

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE MIDDLE DISTRICT OF
FLORIDA, JACKSONVILLE DIVISION

Aushea Williams v. Sheriff Homer Deloach, et al.

Williams v. Deloach · No. 3:25-cv-1021-JEP-SJH · Decided January 14, 2026

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the Middle District of Florida denied Plaintiff Aushea Williams’s motion for relief from judgment under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 60(b)(3). The court also denied as moot Williams’s renewed motion for class certification and appointment of counsel, explaining that he had not shown fraud or misconduct preventing him from presenting his case and could not represent other inmates.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the Middle District of Florida, Jacksonville Division
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Jordan E. Pratt
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the Middle District of Florida, Jacksonville Division
DECIDED	January 14, 2026
DOCKET	3:25-cv-1021-JEP-SJH
DISPOSITION	other
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	Plaintiff moved for relief from the final judgment under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 60(b)(3) and renewed his motion for class certification and appointment of counsel after the action had been dismissed.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	A motion under Rule 60(b)(3) requires clear and convincing evidence that the adverse party obtained the result through fraud, misrepresentation, or other misconduct, and that the alleged misconduct prevented the movant from fully presenting his case.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	unpublished district court order; nonprecedential
PARTIES	Aushea Williams v. Sheriff Homer Deloach, et al.

TOPICS

[motion for reconsideration](#)

[class actions](#)

[civil procedure](#)

[prisoners rights](#)

PRACTICE AREAS

[civil procedure](#)

[civil rights](#)

[prisoner litigation](#)

[class actions](#)

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether Plaintiff was entitled to relief from the final judgment under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 60(b)(3) based on alleged fraud, misrepresentation, or misconduct by a jail employee.
2. Whether Plaintiff's renewed motion for class certification and appointment of counsel should be granted.

HOLDINGS

1. Relief from judgment was properly denied because Plaintiff failed to provide clear and convincing evidence that a jail employee engaged in fraud, misrepresentation, or other misconduct, or that any such conduct prevented him from fully presenting his case.
2. The renewed motion for class certification and appointment of counsel was denied as moot because Plaintiff could not represent the rights of other inmates in this action and could instead file a new case to pursue claims on his own behalf.

KEY QUOTATIONS

“To obtain relief under Rule 60(b)(3), “the moving party must prove by clear and convincing evidence that the adverse party obtained the [result] through fraud, misrepresentation[], or other misconduct,” and the purported fraud must have prevented the movant “from fully presenting his case.”” (Order at 1)

“Plaintiff provides no evidence—such as a mail log—showing that a PCJ employee prevented him from receiving and complying with this Court’s Order.” (Order at 2)

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Plaintiff alleged that an unnamed employee at the Putnam County Jail prevented him from receiving and complying with the Court's order allowing him time to file an amended complaint. He offered no supporting evidence, such as a mail log, to substantiate the allegation. Plaintiff also sought to represent himself and other inmates in a class action challenging allegedly unconstitutional jail policies, despite the Court's prior instruction that he could not represent other inmates.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

The Court had previously dismissed the action after granting Plaintiff time to file an amended complaint and had advised him that he could not represent the rights of other inmates. Plaintiff asserted that an unnamed jail employee prevented him from receiving and complying with the amendment order. The Court denied relief from judgment and denied the renewed motion for class certification and appointment of counsel as moot.

DISPOSITION

other

CASES CITED

- Waddell v. Hendry County Sheriff's Office, 329 F.3d 1300, 1309 (11th Cir. 2003)

OPINION

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT MIDDLE DISTRICT OF FLORIDA JACKSONVILLE
DIVISION AUSHEA WILLIAMS, Plaintiff, v. Case No. 3:25-cv-1021-JEP-SJH SHERIFF
HOMER DELOACH, et al., Defendants. _____ ORDER
Before the Court are Plaintiff's Motion for Relief from Judgment (Doc. 12) and renewed Motion
for Class Certification and Appointment of Counsel (Doc 13).

Plaintiff seeks relief from judgment under Rule 60(b)(3) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure on the ground that an unnamed employee at the jail prevented him from receiving, and therefore complying with, this Court's Order granting him time to file an amended complaint before dismissing the case. See Doc. 12 at 1–2.

In his renewed request for class certification under Rule 23(a), Plaintiff seeks to represent himself and other inmates in a class action lawsuit against the Putnam County Jail ("PCJ") for various unconstitutional policies.¹ See Doc. 13 at 1. ¹ Contrary to Plaintiff's assertion in his Motion for Relief from Judgment, see Doc. 12 at 3, the Court denied Plaintiff's original Motion for Class Certification, Rule 60(b) provides in pertinent part, "[T]he court may relieve a party ... from a final judgment, order, or proceeding for [limited] reasons[, including] ... fraud." Fed.

R. Civ. P. 60(b)(3) (internal numbering omitted). To obtain relief under Rule 60(b)(3), "the moving party must prove by clear and convincing evidence that the adverse party obtained the [result] through fraud, misrepresentation[], or other misconduct," and the purported fraud must have prevented the movant "from fully presenting his case." Waddell v. Hendry Cnty.

Sheriff's Off., 329 F.3d 1300, 1309 (11th Cir. 2003). Plaintiff provides no evidence—such as a mail log—showing that a PCJ employee prevented him from receiving and complying with this Court's Order. His conclusory statement is insufficient. Additionally, any purported fraud or misconduct by a PCJ employee did not prevent Plaintiff "from fully presenting his case" because it appears he remains intent on representing the rights of other inmates, see generally Docs.

12, 13 (explaining his desire to pursue a class action against PCJ), which the Court previously advised him he may not do, and he may file a new complaint in a new case if he wants to pursue any plausible, cognizable claims on his own behalf. advising him that he may not represent the rights of other inmates. See Order (Doc. 8) at 6, 9. ² Accordingly, it is now ORDERED and ADJUDGED as follows: 1.

Plaintiff's Motion for Relief from Judgment (Doc. 12) is DENIED. 2. Plaintiff's Motion for Class Certification and Appointment of Counsel (Doc 13) is DENIED as moot. DONE AND ORDERED in Jacksonville, Florida, on January 13, 2026. £ JORDAN E. PRATT UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE Jax-6 Cc: Aushea Williams, #11002103

Retrieved from lawtools.ai · <https://lawtools.ai/cases/federal/united-states-district-court-for-the-middle-district-of-flor/2026/aushea-williams-v-sheriff-homer-delach-et-al-bt1uz28p>