

**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

OPINION

Douglas

PER CURIAM.

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