

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF
INDIANA, SOUTH BEND DIVISION

Joseph Alan Fisher v. Jared L. Ulrick, et al.

No. 1:24-CV-295-JD (N.D. Ind. Jan. 13, 2026) · No. 1:24-CV-295-JD · Decided January 13, 2026

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the Northern District of Indiana granted summary judgment to jail officers in a prisoner’s Fourteenth Amendment excessive-force action. The court found that Fisher did not dispute the defendants’ evidence showing he violently resisted efforts to restrain him and that the force used was objectively reasonable under the circumstances. The court directed the clerk to enter judgment for the defendants and close the case.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the Northern District of Indiana, South Bend Division
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Jon E. DeGuilio
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the Northern District of Indiana, South Bend Division
DECIDED	January 13, 2026
DOCKET	1:24-CV-295-JD
DISPOSITION	other
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	Prisoner civil-rights action alleging that jail officers used excessive force in violation of the Fourteenth Amendment. Defendants moved for summary judgment, and the court granted the motion.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	Summary judgment is appropriate 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 construes facts and reasonable inferences in favor of the nonmoving party, but the opposing party must identify evidence supporting the claim rather than rely on allegations or denials.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	Unpublished federal district court opinion; generally persuasive rather than precedential.
PARTIES	Joseph Alan Fisher v. Jared L. Ulrick, Austin Mark, Ethan Cook, Tyler Walden

TOPICS

summary judgment

police misconduct

civil rights

fourteenth amendment

civil procedure

PRACTICE AREAS

Civil rights

constitutional law

prisoner civil rights

civil procedure

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether defendants were entitled to summary judgment on Fisher's Fourteenth Amendment excessive-force claim because no reasonable jury could find that the force used against him was objectively unreasonable.
2. Whether Fisher's statements concerning a separate December 2025 escort incident created a genuine dispute of material fact concerning the April 4 encounter.

HOLDINGS

1. Defendants were entitled to summary judgment because the undisputed evidence showed that the force used to restrain Fisher and restore order was objectively reasonable under the circumstances.
2. No genuine dispute of material fact existed because Fisher did not dispute defendants' evidence and the video evidence was consistent with defendants' account.

KEY QUOTATIONS

“Summary judgment must be granted when “there is no genuine dispute as to any material fact and the movant is entitled to judgment as a matter of law.””

“To establish an excessive force claim under the Fourteenth Amendment, the plaintiff must show that “the force purposefully or knowingly used against him was objectively unreasonable.””

“Accordingly, because there is no evidence by which a reasonable jury could conclude the defendants used an objectively unreasonable amount of force against Fisher during the April 4 encounter, summary judgment is warranted in favor of the defendants.”

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Fisher was a pretrial detainee at the DeKalb County jail when officers responded to his cell after he refused to return paperwork, kicked his cell door, and threatened the officers. According to undisputed affidavits and video evidence, Fisher rushed from his cell with a plastic box, struck and placed an officer in a headlock, resisted taser and restraint efforts, kicked and struck officers, gained control of a taser, and bit an officer. The officers ultimately secured Fisher in a WRAP restraint, and medical photographs showed only minor injuries.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Fisher proceeded without counsel against four jail officers in their individual capacities. Defendants moved for summary judgment and provided the required local-rule notice. After the court extended Fisher's response deadline, Fisher filed statements that the court treated as his response. Because Fisher did not dispute defendants'

factual submissions and the video was consistent with them, the court treated the material facts as undisputed and entered judgment for defendants.

DISPOSITION

other

CASES CITED

- Anderson v. Liberty Lobby, Inc., 477 U.S. 242, 248 (1986)
- Ogden v. Atterholt, 606 F.3d 355, 358 (7th Cir. 2010)
- Goodman v. Nat'l Sec. Agency, Inc., 621 F.3d 651, 654 (7th Cir. 2010)
- Kingsley v. Hendrickson, 576 U.S. 389, 396-97 (2015)
- Williams v. Brooks, 809 F.3d 936, 942 (7th Cir. 2016)
- Scott v. Harris, 550 U.S. 372, 379-80 (2007)
- United States v. Norville, 43 F.4th 680, 682 (7th Cir. 2022)