

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF
GEORGIA

**Brandon Dijon Williams v. Core Civic–Wheeler Correctional
Facility; Herman Pittman; Sergeant Demetrius Spike; and Officer
Jose Ramos Castillo**

Williams v. Core Civic–Wheeler Correctional Facility · No. CV 325-007 · Decided January 26, 2026

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the Southern District of Georgia explains the consequences of failing to respond to defendants’ motion for summary judgment in a prisoner civil-rights action under 42 U.S.C. § 1983. The Court orders the plaintiff to file an opposition, supporting evidence, or notice of non-objection by February 17, 2026, and directs the Clerk to provide him with Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 56.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the Southern District of Georgia
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the Southern District of Georgia
DECIDED	January 26, 2026
DOCKET	CV 325-007
DISPOSITION	other
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	Plaintiff brought a 42 U.S.C. § 1983 civil-rights action. Defendants moved for summary judgment, and Plaintiff did not file a response. Before ruling on the motion, the Court issued an order explaining the consequences of failing to respond and directing Plaintiff to respond or state that he did not object.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	Summary judgment is appropriate when the movant shows that there is no genuine dispute as to any material fact and that the movant is entitled to judgment as a matter of law. The moving party bears the initial burden of identifying the basis for the motion and demonstrating the absence of a genuine dispute or evidence supporting the nonmoving party’s case; after the pleadings are pierced, the nonmoving party must identify evidence showing a genuine issue of fact.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	unpublished district-court order; nonprecedential

TOPICS

summary judgment

civil procedure

section 1983

prisoners rights

PRACTICE AREAS

civil procedure

prisoner civil rights

summary judgment

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether Plaintiff must receive a reasonable opportunity, including notice and an explanation of the rights that may be lost, to respond to Defendants' motion for summary judgment before the Court rules on it.
2. What consequences follow under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 56 and Local Rule 7.5 if Plaintiff does not oppose the motion for summary judgment.

HOLDINGS

1. Before ruling on Defendants' motion for summary judgment, the Court must afford Plaintiff a reasonable opportunity to respond, including notice and an explanation of the consequences of failing to submit opposing evidence.
2. If Plaintiff does not oppose the motion, factual assertions in Defendants' affidavits may be deemed admitted under Local Rule 7.5 and Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 56, and the motion may be granted as unopposed.

KEY QUOTATIONS

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

“The reasonable opportunity encompasses not only time to respond, but notice and an explanation of rights that may be lost if a response is not filed.”

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Plaintiff filed a civil-rights action under 42 U.S.C. § 1983 against Core Civic–Wheeler Correctional Facility and four individual defendants. Defendants moved for summary judgment. Plaintiff had not filed an opposition or supporting affidavits when the Court issued this order.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Plaintiff filed this prisoner civil-rights action in the Southern District of Georgia. Defendants filed a motion for summary judgment. Because Plaintiff had not responded, the Court provided additional notice of the summary-judgment requirements and consequences of nonresponse, ordered a response by February 17, 2026, and directed the Clerk to serve Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 56 with the order.

DISPOSITION

other

CASES CITED

- Griffith v. Wainwright, 772 F.2d 822, 825 (11th Cir. 1985)
- Adickes v. S.H. Kress & Co., 398 U.S. 144, 157 (1970)
- Celotex Corp. v. Catrett, 477 U.S. 317, 325 (1986)
- Anderson v. Liberty Lobby, Inc., 477 U.S. 242, 250 (1986)
- Anderson v. Liberty Lobby, Inc., 477 U.S. 242, 252 (1986)
- Casey Enters., Inc. v. Am. Hardware Mut. Ins. Co., 655 F.2d 598, 602 (5th Cir. Unit B Sept. 1981)
- Morris v. Ross, 663 F.2d 1032, 1033 (11th Cir. 1981)
- Bonner v. City of Prichard, 661 F.2d 1206, 1209 (11th Cir. 1981) (en banc)

Retrieved from lawtools.ai · <https://lawtools.ai/cases/federal/united-states-district-court-for-the-southern-district-of-ge/2026/brandon-dijon-williams-v-core-civic-wheeler-correctional-dgc7my5t>