

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF
WISCONSIN

Clarence Albert Saffold, Jr. v. Kevin Bauer et al.

Saffold v. Bauer · No. 25-cv-0759-bhl · Decided May 28, 2026

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the Eastern District of Wisconsin granted Defendants’ motion for summary judgment in Clarence Saffold, Jr.’s 42 U.S.C. § 1983 action. The court held that Saffold failed to exhaust available administrative remedies because he did not notify the institution that he believed he was being treated differently because of his race, and dismissed the action without prejudice.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the Eastern District of Wisconsin
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Brett H. Ludwig
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the Eastern District of Wisconsin
DECIDED	May 28, 2026
DOCKET	25-cv-0759-bhl
DISPOSITION	dismissed
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	Plaintiff proceeding pro se brought a 42 U.S.C. § 1983 action alleging race discrimination. Defendants moved for summary judgment based on failure to exhaust available administrative remedies. Plaintiff did not respond by the extended deadline.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	Summary judgment is appropriate where the undisputed facts show that the movant is entitled to judgment as a matter of law; under the applicable rules, uncontroverted factual assertions may be accepted as true when the opposing party fails to respond.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	unpublished district court decision
PARTIES	Clarence Albert Saffold, Jr. v. Kevin Bauer et al.

TOPICS

- summary judgment
- prisoners rights
- section 1983
- civil rights
- civil procedure

PRACTICE AREAS

civil procedure

civil rights

prisoner litigation

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether Defendants were entitled to summary judgment because Saffold failed to exhaust available administrative remedies before filing his § 1983 action.
2. Whether Saffold's pending motions for a protective order should be denied as moot after dismissal of the action.

HOLDINGS

1. Defendants were entitled to summary judgment because Saffold failed to notify the institution of the nature of the alleged race-discrimination wrong and therefore failed to exhaust the available administrative remedies.
2. Saffold's motions for a protective order were denied as moot.

KEY QUOTATIONS

“Accordingly, because Saffold did not provide the institution with notice of the nature of the wrong at issue in this case, Saffold failed to exhaust the available administrative remedies and Defendants are entitled to summary judgment.” (Disposition)

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Saffold alleged that Defendants violated his constitutional rights by discriminating against him because of his race. The undisputed facts, deemed true after Saffold failed to respond, showed that he did not notify the institution that he believed he was being treated differently from other inmates because of his race.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

The court previously allowed Saffold to proceed on a constitutional race-discrimination claim. Defendants moved for summary judgment on March 13, 2026. After the court extended Saffold's response deadline at his request, he failed to respond; the court deemed Defendants' proposed facts admitted under the applicable rules, granted summary judgment, dismissed the action without prejudice, and denied Saffold's motions for a protective order as moot.

DISPOSITION

dismissed

CASES CITED

- Dye v. Kingston, 130 F. App'x 52, 56 (7th Cir. 2005)

