

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE MIDDLE DISTRICT OF
PENNSYLVANIA

Peter D. Goines Jr. v. Warden Adam Ogle, et al.

Goines v. Ogle · No. 3:24-cv-2155 · Decided January 23, 2026

SUMMARY

The memorandum addresses Defendants’ motion for summary judgment in a 42 U.S.C. § 1983 action brought by an inmate alleging that York County Prison officials failed to protect him from an assault, failed to intervene, failed to train or supervise, and provided inadequate medical care. The court denies summary judgment on exhaustion grounds because a genuine issue of fact exists regarding whether administrative remedies were properly exhausted. The court grants summary judgment on the failure-to-protect, failure-to-intervene, failure-to-train or supervise, and inadequate-medical-care claims to the extent addressed in the provided text.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the Middle District of Pennsylvania
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Robert D. Mariani
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the Middle District of Pennsylvania
DECIDED	January 23, 2026
DOCKET	3:24-cv-2155
DISPOSITION	other
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	Plaintiff brought an action under 42 U.S.C. § 1983 concerning an inmate assault, alleged failure to protect and intervene, failure to train or supervise, inadequate medical care, and a Fourteenth Amendment due process violation. Defendants moved for summary judgment under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 56.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	Summary judgment is appropriate when the record shows no genuine dispute as to any material fact and the movant is entitled to judgment as a matter of law. The court viewed disputed facts and reasonable inferences in the light most favorable to the nonmoving party, but required the nonmovant to identify specific record evidence rather than rely on pleadings, conclusory assertions, or a mere scintilla of evidence.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	unpublished district court memorandum; persuasive authority only

PARTIES

Peter D. Goines Jr. v. Warden Adam Ogle, Brian Horner, Keith Gembe, John Hammel

TOPICS

summary judgment

prisoners rights

section 1983

civil rights

due process

PRACTICE AREAS

prisoner civil rights

constitutional law

civil procedure

summary judgment

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether Goines exhausted available administrative remedies under the Prison Litigation Reform Act.
2. Whether defendants were deliberately indifferent to a substantial risk of serious harm by failing to protect Goines from the inmate assault.
3. Whether defendants failed to intervene in the assault despite having a realistic and reasonable opportunity to do so.
4. Whether defendants were liable under Section 1983 for failing to train or supervise prison staff or for inadequate inmate classification, monitoring, or staffing.
5. Whether defendants were deliberately indifferent to Goines's serious medical needs.
6. Whether the alleged conduct violated Goines's Fourteenth Amendment due process rights.

HOLDINGS

1. Summary judgment was not warranted on exhaustion because the record presented a genuine issue of fact regarding whether Goines properly exhausted his administrative remedies.
2. Defendants were entitled to summary judgment on Goines's failure-to-protect claim because the evidence did not show that they knew of and disregarded an excessive risk to his health or safety.
3. Defendants were entitled to summary judgment on the failure-to-intervene claim because Goines produced no evidence that they had a realistic and reasonable opportunity to intervene.
4. Defendants were entitled to summary judgment on the failure-to-train or supervise claim because Goines offered only conclusory assertions and no evidence of deliberate indifference, a deficient training or supervision program, a pattern of constitutional violations, or a highly predictable single-incident violation.
5. Defendants were entitled to summary judgment on the inadequate-medical-care claim because the evidence showed prompt treatment and did not establish deliberate indifference by the nonmedical defendants.
6. Goines failed to establish a Fourteenth Amendment due process claim because the alleged lack of care amounted, at most, to negligence.

KEY QUOTATIONS

“Therefore, for a prisoner-plaintiff to plausibly allege an Eighth Amendment failure-to-protect claim, they must allege that: (1) they were incarcerated under conditions posing a substantial risk of serious harm (the objective element); and (2) the prison Officials involved had a sufficiently culpable state of mind (the subjective element).” (at 12)

“The Court finds that a reasonable jury could not conclude that Defendants knew of and disregarded an excessive risk to Goines’ health or safety.” (at 13)

“There is simply no evidence that Defendants ever had “a realistic and reasonable opportunity to intervene” to protect Goines but refused to do so.” (at 15)

“At best, the failure to timely send Goines to an outside hospital for a follow-up appointment may state a negligence claim which does not, as a matter of law, rise to deliberate indifference to a serious medical condition required to establish an Eighth Amendment violation.” (at 20)

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Goines was a sentenced prisoner at York County Prison and was classified as a level 3, high-risk inmate. At his request, he was transferred on June 11, 2024, to a larger housing area containing other level 3 inmates, where five inmates unexpectedly assaulted him on June 14, 2024, over the use of an electronic tablet. Correctional staff discovered Goines shortly after the approximately two-minute assault, summoned emergency medical assistance, and Goines was treated at the prison and transported to an outside hospital. Goines alleged that he later did not receive a follow-up medical appointment within the timeframe recommended by the outside hospital and that he was housed in unsanitary segregation conditions.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Goines commenced the action by complaint and proceeded on an amended complaint. Defendants moved for summary judgment. The court considered exhaustion as a factfinder under Third Circuit precedent, found a genuine dispute regarding exhaustion, denied summary judgment on that ground, and granted summary judgment on the substantive constitutional claims.

DISPOSITION

other

CASES CITED

- Rau v. Allstate Fire & Casualty Insurance Co., 793 F. App'x 84, 87 (3d Cir. 2019)
- Weitzner v. Sanofi Pasteur Inc., 909 F.3d 604, 613 (3d Cir. 2018)
- Anderson v. Liberty Lobby, Inc., 477 U.S. 242, 248, 252 (1986)
- Celotex Corp. v. Catrett, 477 U.S. 317, 323 (1986)
- Lujan v. National Wildlife Federation, 497 U.S. 871, 888 (1990)
- Big Apple BMW, Inc. v. BMW of North America, Inc., 974 F.2d 1358, 1363 (3d Cir. 1992), cert. denied, 507 U.S. 912 (1993)

- Scott v. Harris, 550 U.S. 372, 380 (2007)
- Ross v. Blake, 578 U.S. 632, 639, 642 (2016)
- Porter v. Nussle, 534 U.S. 516, 532 (2002)
- Williams v. Beard, 482 F.3d 637, 639 (3d Cir. 2007)
- Booth v. Churner, 532 U.S. 731, 741 (2001)
- Nyhuis v. Reno, 204 F.3d 65, 67, 73, 77-78 (3d Cir. 2000)
- Spruill v. Gillis, 372 F.3d 218, 227-32, 231, 236 (3d Cir. 2004)
- Camp v. Brennan, 219 F.3d 279 (3d Cir. 2000)
- Rinaldi v. United States, 904 F.3d 257, 266 (3d Cir. 2018)
- Woodford v. Ngo, 548 U.S. 81, 93 (2006)
- Downey v. Pennsylvania Department of Corrections, 968 F.3d 299, 305 (3d Cir. 2020)
- Shifflett v. Korszniak, 934 F.3d 356, 365 (3d Cir. 2019)
- Hamilton v. Leavy, 117 F.3d 742, 746 (3d Cir. 1997)
- Farmer v. Brennan, 511 U.S. 825, 833-34, 837, 842-43 (1994)
- Smith v. Mensinger, 293 F.3d 641, 650-51 (3d Cir. 2002)
- Forrest v. Parry, 930 F.3d 93, 105-06 (3d Cir. 2019)
- Porter v. City of Philadelphia, 975 F.3d 374, 383 (3d Cir. 2020)
- Estate of Roman v. City of Newark, 914 F.3d 789, 798 (3d Cir. 2019)
- Andrews v. City of Philadelphia, 895 F.2d 1469, 1480 (3d Cir. 1990)
- Bielewicz v. Dubinon, 915 F.2d 845, 850 (3d Cir. 1990)
- Thomas v. Cumberland County, 749 F.3d 217, 223-25 (3d Cir. 2014)
- Connick v. Thompson, 563 U.S. 51, 62, 64 (2011)
- Wood v. Williams, 568 F. App'x 100, 104 (3d Cir. 2014)
- Yoast v. Pottstown Borough, 437 F. Supp. 3d 403, 433 (E.D. Pa. 2020)
- Williams v. Borough of West Chester, 891 F.2d 458, 460 (3d Cir. 1989)
- Mitchell v. Gershen, 466 F. App'x 84, 86 (3d Cir. 2011)
- Montgomery v. Pinchak, 294 F.3d 492, 499 (3d Cir. 2002)
- Monmouth County Correctional Institutional Inmates v. Lanzaro, 834 F.2d 326, 347 (3d Cir. 1987)
- Young v. Kazmerski, 266 F. App'x 191, 194 (3d Cir. 2008)
- White v. Napoleon, 897 F.2d 103, 110 (3d Cir. 1990)
- Davidson v. Cannon, 474 U.S. 344, 347-48 (1986)
- Daniels v. Williams, 474 U.S. 327, 330 (1986)