

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF
FLORIDA, PENSACOLA DIVISION

Javonte Ramsey a/k/a Jovonte Ramsey v. Captain Hughes, et al.

No. 3:25cv202-MW/ZCB, United States District Court for the Northern District of Florida, Pensacola Division
(January 5, 2026)

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the Northern District of Florida adopted the Magistrate Judge’s report and recommendation in Javonte Ramsey v. Captain Hughes, et al. The court granted defendants’ motion to dismiss as to requests for declaratory and injunctive relief, denied dismissal based on plaintiff’s litigation-history disclosures, and referred the case for further consideration of Eighth Amendment claims for monetary damages.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the Northern District of Florida, Pensacola Division
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Mark E. Walker
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the Northern District of Florida, Pensacola Division
DECIDED	January 5, 2026
DOCKET	3:25cv202-MW/ZCB
DISPOSITION	other
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	The district court reviewed a magistrate judge's report and recommendation on Defendants' motion to dismiss. The court adopted the report and recommendation, partially granted the motion as to declaratory and injunctive relief, denied the motion insofar as it sought dismissal based on Plaintiff's disclosure of litigation history, and referred the case back to the magistrate judge.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	The district court considered the report and recommendation without a hearing; the order does not specify a separate standard of review.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	nonprecedential
PARTIES	Javonte Ramsey a/k/a Jovonte Ramsey v. Captain Hughes, et al.

TOPICS

motions to dismiss

sanctions

civil rights

cruel and unusual punishment

damages

PRACTICE AREAS

Civil procedure

Civil rights

Constitutional law

Remedies

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether Plaintiff's requests for declaratory and injunctive relief should be dismissed.
2. Whether Plaintiff's alleged failure to accurately disclose his litigation history warranted dismissal of the action as a sanction.

HOLDINGS

1. Plaintiff's requests for declaratory and injunctive relief were dismissed.
2. Dismissal was not warranted as a sanction for Plaintiff's alleged violations concerning disclosure of his litigation history; the remainder of Defendants' motion to dismiss was denied.

KEY QUOTATIONS

"This Court is not persuaded, under the unique facts of this case, that dismissal ought to be imposed as a sanction."

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Plaintiff brought Eighth Amendment claims seeking monetary damages, as well as declaratory and injunctive relief, against Defendants. Defendants argued that dismissal was warranted because Plaintiff initially failed to fully disclose his litigation history and later made an insufficient disclosure in his amended complaint. The district court concluded that dismissal as a sanction was not warranted under the unique facts of the case.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Defendants moved to dismiss based on Plaintiff's initial failure to fully disclose his litigation history and his allegedly insufficient disclosure in an amended complaint. The magistrate judge recommended dismissing Plaintiff's requests for declaratory and injunctive relief but denying the remainder of the motion. The district court accepted and adopted that recommendation.

DISPOSITION

other

REMAND INSTRUCTIONS

The case was referred back to the magistrate judge for further consideration of Plaintiff's Eighth Amendment claims for monetary damages against Defendants.

CASES CITED

- McNair v. Johnson, 143 F. 4th 1301, 1308 (11th Cir. 2025)

OPINION

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT NORTHERN DISTRICT OF FLORIDA
PENSACOLA DIVISION JAVONTE RAMSEY a/ka/ JOVONTE RAMSEY, Plaintiff, v. Case
No.: 3:25cv202-MW/ZCB CAPTAIN HUGHES, et al., Defendants.
_____/ ORDER ACCEPTING AND ADOPTING REPORT AND
RECOMMENDATION This Court has considered, without hearing, the Magistrate Judge's Report
and Recommendation.

ECF No. 46. The Magistrate Judge recommends granting Defendants' motion to dismiss in part with respect to Plaintiff's requests for declaratory and injunctive relief and denying the balance of the motion premised on Plaintiff's failure to accurately disclose his litigation history. Defendants contend that dismissal is necessary in this case based on Plaintiff's initial failure to fully disclose his litigation history and his subsequent insufficient disclosure in his amended complaint.

But this Court has "considerable discretion" when exercising its inherent authority to manage its docket and determining whether to sanction a violation of the local rules. McNair v. Johnson, 143 F. 4th 1301, 1308 (11th Cir. 2025). This Court is not persuaded, under the unique facts of this case, that dismissal ought to be imposed as a sanction.

Accordingly, IT IS ORDERED: The report and recommendation, ECF No. 46, is accepted and adopted as this Court's opinion. Defendants' motion to dismiss, ECF No. 40, is GRANTED in part and DENIED in part. Plaintiff's requests for declaratory and injunctive relief are DISMISSED.

The balance of the motion to dismiss is DENIED. This case is referred back to the Magistrate Judge for further consideration of Plaintiff's Eighth Amendment claims for monetary damages against Defendants. SO ORDERED on January 5, 2026. s/Mark E. Walker United States District Judge