

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF
OHIO, EASTERN DIVISION

Shannon McDaniel v. Warden Ryan Walters

McDaniel · No. 3:22-cv-02051 · Decided March 9, 2026

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the Northern District of Ohio adopts a magistrate judge’s Report and Recommendation and dismisses Shannon McDaniel’s 28 U.S.C. § 2254 habeas petition. The court rejects claims of ineffective assistance of counsel and due process violations arising from McDaniel’s guilty pleas to sexual battery charges, concluding that alleged erectile dysfunction did not preclude the charged conduct. The court also overrules McDaniel’s objections and declines to issue a certificate of appealability.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the Northern District of Ohio, Eastern Division
WRITING FOR THE COURT	David A. Ruiz
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the Northern District of Ohio, Eastern Division
DECIDED	March 9, 2026
DOCKET	3:22-cv-02051
DISPOSITION	dismissed
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	Petition for a writ of habeas corpus under 28 U.S.C. § 2254 following a state-court guilty plea and conviction; the district court reviewed objections to a magistrate judge's Report and Recommendation.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	The district court conducts de novo review of portions of a magistrate judge's Report and Recommendation to which proper objections are made. General objections that merely restate prior arguments or express disagreement have the same effect as a failure to object. The habeas claims were evaluated under the applicable Strickland and Hill standards.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	Unpublished district court memorandum opinion; nonprecedential
PARTIES	Shannon McDaniel v. Warden Ryan Walters

TOPICS

federal habeas corpus ineffective assistance due process plea bargaining post-conviction relief

PRACTICE AREAS

Federal habeas corpus Post-conviction relief Criminal procedure Ineffective assistance of counsel

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether trial counsel was ineffective for failing to inform the court of McDaniel's alleged erectile dysfunction and whether that condition rendered his guilty plea involuntary, unintelligent, or unknowing.
2. Whether McDaniel was denied due process because he allegedly admitted to sexual-battery offenses he could not have committed.
3. Whether the magistrate judge's Report and Recommendation should be adopted over McDaniel's objections.

HOLDINGS

1. McDaniel failed to establish ineffective assistance of counsel or an involuntary, unintelligent, or unknowing guilty plea. His alleged erectile dysfunction did not establish that the charged sexual-battery conduct was impossible and did not show deficient performance or prejudice.
2. McDaniel's due-process claim failed because alleged impotence or an inability to perform vaginal intercourse did not preclude his ability to commit sexual battery through other prohibited forms of sexual conduct.
3. The district court adopted the magistrate judge's Report and Recommendation after de novo review of McDaniel's objections because the objections identified no legal or factual error.

KEY QUOTATIONS

“Thus, the very foundation of Petitioner’s argument—that he could not have committed sexual battery while experiencing erectile dysfunction—does not preclude his ability to satisfy the elements of the crime.”

(PageID# 427-428)

“Ground Two essentially repackages Petitioner’s argument from Ground One, but as a due process violation.” (PageID# 429)

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

McDaniel was charged in Ohio with fourteen counts of sexual battery involving his adopted daughter. After waiving indictment, he pleaded guilty to all counts under a negotiated plea agreement and received consecutive twelve-month sentences totaling fourteen years. In his federal habeas petition, he argued that erectile dysfunction made the charged conduct impossible and that counsel was ineffective for failing to present medical evidence, and he repackaged that argument as a due-process claim.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

McDaniel filed a § 2254 petition raising ineffective-assistance and due-process claims. The case was stayed while unexhausted claims proceeded in the Ohio Supreme Court. After the return of writ and traverse, the magistrate judge recommended dismissal on the merits. The district court conducted de novo review of the objections, overruled them, adopted the Report and Recommendation, dismissed the petition, and declined to issue a certificate of appealability.

DISPOSITION

dismissed

CASES CITED

- Campbell v. United States District Court, 501 F.2d 196, 206 (9th Cir. 1974), cert. denied, 419 U.S. 879
- Howard v. Secretary of Health & Human Services, 932 F.2d 505, 509 (6th Cir. 1991)
- Austin v. Commissioner of Social Security, 2021 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 75330, 2021 WL 1540389, at *4 (N.D. Ohio Apr. 19, 2021)
- Strickland v. Washington, 466 U.S. 668 (1984)
- Hill v. Lockhart, 474 U.S. 52, 58 (1985)
- United States v. Dawson, 2020 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 3578, 2020 WL 109137, at *1 (N.D. Ohio Jan. 9, 2020)