

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

**Bobby J. Smith v. Unknown Goostrey**

Smith v. Goostrey · No. 1:22-cv-753 · Decided February 20, 2026

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the Western District of Michigan adopted a magistrate judge’s report and recommendation in a prisoner civil rights action. The court granted defendants’ motion for summary judgment, dismissed the federal retaliation claim with prejudice, and declined supplemental jurisdiction over the state-law claim, dismissing it without prejudice.

CASE DETAILS

|                       |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                          |
|-----------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| COURT                 | United States District Court for the Western District of Michigan, Southern Division                                                                                                                                                                                                                     |
| WRITING FOR THE COURT | Paul L. Maloney                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                          |
| JURISDICTION          | United States District Court for the Western District of Michigan, Southern Division                                                                                                                                                                                                                     |
| DECIDED               | February 20, 2026                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                        |
| DOCKET                | 1:22-cv-753                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                              |
| DISPOSITION           | other                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                    |
| PROCEDURAL POSTURE    | The district court reviewed a magistrate judge's report and recommendation, considered the prisoner's objections de novo, adopted the recommendation, granted defendants' motion for summary judgment on the federal retaliation claim, and declined supplemental jurisdiction over the state-law claim. |
| STANDARD OF REVIEW    | The district court reviewed de novo those portions of the magistrate judge's report and recommendation to which specific objections were made, under 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1) and Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 72(b)(3).                                                                                 |
| PRECEDENTIAL VALUE    | unpublished                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                              |
| PARTIES               | Bobby J. Smith v. Unknown Goostrey, Johnson                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                              |

TOPICS

summary judgment

section 1983

civil rights

subject matter jurisdiction

civil procedure

## PRACTICE AREAS

civil rights

prisoner litigation

federal civil procedure

summary judgment

supplemental jurisdiction

## QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether the magistrate judge's report and recommendation should be reviewed de novo based on the plaintiff's objections.
2. Whether defendants were entitled to summary judgment on the plaintiff's federal retaliation claim because the plaintiff could not establish causation.
3. Whether the court should exercise supplemental jurisdiction over the remaining state-law claim.

## HOLDINGS

1. A district court reviews de novo the portions of a magistrate judge's report and recommendation to which specific objections are filed; nonspecific objections do not require de novo review under the statute.
2. Defendants were entitled to summary judgment because Smith could not establish causation for his retaliation claim; the evidence showed that his continued temporary custody was unrelated to his grievance.
3. The court declined to exercise jurisdiction over the remaining state-law claim after dismissing the federal claim and dismissed the state-law claim without prejudice.

## KEY QUOTATIONS

*"As a result, Defendants have demonstrated that the reason Plaintiff remained in temporary custody was unrelated to the grievance."*

## FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Bobby Smith, a Michigan Department of Corrections prisoner, alleged that defendants violated his civil rights through retaliation. The retaliation claim concerned Smith's remaining in temporary segregation pending transfer. The Security Classification Committee gave Smith the option of remaining in temporary segregation until transfer, and Smith identified no record evidence contradicting that fact. The court concluded that the reason for his continued temporary custody was unrelated to his grievance.

## PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Plaintiff, a prisoner proceeding without counsel, asserted federal civil-rights and state-law claims. Defendants Goostrey and Johnson moved for summary judgment. The magistrate judge recommended granting summary judgment and dismissing the federal claim, while declining jurisdiction over the state-law claim. Plaintiff objected, but the district court overruled the objections, adopted the report and recommendation, granted

summary judgment, dismissed the federal retaliation claim with prejudice, and dismissed the state-law claim without prejudice.

#### DISPOSITION

other

#### CASES CITED

- 806 F.2d 636, 637 (6th Cir. 1986) (per curiam)

#### OPINION

Goostrey

PER CURIAM.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

WESTERN DISTRICT OF MICHIGAN

SOUTHERN DIVISION

BOBBY J. SMITH, #482352, )

Plaintiff, ) ) No. 1:22-cv-753 -v- ) ) Honorable Paul L. Maloney

UNKNOWN GOOSTREY, ., )

Defendants. ) )

#### ORDER ADOPTING REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION

Plaintiff Bobby Smith, a prisoner under the control of the Michigan Department of Corrections, alleges the defendants violated his civil rights. Two defendants remain. Two claims also remain, one under federal law and one under state law. Defendants Goostrey and Johnson filed a motion for summary judgment (ECF No. 59). The Magistrate Judge issued a report recommending the court grant the motion and dismiss the federal claim (ECF No. 66). The Magistrate Judge recommends declining to exercise jurisdiction over the state law claim. Plaintiff, who does not have counsel to assist him, filed objections (ECF No. 67). The court will adopt the recommendations of the Magistrate Judge. After being served with a report and recommendation (R&R) issued by a magistrate judge, a party has fourteen days to file written objections to the proposed findings and recommendations. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1); Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(b)(2). A district court judge reviews de novo the portions of the R&R to which objections have been filed. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1); Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(b)(3). Only those objections that are specific are entitled to a de novo review under the statute. , 806 F.2d 636, 637 (6th Cir. 1986) (per curiam). The Magistrate Judge concludes that Plaintiff cannot establish causation for his retaliation claim. Plaintiff does not address the Magistrate Judge's summary of the law concerning retaliation and the causation element. Most of Plaintiff's objections fail to address the facts outlined in the R&R concerning causation and, therefore, do not provide a reason for the court to reject the R&R. In paragraph 6, Plaintiff asserts he was not voluntarily staying in temporary segregation because if he had been

told to leave and did not, he would have been issued a misconduct ticket. The court overrules the objection. The Magistrate Judge accurately summarized the evidence in the record. The Security Classification Committee gave Plaintiff the option of staying in temporary segregation until his transfer. Plaintiff has not pointed to any evidence in the record to contradict this fact. As a result, Defendants have demonstrated that the reason Plaintiff remained in temporary custody was unrelated to the grievance. For these reasons, the court ADOPTS the report and recommendation (ECF No. 66). The court GRANTS Defendants' motion for summary judgment (ECF No. 59). The court dismisses Plaintiff's retaliation claim with prejudice and declines to exercise jurisdiction over Plaintiff's state law claim, which is dismissed without prejudice. IT IS SO ORDERED. Date: February 20, 2026 /s/ Paul L. Maloney Paul L. Maloney United States District Judge