

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF  
ARKANSAS, HARRISON DIVISION

William E. Smith v. Sheriff John Montgomery, Baxter County,  
Arkansas, and Deputy Jordan Ikari

Smith v. Montgomery · No. 3:24-cv-03034-CDC · Decided January 20, 2026

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the Western District of Arkansas granted summary judgment to Sheriff John Montgomery and Deputy Jordan Ikari in William E. Smith’s 42 U.S.C. § 1983 action. The court held that the undisputed facts established no Fourth Amendment excessive-force violation during Smith’s arrest and that Smith presented no evidence linking the defendants to his other alleged deprivations at the detention center. Smith’s claims against Montgomery and Ikari were dismissed with prejudice.

CASE DETAILS

|                       |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                    |
|-----------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| COURT                 | United States District Court for the Western District of Arkansas, Harrison Division                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                               |
| WRITING FOR THE COURT | Christy Comstock                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                   |
| JURISDICTION          | United States District Court for the Western District of Arkansas, Harrison Division                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                               |
| DECIDED               | January 20, 2026                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                   |
| DOCKET                | 3:24-cv-03034-CDC                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                  |
| DISPOSITION           | dismissed                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                          |
| PROCEDURAL POSTURE    | Plaintiff brought a pro se action under 42 U.S.C. § 1983. Defendants moved for summary judgment, and the court granted the motion on all remaining claims.                                                                                                                                                                                         |
| STANDARD OF REVIEW    | Summary judgment is proper when, viewing the facts and reasonable inferences in favor of the nonmoving party, the record shows no genuine dispute of material fact and the movant is entitled to judgment as a matter of law. The nonmoving party must identify specific evidence supporting a genuine issue sufficient to support a jury verdict. |
| PRECEDENTIAL VALUE    | Unknown                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                            |

## TOPICS

section 1983

summary judgment

police misconduct

prisoners rights

civil rights

## PRACTICE AREAS

Civil rights

constitutional law

federal civil procedure

prisoner litigation

## QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether Ikari's use of force to take Smith to the ground during the arrest violated the Fourth Amendment.
2. Whether Smith presented evidence creating a genuine dispute that Montgomery or Ikari were personally responsible for unconstitutional conditions of confinement, inadequate medical care, interference with legal access, or the theft of Smith's benefit cards.
3. Whether defendants were entitled to summary judgment based on Smith's failure to respond to their statement of undisputed material facts.

## HOLDINGS

1. Because Smith failed to respond as required, the material facts asserted by defendants were deemed admitted for purposes of the summary-judgment motion, and the resulting record was insufficient to support his claims.
2. Ikari's use of force to subdue Smith and force him to the ground was objectively reasonable under the circumstances and therefore did not violate the Fourth Amendment.
3. Montgomery and Ikari were entitled to summary judgment because Smith presented no evidence establishing their personal involvement or a causal link to the alleged deprivations.

## KEY QUOTATIONS

*“Accordingly, it was objectively reasonable for Ikari to use force to subdue Plaintiff and force him to the ground. Thus no constitutional violation occurred at the time of Plaintiff’s arrest, and the Defendants are entitled to summary judgment on his claim for excessive force.”* (Section III)

*“Put simply, even if Plaintiff could prove that the conditions of his confinement or the quality of his medical treatment deprived him of some federal right, he cannot prove that the deprivation was inflicted by Defendant Montgomery.”* (Section III)

## FACTUAL BACKGROUND

During Smith's arrest, Deputy Ikari responded to reports that Smith had threatened people with a handgun and fired shots. Smith displayed or concealed a gun, failed to comply with commands to drop it and raise his hands, closed the door, and then refused to lie on the ground; Ikari forced him to the ground, fracturing Smith's nasal bones, after which Smith received hospital treatment. Smith later alleged inadequate jail conditions and medical care, interference with legal access, and theft of benefit cards, but the undisputed record showed that he received

a sleeping pad, later a medical mattress, medications, and medical treatment, and contained no evidence that Montgomery or Ikari personally caused the alleged deprivations.

## PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Smith filed suit on July 29, 2024, alleging excessive force during arrest, unconstitutional conditions of confinement, inadequate medical care, interference with legal mail and court access, and failure to investigate theft of his benefits cards. He voluntarily dismissed his claims against Jail Administrator Tabitha Maze in March 2025. After Montgomery and Ikari moved for summary judgment, Smith failed to respond to their statement of undisputed material facts and did not supplement his response despite multiple extensions. The court deemed the material facts admitted, granted summary judgment, and dismissed the claims with prejudice.

## DISPOSITION

dismissed

## CASES CITED

- *Matsushita Electric Industrial Co. v. Zenith Radio Corp.*, 475 U.S. 574, 586-87 (1986)
- *National Bank of Commerce v. Dow Chemical Co.*, 165 F.3d 602, 607 (8th Cir. 1999)
- *Anderson v. Liberty Lobby, Inc.*, 477 U.S. 242, 249 (1986)
- *Metge v. Baehler*, 762 F.2d 621, 625 (8th Cir. 1985)
- *Scott v. Harris*, 550 U.S. 372, 380 (2007)
- *Graham v. Connor*, 490 U.S. 386, 394-97 (1989)
- *Madewell v. Roberts*, 909 F.2d 1203, 1208 (8th Cir. 1990)