

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF
INDIANA, INDIANAPOLIS DIVISION

Kevin L. Martin v. Sgt. Fish, et al.

Martin v. Fish · No. 1:24-cv-00074-SEB-KMB · Decided March 2, 2026

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the Southern District of Indiana granted summary judgment to Sgt. Fish and Nurse Agboola in Kevin L. Martin's Eighth Amendment deliberate-indifference action. The court held that Sgt. Fish reasonably relied on medical personnel and that Nurse Agboola's assessment and clearance of Martin did not constitute deliberate indifference. The court also concluded that alleged violations of departmental policies did not independently establish a constitutional violation.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the Southern District of Indiana, Indianapolis Division
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Sarah Evans Barker
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the Southern District of Indiana
DECIDED	March 2, 2026
DOCKET	1:24-cv-00074-SEB-KMB
DISPOSITION	other
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	Prisoner civil-rights action under 42 U.S.C. § 1983 alleging Eighth Amendment deliberate indifference to serious medical needs; defendants moved for summary judgment.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	Summary judgment is proper when there is no genuine dispute as to any material fact and the movant is entitled to judgment as a matter of law. The court views the record and draws reasonable inferences in favor of the nonmoving party, without weighing evidence or making credibility determinations.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	Unknown; federal district court opinion with no reported citation identified.
PARTIES	Kevin L. Martin v. Sgt. Fish, Nurse Agboola

TOPICS

summary judgment

prisoners rights

cruel and unusual punishment

section 1983

civil procedure

PRACTICE AREAS

Civil rights

Prisoner litigation

Constitutional law

Federal civil procedure

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether Sgt. Fish was deliberately indifferent to Martin's serious medical needs by relying on Nurse Agboola's assessment and clearance.
2. Whether Nurse Agboola was deliberately indifferent by assessing Martin and determining that he did not require medical treatment.
3. Whether alleged violations of prison policies, including failure to sign a visitor log or create a medical report, established a constitutional violation.
4. Whether defendants were entitled to summary judgment on Martin's Eighth Amendment claims.

HOLDINGS

1. Sgt. Fish was entitled to summary judgment because the record showed that he responded to Martin's fall and relied on medical personnel to determine the appropriate course of care, with no evidence that he knew or should have known that Martin required additional treatment.
2. Nurse Agboola was entitled to summary judgment because no evidence showed that his assessment and decision to clear Martin departed so substantially from accepted professional judgment as to constitute deliberate indifference.
3. Alleged violations of departmental policies, rules, or procedures, including failure to sign a visitor log or create a report, do not by themselves establish a constitutional violation.
4. Martin failed to produce evidence from which a reasonable jury could find that either defendant consciously disregarded a serious risk to his health; therefore, defendants were entitled to summary judgment.

KEY QUOTATIONS

“A motion for summary judgment asks the Court to find that a trial is unnecessary because there is no genuine dispute as to any material fact and, instead, the movant is entitled to judgment as a matter of law.”

“Accordingly, no reasonable juror could find that Sgt. Fish was deliberately indifferent to Mr. Martin's serious medical needs.”

“Mr. Martin has produced no evidence to refute Nurse Agboola's testimony.”

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Martin, an inmate housed in restrictive housing at Pendleton Correctional Facility, claimed that he became hot and dizzy on July 6, 2022, fell, and hit his head. Sgt. Fish and Nurse Agboola entered his cell, and Agboola assessed him and cleared him, determining that there was no serious medical need requiring treatment. Martin

later testified that he received no treatment for the claimed injuries, never received stitches, and was not subsequently found to have a head injury or heat stroke.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Martin filed suit concerning an alleged head injury and possible heat-related illness while incarcerated at Pendleton Correctional Facility. Sgt. Fish and Nurse Agboola separately moved for summary judgment. The district court granted both motions, granted Martin's motion to clarify to the extent the order updated him about the case, and stated that final judgment would issue separately.

DISPOSITION

other

CASES CITED

- *Khungar v. Access Cmty. Health Network*, 985 F.3d 565, 572-73 (7th Cir. 2021)
- *Miller v. Gonzalez*, 761 F.3d 822, 827 (7th Cir. 2014)
- *Grant v. Trs. of Ind. Univ.*, 870 F.3d 562, 573-74 (7th Cir. 2017)
- *Celotex Corp. v. Catrett*, 477 U.S. 317, 323 (1986)
- *Boyce v. Moore*, 314 F.3d 884, 889 (7th Cir. 2002)
- *Estelle v. Gamble*, 429 U.S. 97, 103-04 n.10 (1976)
- *Thomas v. Blackard*, 2 F.4th 716, 721-22 (7th Cir. 2021)
- *Johnson v. Dominguez*, 5 F.4th 818, 824 (7th Cir. 2021)
- *Whiting v. Wexford Health Sources, Inc.*, 839 F.3d 658, 662 (7th Cir. 2016)
- *Dean v. Wexford Health Sources, Inc.*, 18 F.4th 214, 241 (7th Cir. 2021)
- *Berry v. Peterman*, 604 F.3d 435, 440 (7th Cir. 2010)
- *King v. Kramer*, 680 F.3d 1013, 1018 (7th Cir. 2012)
- *Zemlick v. Burkhart*, No. 24-2799, 2026 WL 172617, at *4 (7th Cir. Jan. 22, 2026)
- *Riccardo v. Rausch*, 375 F.3d 521, 525 (7th Cir. 2004)
- *Estate of Simpson v. Gorbett*, 863 F.3d 740, 746 (7th Cir. 2017)
- *Petties v. Carter*, 836 F.3d 722, 728-30 (7th Cir. 2016)
- *Cole v. Fromm*, 94 F.3d 254, 260 (7th Cir. 1996)
- *White v. City of Chicago*, 829 F.3d 837, 841 (7th Cir. 2016)