

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

David Goodykoontz v. State of Ohio

Goodykoontz · No. 1:24-cv-145 · Decided December 1, 2025

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the Southern District of Ohio adopts the Magistrate Judge’s Report and Recommendation after no timely objections were filed. The court grants the State of Ohio’s motion for summary judgment and denies David Goodykoontz’s motion for summary judgment.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the Southern District of Ohio, Western Division
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Michael R. Barrett
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the Southern District of Ohio, Western Division
DECIDED	December 1, 2025
DOCKET	1:24-cv-145
DISPOSITION	other
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	The district court reviewed the Magistrate Judge's Report and Recommendation on the parties' cross-motions for summary judgment. No party filed timely objections.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	unknown
PARTIES	David Goodykoontz v. State of Ohio

TOPICS

- summary judgment
- civil procedure

PRACTICE AREAS

- civil procedure
- prisoner civil rights

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether the district court should adopt the Magistrate Judge's Report and Recommendation when no timely objections were filed.
2. Whether Defendant's motion for summary judgment should be granted and Plaintiff's motion for summary judgment denied, consistent with the Report and Recommendation.

HOLDINGS

1. The district court adopted the Magistrate Judge's Report and Recommendation after determining that proper notice had been given and that no timely objections were filed.
2. Defendant's motion for summary judgment was granted, and Plaintiff's motion for summary judgment was denied, consistent with the adopted Report and Recommendation.

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

The order contains no substantive factual background concerning the underlying dispute. It addresses the parties' cross-motions for summary judgment and the absence of objections to the Magistrate Judge's Report and Recommendation.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

The Magistrate Judge issued a Report and Recommendation on November 3, 2025. After notice under 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(C), no objections were filed, and the district court adopted the Report and Recommendation, granting Defendant's motion for summary judgment and denying Plaintiff's motion for summary judgment.

DISPOSITION

other

CASES CITED

- United States v. Walters, 638 F.2d 947 (6th Cir. 1981)

OPINION

Goodykoontz

PER CURIAM.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF OHIO

WESTERN DIVISION

David Goodykoontz, Plaintiff, v. Case No. 1:24cv145 State of Ohio, Defendant.

ORDER

This matter is before the Court on the Report and Recommendation (“R&R”) filed by the Magistrate Judge on November 3, 2025 (Doc. 52). Proper notice has been given to the parties under 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(C), including notice that the parties may forfeit rights on appeal if

they failed to file objections to the R&R in a timely manner. *United States v. Walters*, 638 F.2d 947 (6th Cir. 1981). No objections to the Magistrate Judge's R&R (Doc. 52) have been filed and the time to do so has expired. Accordingly, it is ORDERED that the R&R (Doc. 52) of the Magistrate Judge is hereby ADOPTED. Consistent with the recommendation by the Magistrate Judge, Defendant's motion for summary judgment (Doc. 38) is GRANTED, and Plaintiff's motion for summary judgment (Doc. 29) is DENIED. IT IS SO ORDERED. s/Michael R. Barrett Michael R. Barrett, Judge United States District Court 1