

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF
TENNESSEE, EASTERN DIVISION

Gregory D. Douglas v. Whiteville Correctional Facility, et al.

Douglas · No. 1:24-cv-01049-JDB-tmp · Decided June 18, 2026

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the Western District of Tennessee dismissed Gregory D. Douglas’s 42 U.S.C. § 1983 action with prejudice after he failed to file an amended complaint by the court-ordered deadline. The court recommended that the dismissal count as a strike under 28 U.S.C. § 1915(g), certified that an appeal would not be taken in good faith, and directed the Clerk to enter judgment.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the Western District of Tennessee, Eastern Division
WRITING FOR THE COURT	J. Daniel Breen
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the Western District of Tennessee, Eastern Division
DECIDED	June 18, 2026
DOCKET	1:24-cv-01049-JDB-tmp
DISPOSITION	dismissed
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	A pro se prisoner brought a civil-rights action under 42 U.S.C. § 1983. After the court screened the complaint, dismissed claims for failure to state a claim, and granted leave to amend certain claims without prejudice, the court dismissed the case with prejudice when the plaintiff failed to amend by the deadline.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	Unknown; district-court order with no reported citation.
PARTIES	Gregory D. Douglas v. Whiteville Correctional Facility, et al.

TOPICS

- section 1983
- prisoners rights
- civil rights
- appellate procedure
- civil procedure

PRACTICE AREAS

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether the action should be dismissed with prejudice after the plaintiff failed to file an amended complaint by the court-ordered deadline.
2. Whether the dismissal should be recommended as a strike under 28 U.S.C. § 1915(g).
3. Whether the court should certify under Federal Rule of Appellate Procedure 24(a) and 28 U.S.C. § 1915(a)(3) that an appeal would not be taken in good faith.

HOLDINGS

1. Because Douglas failed to file an amended complaint or seek an extension within the time permitted by the screening order, the case was dismissed with prejudice in its entirety.
2. The court recommended that the dismissal be treated as a strike under the Prison Litigation Reform Act.
3. The court certified that any appeal by Douglas would not be taken in good faith.

KEY QUOTATIONS

“Accordingly, the case is DISMISSED WITH PREJUDICE in its entirety for the reasons discussed in the Screening Order.”

“Pursuant to Federal Rule of Appellate Procedure 24(a) and 28 U.S.C. § 1915(a)(3), it is CERTIFIED that any appeal in this matter by Douglas would not be taken in good faith.”

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Gregory D. Douglas, a Tennessee prisoner incarcerated at Whiteville Correctional Facility, filed a pro se complaint under 42 U.S.C. § 1983. After screening, the court dismissed his claims for failure to state a claim and allowed him to amend claims dismissed without prejudice. Douglas neither amended his complaint nor sought an extension before the court-ordered deadline expired.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Douglas filed the complaint on March 5, 2024, and was granted leave to proceed in forma pauperis. On May 18, 2026, the court screened the complaint, dismissed the claims for failure to state a claim, and allowed amendment of claims dismissed without prejudice within twenty-one days. Douglas did not file an amended complaint or request an extension before the June 8, 2026 deadline. The court dismissed the case with prejudice, recommended that the dismissal count as a strike, certified that an appeal would not be taken in good faith, and directed the clerk to enter judgment.

DISPOSITION

dismissed

CASES CITED

- Simons v. Washington, 996 F.3d 350, 353 (6th Cir. 2021)

OPINION

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF
TENNESSEE EASTERN DIVISION

GREGORY D. DOUGLAS, Plaintiff, v. No. 1:24-cv-01049-JDB-tmp WHITEVILLE
CORRECTIONAL FACILITY, et al., Defendants.

ORDER DISMISSING CASE WITH PREJUDICE, CERTIFYING THAT AN APPEAL WOULD
NOT BE TAKEN IN GOOD FAITH, NOTIFYING PLAINTIFF OF THE APPELLATE FILING
FEE AND STRIKE RECOMMENDATION, AND CLOSING CASE

On March 5, 2024, Plaintiff, Gregory D. Douglas, Tennessee Department of Correction prisoner number 458144, who is currently incarcerated at the Whiteville Correctional Facility in Whiteville, Tennessee, filed a pro se civil complaint pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983.

(Docket Entry (“D.E”) 1 (the “Complaint”).) On June 13, 2024, Douglas filed a motion for leave to proceed in forma pauperis (D.E. 4), which the Court granted and assessed the \$350.00 filing fee in accordance with the Prison Litigation Reform Act (“PLRA”), 28 U.S.C. § 1915, et seq. (D.E. 5.)

On May 18, 2026, the Court screened the Complaint pursuant to the PLRA and dismissed Plaintiff’s claims for failure to state a claim for relief. (D.E. 6 (the “Screening Order”).) The Court granted leave to amend the claims dismissed without prejudice within twenty-one days of the date of the Screening Order. (Id. at PageID 34-35.)

The Court warned Douglas that if he “fails to file an amended complaint within the time specified, the Court will dismiss the case with prejudice and enter judgment.” (Id. at PageID 35.) Plaintiff’s deadline to submit amended claims expired on June 8, 2026. He has neither submitted an amended complaint nor sought an extension of time to do so.

Accordingly, the case is DISMISSED WITH PREJUDICE in its entirety for the reasons discussed in the Screening Order. The Court recommends that this dismissal be treated as a strike pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915(g). See Simons v. Washington, 996 F.3d 350, 353 (6th Cir. 2021). Pursuant to Federal Rule of Appellate Procedure 24(a) and 28 U.S.C. § 1915(a)(3), it is CERTIFIED that any appeal in this matter by Douglas would not be taken in good faith.

If Plaintiff nevertheless chooses to file a notice of appeal, he must either pay the entire \$605.00 appellate filing fee or submit a new in forma pauperis affidavit and, if incarcerated, a current,

certified copy of his inmate trust account statement for the last six months, in compliance with 28 U.S.C. § 1915(a)-(b).

The Clerk is DIRECTED to enter judgment in accordance with the Screening Order. IT IS SO ORDERED this 18th day of June 2026. s/ J. DANIEL BREEN UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

Retrieved from lawtools.ai · <https://lawtools.ai/cases/federal/united-states-district-court-for-the-western-district-of-ten/2026/gregory-d-douglas-v-whiteville-correctional-facility-et-al-g2an21hq>