

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF
VIRGINIA, ROANOKE DIVISION

Tory Teigen v. Sgt. Osborne, et al.

Teigen · No. 7:25-cv-00410 · Decided April 16, 2026

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the Western District of Virginia summarily dismissed Tory Teigen’s 42 U.S.C. § 1983 action without prejudice. The court held that alleged deprivation of personal property did not support a federal due process claim because Virginia provides adequate post-deprivation remedies, and that mishandling prison grievances does not violate a constitutionally protected right.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the Western District of Virginia, Roanoke Division
WRITING FOR THE COURT	James P. Jones
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the Western District of Virginia, Roanoke Division
DECIDED	April 16, 2026
DOCKET	7:25-cv-00410
DISPOSITION	dismissed
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	The court screened a pro se prisoner complaint filed under 42 U.S.C. § 1983 and summarily dismissed it without prejudice for failure to state a claim under 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B).
STANDARD OF REVIEW	The court reviewed the complaint under the mandatory screening standard of 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B), dismissing claims that failed to state a claim on which relief could be granted.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	unknown

TOPICS

- prisoners rights
- section 1983
- due process
- civil rights
- civil procedure

PRACTICE AREAS

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether the alleged intentional or negligent deprivation of Teigen's personal property by prison officials stated a federal due process claim under 42 U.S.C. § 1983.
2. Whether prison officials' alleged mishandling or failure to follow the grievance process stated a constitutional claim under § 1983.

HOLDINGS

1. A random and unauthorized deprivation of an inmate's property by a state employee does not violate federal due process when the state provides a meaningful postdeprivation remedy, regardless of whether the deprivation resulted from intentional conduct or negligence. Because Virginia provides adequate postdeprivation remedies, Teigen failed to state a § 1983 due process claim.
2. An inmate has no constitutionally protected right to participate in a prison grievance procedure, and a jail official's failure to comply with such a procedure does not itself violate a constitutional right. Teigen therefore failed to state a § 1983 claim based on the alleged mishandling of his grievances.

KEY QUOTATIONS

“The court must dismiss a case “at any time” if the court determines that the complaint “fails to state a claim on which relief may be granted.””

“Therefore, “if a meaningful postdeprivation remedy for the loss is available,” the inmate has no constitutional due process claim, regardless of whether the employee’s actions were intentional or the result of negligence.”

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

After being transferred to a new building, Teigen alleged that defendants deprived him of personal property, including technology items, clothing, personal hygiene products, books, photographs, and letters. He also alleged that defendants failed to remedy the property issue through the prison grievance process.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Teigen, a Virginia inmate, filed an original § 1983 action alleging that defendants confiscated, damaged, or disposed of his personal property and mishandled his grievances. The district court reviewed the complaint and dismissed it without prejudice at the screening stage, directing that a separate judgment be entered.

DISPOSITION

dismissed

CASES CITED

- Cooper v. Sheehan, 735 F.3d 153, 158 (4th Cir. 2013)

- Hudson v. Palmer, 468 U.S. 517, 532-533 (1984)
- Wadhams v. Proctor, 772 F.2d 75, 78 (4th Cir. 1985)
- Adams v. Rice, 40 F.3d 72, 75 (4th Cir. 1994)
- Mann v. Adams, 855 F.2d 639, 640 (9th Cir. 1988)

Retrieved from lawtools.ai · <https://lawtools.ai/cases/state/united-states-district-court-for-the-western-district-of-virginia-roanoke-division-united-states-dis/2026/tory-teigen-v-sgt-osborne-et-al-ap31i4hs>