

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF
WISCONSIN

Quaa'sheem A. Chambers v. Matthew Miles

Chambers v. Miles · No. 25-CV-1024 · Decided February 19, 2026

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the Eastern District of Wisconsin granted Defendant Matthew Miles’s motion to dismiss a Fourteenth Amendment excessive-force claim brought by self-represented Plaintiff Quaa’sheem A. Chambers. The court concluded that the alleged failure to remove Chambers’s restraints was negligence rather than purposeful, knowing, or reckless use of force, and also granted the motion as a sanction for Chambers’s failure to respond to the motion.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the Eastern District of Wisconsin
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Tighe, United States Magistrate Judge
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the Eastern District of Wisconsin
DECIDED	February 19, 2026
DOCKET	25-CV-1024
DISPOSITION	dismissed
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	Defendant moved to dismiss the Fourteenth Amendment excessive-force claim for failure to state a claim. Plaintiff did not timely respond, and the court independently reviewed the complaint and granted the motion.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	The court reviewed the complaint under the failure-to-state-a-claim standard and accepted the alleged facts for purposes of the motion. It also independently reviewed the complaint under the local-rule briefing requirements.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	unpublished district court decision; nonprecedential
PARTIES	Quaa’sheem A. Chambers v. Matthew Miles

TOPICS

- motions to dismiss
- fourteenth amendment
- prisoners rights
- section 1983
- sanctions

PRACTICE AREAS

prisoner civil rights

constitutional torts

civil procedure

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether the complaint stated a Fourteenth Amendment excessive-force claim against Officer Miles based on the alleged failure to remove Chambers's restraints before placing him in a cell overnight.
2. Whether the complaint stated a claim against Officer Miles for the conduct of other officers who allegedly failed to respond to Chambers's medical-call-button requests after Miles left the jail.
3. Whether Chambers's failure to respond to the motion justified granting the motion as a sanction under the Eastern District of Wisconsin's local rules.

HOLDINGS

1. The complaint failed to state a Fourteenth Amendment excessive-force claim because the alleged failure to remove Chambers's restraints amounted at most to negligence and did not allege that Officer Miles purposely or knowingly used force, or acted with reckless intent to cause harm.
2. The complaint did not state a claim against Officer Miles based on other officers' alleged failure to remove the restraints after Miles clocked out because liability depends on each defendant's own knowledge and actions.
3. The court found sufficient cause under the local rules to grant the motion as a sanction because Chambers failed to respond to the motion within the required briefing period.

KEY QUOTATIONS

“Liability depends on each defendant's knowledge and actions, not on the knowledge or actions of [others].”

“But if a plaintiff does plead particulars [in his complaint], and they show that he has no claim, then he is out of luck—he has pleaded himself out of court.”

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Chambers alleged that on March 28, 2025, Officer Miles placed him in a Milwaukee County Jail cell without removing his restraints. Miles allegedly stated that another correctional officer would remove the restraints because Miles's shift was ending. Chambers alleged that his medical-call-button requests at 11:25 p.m., 12:25 a.m., 12:50 a.m., and 1:05 a.m. were ignored. The court characterized the alleged failure to remove the restraints as negligence rather than purposeful, knowing, or reckless use of force by Miles.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Chambers filed a complaint alleging that Correctional Officer Matthew Miles failed to ensure that Chambers's restraints were removed before Chambers was placed in a Milwaukee County Jail cell overnight. Miles moved to dismiss on January 20, 2026. Chambers did not timely respond, and the court granted the motion both on the merits and as a sanction for failure to comply with the local briefing rules, dismissing the case.

DISPOSITION

dismissed

CASES CITED

- Kingsley v. Henderickson, 576 U.S. 389, 396-97 (2015)
- Burks v. Raemisch, 555 F.3d 592, 593-94 (7th Cir. 2009)
- Thomas v. Farley, 31 F.3d 557, 558-59 (7th Cir. 1994)

OPINION

Chambers

PER CURIAM.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

EASTERN DISTRICT OF WISCONSIN

QUAA'SHEEM A. CHAMBERS,

Plaintiff, v. Case No. 25-CV-1024

MATTHEW MILES,

Defendant.

DECISION AND ORDER

Plaintiff Quaa'sheem A. Chambers, who is representing himself, is proceeding on a Fourteenth Amendment excessive force claim in connection with allegations that Correctional Officer Matthew Miles forgot to remove Plaintiff's restraints before placing him in a cell overnight at the Milwaukee County Jail on March 28, 2025. Dkt. Nos. 1 & 7. On January 20, 2026, Defendant filed a motion to dismiss for failure to state a claim. Dkt. No. 13. Defendant argues that his conduct was negligence at most—not purposeful, knowing, or a reckless intent to cause harm—and negligence does not violate the constitution. Dkt. No. 14. Under the Civil Local Rules, Plaintiff's response materials were due February 10, 2026. See Civ. L. R. 7(b) (E.D. Wis.). Plaintiff did not timely respond. The "[f]ailure to comply with the briefing requirements in Civil L. R. 7(a)-(b) may result in sanctions up to and including the Court denying or granting the motion." See Civ. L. R. 7(d). Additionally, the Court has independently reviewed the complaint, see Dkt. No. 1, and it agrees that the failure to remove Plaintiff's restraints before placing him in a cell overnight was mere negligence. Based on the facts alleged, it appears that Officer Miles intended for another officer to remove Plaintiff's restraints because his shift was ending, and either Officer Miles forgot to relay the message or that other officer forgot to go back to Plaintiff's cell to remove the restraints. See Dkt. No. 1 at 2 (alleging that Officer Miles said, "Just go in, I'll have another CO get the belt [because]... I have to...clock out."). Those allegations amount to negligence; not a purposeful, knowing, or reckless intent to cause harm. See *Kingsley v. Henderickson*, 576 U.S. 389, 396-97 (2015). Given that Officer Miles then "clocked out," he would not have been

personally responsible for whoever ignored Plaintiffs medical call button at 11:25 p.m., 12:25 a.m., 12:50 a.m., and 1:05 a.m. to remove the restraints. See *Burks v. Raemisch*, 555 F.3d 592, 593-94 (7th Cir. 2009) (“Liability depends on each defendant's knowledge and actions, not on the knowledge or actions of [others].”). The complaint contains no allegations from which the Court can reasonably infer that Officer Miles purposely or knowingly used force against Plaintiff. Plaintiff has therefore failed to state a claim against Officer Miles; and the Court must dismiss this case for failure to state a claim. See *Thomas v. Farley*, 31 F.3d 557, 558-59 (7th Cir. 1994) (“But if a plaintiff does plead particulars [in his complaint], and they show that he has no claim, then he is out of luck—he has pleaded himself out of court.”). Moreover, pursuant to Civ. L. R. 56(b)(9), the Court finds that Plaintiffs failure to respond to Defendant’s motion is sufficient cause for the Court to grant the motion as a sanction for noncompliance with the briefing requirements of the local rules. IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED that Defendant’s motion to dismiss for failure to state a claim (Dkt. No. 13) is GRANTED; and this case is DISMISSED. The Clerk is directed to enter judgment accordingly. Dated in Milwaukee, Wisconsin this 19th day of February, 2026. jun ©. [ee Tighe 0, United States Magistrate Judge