

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF
FLORIDA

Keion Nathaniel Chambers v. Ricky Dixon, et al.

Chambers · No. 4:26-cv-52-AW-MJF · Decided March 16, 2026

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the Northern District of Florida adopted the amended report and recommendation and dismissed the action without prejudice. The dismissal was based on the plaintiff’s failure to comply with local rules and accurately disclose his prior litigation history.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the Northern District of Florida
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Allen Winsor
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the Northern District of Florida
DECIDED	March 16, 2026
DOCKET	4:26-cv-52-AW-MJF
DISPOSITION	dismissed
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	The district court reviewed Plaintiff's objections de novo and adopted the magistrate judge's amended report and recommendation recommending dismissal without prejudice.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	De novo review of the issues raised in Plaintiff's objections to the amended report and recommendation.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	unpublished district court order
PARTIES	Keion Nathaniel Chambers v. Ricky Dixon, et al.

TOPICS

- sanctions
- civil procedure
- pleadings

PRACTICE AREAS

- civil procedure
- civil rights

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether dismissal without prejudice was appropriate because Plaintiff failed to comply with the court's local rules by failing to fully and accurately disclose his litigation history.
2. Whether Plaintiff's asserted lack of access to his files excused his failure to disclose known prior litigation.
3. Whether dismissal without prejudice would effectively operate as a dismissal with prejudice because the claims might become time-barred.

HOLDINGS

1. Dismissal without prejudice was appropriate because Plaintiff failed to fully and accurately disclose his prior litigation as required by the court's local rules.
2. Plaintiff's lack of complete files did not excuse his failure to disclose the prior litigation information that he did know.
3. Dismissal without prejudice would not effectively operate as a dismissal with prejudice because the complaint alleged conduct occurring in 2025 and there was no indication that the claims would be time-barred.

KEY QUOTATIONS

“This case is dismissed without prejudice based on Plaintiff’s failure to comply with the court’s local rules and failure to disclose litigation history.”

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Plaintiff filed a complaint alleging conduct occurring in 2025. He did not fully and accurately disclose his prior litigation on the court's required form. Although he asserted that he lacked details because he did not have all of his files, the district court concluded that he could have disclosed the information he did know. Because the claims arose from recent conduct, the court found no indication that dismissal without prejudice would operate as a dismissal with prejudice through expiration of the limitations period.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

The magistrate judge recommended dismissal because Plaintiff failed to fully and accurately disclose his prior litigation on the court-required form. Plaintiff objected, explaining that he lacked details because he did not have all of his files. The district court considered the objections de novo, adopted the amended report and recommendation, directed entry of judgment dismissing the case without prejudice, and ordered the file closed.

DISPOSITION

dismissed

CASES CITED

- *McNair v. Johnson*, 143 F.4th 1301, 1307-08 (11th Cir. 2025)

OPINION

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF
FLORIDA TALLAHASSEE DIVISION KEION NATHANIEL CHAMBERS, Plaintiff, v. Case
No. 4:26-cv-52-AW-MJF RICKY DIXON, et al., Defendants.

_____/ ORDER ADOPTING REPORT AND
RECOMMENDATION Having carefully considered the matter, I now adopt the amended report
and recommendation (ECF No. 10) and incorporate it into this order.

I have considered de novo the issues raised in Plaintiff's objections (ECF No. 12). As the
magistrate judge explains, Plaintiff did not fully and accurately disclose his prior litigation on the
court's required form.

Under these circumstances, I agree with the magistrate judge that dismissal without prejudice is
appropriate. See *McNair v. Johnson*, 143 F.4th 1301, 1307-08 (11th Cir. 2025) (affirming dismissal
in similar circumstances).

In his objections, Plaintiff explains he lacked the details because he did not have all his files. But
even if he lacked details of his missing case, he could have disclosed what he did know. Allowing
pro se litigants to avoid sanction by saying they misremembered would undermine the purpose of
the rule. I have considered the fact that the complaint alleges conduct in 2025, meaning there is no
indication that the claims will be time barred.

Thus, there is no indication that this dismissal without prejudice will act in effect as a dismissal
with prejudice. Plaintiff may file a new lawsuit that complies with the rules. The clerk will enter a
judgment that says, "This case is dismissed without prejudice based on Plaintiff's failure to
comply with the court's local rules and failure to disclose litigation history." The clerk will then
close the file.

SO ORDERED on March 16, 2026. s/ Allen Winsor Chief United States District Judge