haine's motion for judgment on the pleadings in part, the parties filed summary-judgment motions. The court denied Castillo's first motion, granted O'Haine's motion, deemed Castillo's second unsupported motion withdrawn, entered judgment for O'Haine, and closed the case.

DISPOSITION

other

CASES CITED

- Anderson v. Liberty Lobby, Inc., 477 U.S. 242, 248 (1986)
- Thomas v. Tice, 943 F.3d 145, 149 (3d Cir. 2019)
- Lichtenstein v. Univ. of Pittsburgh Med. Ctr., 691 F.3d 294, 300 (3d Cir. 2012)
- Emil Jutrowski v. Township of Riverdale, Jutrowski v. Twp. of Riverdale, 904 F.3d 280, 288-89 (3d Cir. 2018)
- Scheidemantle v. Slippery Rock Univ. State Sys. of Higher Educ., 470 F.3d 535, 538 (3d Cir. 2006)
- D.E. v. Cent. Dauphin Sch. Dist., 765 F.3d 260, 268-69 (3d Cir. 2014)
- Celotex Corp. v. Catrett, 477 U.S. 317, 322-23 (1986)
- Matsushita Elec. Indus. Co. v. Zenith Radio Corp., 475 U.S. 574, 587 (1986)
- Ross v. Blake, 578 U.S. 632, 639, 642-44 (2016)
- Woodford v. Ngo, 548 U.S. 81, 85 (2006)
- Rinaldi v. United States, 904 F.3d 257, 266-67 (3d Cir. 2018)
- Robinson v. Superintendent Rockview SCI, 831 F.3d 148, 154 (3d Cir. 2016)
- Small v. Camden Cty., 728 F.3d 265, 269, 271 (3d Cir. 2013)
- Drippe v. Tobelinski, 604 F.3d 778, 781 (3d Cir. 2010)
- Pavey v. Conley, 544 F.3d 739, 741 (7th Cir. 2008)
- Wilkerson v. United States, No. 3:13-1499, 2014 WL 1653249, at *9 (M.D. Pa. Apr. 24, 2014)