

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF
MICHIGAN, SOUTHERN DIVISION

Jamerson v. Wilkinson

Jamerson · No. 1:22-cv-529 · Decided December 9, 2025

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the Western District of Michigan adopted a magistrate judge’s report and recommendation and granted the remaining defendants’ motion for summary judgment. The court concluded that Plaintiff John Jamerson failed to exhaust claims concerning an alleged fall from an upstairs cell because his grievance identified an incident date after he had been transferred to a ground-floor housing unit, and he did not address the evidentiary deficiencies identified in the report.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the Western District of Michigan, Southern Division
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Paul L. Maloney
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the Western District of Michigan
DECIDED	December 9, 2025
DOCKET	1:22-cv-529
DISPOSITION	affirmed
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	Plaintiff objected to a magistrate judge's report and recommendation recommending that the remaining defendants' motion for summary judgment be granted. The district court adopted the report and recommendation and granted summary judgment to defendants.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	The district court reviews de novo those portions of a magistrate judge's report and recommendation to which a party makes specific objections.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	Unknown
PARTIES	John Jamerson v. M. Wilkinson and remaining defendants

TOPICS

- summary judgment
- prisoners rights
- civil rights
- civil procedure

PRACTICE AREAS

civil procedure

prisoner civil rights

civil rights

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether Jamerson's objections to the magistrate judge's report and recommendation were sufficiently specific to warrant de novo review.
2. Whether defendants were entitled to summary judgment because the grievance used to exhaust Jamerson's claim identified an incident date on which he was housed in a ground-floor unit and therefore did not exhaust a claim arising from his earlier Housing Unit 6 assignment.

HOLDINGS

1. Only specific objections to a magistrate judge's report and recommendation are entitled to de novo review; objections that do not address the relevant grounds for the recommendation do not require further de novo consideration.
2. Defendants were entitled to summary judgment because Jamerson's grievance identified February 12, 2021 as the incident date, but the evidence showed that he had been transferred to ground-floor Housing Unit 3 on February 1, 2021; the grievance therefore did not exhaust a claim arising from his earlier Housing Unit 6 assignment.

KEY QUOTATIONS

"The Magistrate Judge concluded that Defendants demonstrated a lack of genuine issue of material fact that Plaintiff did not have an upstairs cell on February 12, 2021, the date of the alleged incident identified in the grievance Plaintiff used to exhaust his claim against these defendants."

"Accordingly, the court ADOPTS the report and recommendation (ECF No. 62) and GRANTS Defendants' motion for summary judgment (ECF No. 54)."

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Jamerson was transferred to Muskegon Correctional Facility in October 2020 and initially housed in Housing Unit 6, where at least some cells required use of stairs. He was assigned to Lock 123 from October 22 to October 29, 2020, and to Lock 232 from October 29, 2020, until his transfer to Housing Unit 3 on February 1, 2021. Housing Unit 3 had only ground-floor cells. In a grievance filed April 11, 2021, Jamerson identified the incident date as February 12, 2021, and alleged that he had a bottom-bunk detail, was moved upstairs, and fell down stairs; the court concluded that this date conflicted with the evidence showing he was then housed in Unit 3.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Jamerson, a prisoner, brought civil-rights claims against Michigan Department of Corrections personnel. The remaining defendants moved for summary judgment, and the magistrate judge recommended granting the motion. Jamerson filed objections, but the district court concluded that his objections did not address the discrepancy between the date identified in his grievance and the dates of his housing assignment, or other evidentiary deficiencies identified in the report and recommendation.

DISPOSITION

affirmed

CASES CITED

- Unnamed authority, 806 F.2d 636, 637 (6th Cir. 1986) (per curiam)

OPINION

Wilkinson

PER CURIAM.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

WESTERN DISTRICT OF MICHIGAN

SOUTHERN DIVISION

JOHN JAMERSON, #185490,)

Plaintiff,)) No. 1:22-cv-529 -v-)) Honorable Paul L. Maloney

M. WILKINSON, .,)

Defendants.))

ORDER ADOPTING REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION

Plaintiff Jamerson, a prisoner under the control of the Michigan Department of Corrections, alleges Defendants violated his civil rights. Two defendants remain and they filed a motion for summary judgment (ECF No. 54). The Magistrate Judge issued a report recommending the court grant Defendants' motion (ECF No. 62 R&R). Plaintiff filed objections (ECF No. 63). The court will adopt the R&R. After being served with a report and recommendation (R&R) issued by a magistrate judge, a party has fourteen days to file written objections to the proposed findings and recommendations. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1); Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(b)(2). A district court judge reviews de novo the portions of the R&R to which objections have been filed. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1); Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(b)(3). Only those objections that are specific are entitled to a de novo review under the statute. , 806 F.2d 636, 637 (6th Cir. 1986) (per curiam). MDOC transferred Plaintiff to the Muskegon Correctional Facility in October 2020 where he was assigned to Housing Unit 6 (ECF No. 24-3 PageID.326). Accessing at least some of the cells in Housing Unit 6 requires the use of stairs (ECF No. 55-4 PageID.335). Plaintiff was initially assigned to "Lock" 123 from October 22, 2020, to October 29, 2020 (ECF No. 24-3 PageID.326). He was then moved to "Lock" 232 from October 29, 2020, to February 1, 2021 () MDOC transferred Plaintiff from Housing Unit 6 to Housing Unit 3 on February 1, 2021 (). The cells in Housing Unit 3 do not require the use of stairs (ECF No. 55-4 PageID.336). Concerning the remaining Defendants, Plaintiff exhausted his claim against them in a grievance filed on April 11, 2021, in which he identified the date of the incident as February 12, 2021. In the grievance he mentions (1) that he has a bottom bunk detail, (2) he was moved upstairs, and (3) he fell down the stairs and injured himself (ECF No. 37 PageID.248; ECF

No. 24-3 PageID.136). As part of their motion for summary judgment, Defendants produced evidence that on February 1, 2021, Plaintiff had been transferred to Unit 3, which only has ground floor cells. The Magistrate Judge concluded that Defendants demonstrated a lack of genuine issue of material fact that Plaintiff did not have an upstairs cell on February 12, 2021, the date of the alleged incident identified in the grievance Plaintiff used to exhaust his claim against these defendants. Plaintiff's objection does not address this discrepancy in the dates. He alleges he fell while housed in Unit 6 and that some discovery would show that these defendants had knowledge that he should not have been assigned an upstairs cell because of his detail. The court overrules Plaintiff's objection. Plaintiff did not exhaust any claim against these defendants that occurred during the time Plaintiff was assigned to Housing Unit 6. His claim likely arose between October 29, 2020, and February 1, 2021. The court can infer that Lock 232 was a cell on the second floor. In addition, Plaintiff does not address the discussion in the R&R in footnote 1. The Magistrate Judge also points out several other evidentiary lapses relevant to any claim against these defendants that arose prior to February

1. Plaintiff's objection does not address those other evidentiary lapses.

Accordingly, the court ADOPTS the report and recommendation (ECF No. 62) and GRANTS Defendants' motion for summary judgment (ECF No. 54). IT IS SO ORDERED. Date: December 9, 2025 /s/ Paul L. Maloney Paul L. Maloney United States District Judge