

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF PUERTO RICO

Gladys Torres-Correa v. Instituto de Ojos y Piel Inc., et al.

Torres-Correa · No. Civil No. 23-01025 (MAJ); 3:23-cv-01025 · Decided December 1, 2025

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the District of Puerto Rico granted Defendants’ motion for summary judgment in a medical malpractice action arising from ophthalmic surgery. The court held that Plaintiff failed to properly controvert Defendants’ factual assertions and offered no admissible evidence establishing the applicable standard of care, breach, or causation. The case was dismissed with prejudice.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the District of Puerto Rico
WRITING FOR THE COURT	María Antongiorgi-Jordán
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the District of Puerto Rico
DECIDED	December 1, 2025
DOCKET	Civil No. 23-01025 (MAJ); 3:23-cv-01025
DISPOSITION	dismissed
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	Defendants moved for summary judgment in a Puerto Rico medical-malpractice action after the court excluded Plaintiff's proffered expert testimony. The court granted summary judgment and dismissed the action with prejudice.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	Summary judgment is appropriate when there is no genuine dispute as to any material fact and only questions of law remain. The moving party bears the initial burden of showing the absence of a genuine issue of material fact; the nonmovant must produce specific facts sufficient to establish a genuine dispute. The court views evidence in the light most favorable to the nonmovant and does not weigh evidence or make credibility determinations.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	Unpublished district court opinion; limited persuasive value.

TOPICS

- summary judgment
- medical malpractice
- standard of care
- expert testimony
- civil procedure

PRACTICE AREAS

civil procedure

medical malpractice

professional negligence

evidence

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether Defendants were entitled to summary judgment because Plaintiff failed to identify admissible evidence establishing the applicable medical standard of care, a deviation from that standard, and causation.
2. Whether Plaintiff was entitled under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 56(d) to defer or deny consideration of summary judgment because discovery allegedly remained ongoing.
3. Whether Plaintiff's failure to comply with the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure and District of Puerto Rico Local Rule 56 required the court to deem Defendants' factual assertions admitted.

HOLDINGS

1. Summary judgment was warranted because Plaintiff failed to produce admissible evidence establishing the standard of care, breach, or causation, each of which was essential to her medical-malpractice claims.
2. Plaintiff was not entitled to defer or deny consideration of summary judgment under Rule 56(d).
3. Plaintiff's unsupported factual assertions did not establish a genuine dispute and Defendants' properly supported factual assertions were deemed admitted.

KEY QUOTATIONS

“Summary judgment is appropriate when there is no genuine dispute as to any material fact and only questions of law remain.” (III)

“Since a claimant “bears the burden of producing specific facts sufficient to” defeat summary judgment, González-Cabán, 48 F.4th at 14, Plaintiff’s claims must be dismissed.” (IV)

“This case is hereby DISMISSED WITH PREJUDICE.” (IV)

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Plaintiff underwent ophthalmic surgery performed by Defendants and allegedly developed complications, including loss of eyesight. She alleged that Defendants negligently failed to provide appropriate follow-up care, including after permitting her to return to Florida during the COVID-19 period. Plaintiff sought to present expert testimony to establish the standard of care, breach, and causation, but the court excluded that testimony, and Plaintiff identified no other admissible evidentiary support.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Plaintiff sued Instituto de Ojos y Piel, Inc., Dr. Miguel Santiago García, and unnamed insurers, alleging negligence arising from complications following ophthalmic surgery. The court granted Defendants' motion in limine excluding Plaintiff's expert testimony. Defendants then moved for summary judgment, arguing that Plaintiff lacked admissible evidence of the standard of care, breach, or causation. The court deemed Defendants'

factual assertions admitted under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 56 and District of Puerto Rico Local Rule 56 because Plaintiff's opposition lacked record citations, then granted summary judgment and dismissed the case with prejudice.

DISPOSITION

dismissed

CASES CITED

- López-Hernández v. Terumo P.R. LLC, 64 F.4th 22, 26 (1st Cir. 2023)
- Ramírez-Rivera v. DeJoy, 693 F. Supp. 3d 210, 213 (D.P.R. 2023)
- White v. Hewlett Packard Enterprise Co., 985 F.3d 61, 68 (1st Cir. 2021)
- Flood v. Bank of Am. Corp., 780 F.3d 1, 7 (1st Cir. 2015)
- Taite v. Bridgewater State Univ., Bd. of Trs., 999 F.3d 86, 93 (1st Cir. 2021)
- Celotex Corp. v. Catrett, 477 U.S. 317, 323, 325 (1986)
- Feliciano-Muñoz v. Rebarber-Ocasio, 970 F.3d 53, 62 (1st Cir. 2020)
- E.E.O.C. v. Kohl's Dept. Stores, Inc., 774 F.3d 127, 131 (1st Cir. 2014)
- González-Cabán v. JR Seafood Inc., 48 F.4th 10, 14 (1st Cir. 2022)
- Cochran v. Quest Software, Inc., 328 F.3d 1, 6 (1st Cir. 2003)
- Pina v. Children's Place, 740 F.3d 785, 802 (1st Cir. 2014)
- Anderson v. Liberty Lobby, Inc., 477 U.S. 242, 255 (1986)
- Martínez-Serrano v. Quality Health Servs. of P.R., Inc., 568 F.3d 278, 285-286 (1st Cir. 2009)
- Rivera Rodríguez v. Quality Health Servs. of P.R., Civ. No. 18-1287, 2022 WL 3445348, at *3 (D.P.R. Aug. 4, 2022)
- Cortés Irizarry v. Corporación Insular de Seguros, 111 F.3d 184, 190 (1st Cir. 1997)
- Forde v. Concho Corp., Civ. No. 23-01052, 2025 WL 320683, at *3 n.3 (D.P.R. Jan. 28, 2025)