

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF KANSAS

David L. Woodward v. Holly Shaw, et al.

Woodward v. Shaw · No. 25-3252-JWL · Decided February 13, 2026

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the District of Kansas addresses a pro se prisoner’s claims under 42 U.S.C. § 1983 arising from an alleged inmate assault, conditions of confinement, and loss of personal property. The court dismisses the conditions-of-confinement and property-loss claims, dismisses several defendants, and orders the Kansas Department of Corrections to prepare a Martinez Report concerning the failure-to-protect claim.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the District of Kansas
WRITING FOR THE COURT	John W. Lungstrum
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the District of Kansas
DECIDED	February 13, 2026
DOCKET	25-3252-JWL
DISPOSITION	other
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	Pro se prisoner civil-rights action under 42 U.S.C. § 1983 undergoing initial screening under 28 U.S.C. § 1915A. After the court directed plaintiff to show cause why the complaint should not be dismissed, plaintiff filed a response.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	Initial screening under 28 U.S.C. § 1915A; dismissal for failure to state a claim where the complaint does not allege facts sufficient to establish a constitutional violation.
PARTIES	David L. Woodward v. Holly Shaw, Jeff Zmuda, Jesse Howes, Unit Team Manager Keon, Unit Team Supervisor Speer, Unit Team Cleaver, Unnamed Unit Team Manager Pod B6, Two unknown Unit Team Officers on Pod B6

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

- Whether Woodward stated an Eighth Amendment conditions-of-confinement claim based on his placement and alleged lack of clothing, supplies, property, and privileges in segregation.

2. Whether Woodward stated a Fourteenth Amendment due-process claim for the loss or deprivation of his personal property when Kansas provides an adequate state post-deprivation remedy.
3. Whether defendants Zmuda and Howes could remain in the action absent allegations of their personal participation in the alleged constitutional violations.
4. Whether the court could complete screening of the failure-to-protect claim without additional factual information from KDOC officials.

HOLDINGS

1. The allegations concerning Woodward's confinement in segregation did not state a constitutional claim, and the claim for damages based on those conditions was dismissed because he did not allege a physical injury arising from the confinement conditions.
2. Woodward's loss-of-property claim did not state a federal due-process violation because Kansas provides an adequate state post-deprivation remedy.
3. Defendants Zmuda and Howes were dismissed because Woodward did not allege facts showing their personal participation in the alleged constitutional violations.
4. The court could not complete screening of Woodward's failure-to-protect claim without additional information and therefore ordered appropriate KDOC officials to prepare a Martinez Report.

KEY QUOTATIONS

“No Federal civil action may be brought by a prisoner confined in a jail, prison, or other correctional facility, for mental or emotional injury suffered”

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Woodward, an inmate at the Lansing Correctional Facility, alleged that three inmates entered his cell on April 1, 2025, attacked him, and stole personal property after unknown officials opened the cell door. He further alleged that, after requesting protective custody, he was held in a shower unit, a crisis cell, and disciplinary segregation, where he claimed inadequate clothing, bedding, cleaning supplies, property access, and privileges for approximately 55 days. He asserted that his property was lost or unavailable and that prison officials failed to respond adequately to a later property claim.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Woodward alleged failure to protect, unconstitutional conditions of confinement, and deprivation of personal property arising from events at the Lansing Correctional Facility. The court's prior memorandum and order to show cause identified pleading deficiencies, including failure to allege a substantial risk of serious harm, an atypical and significant hardship, the absence of an adequate state post-deprivation remedy, physical injury, and personal participation by certain defendants. After considering Woodward's response, the court dismissed the conditions-of-confinement and property claims, dismissed Zmuda, Howes, and Shaw, and ordered KDOC officials to prepare a Martinez Report before the court completed screening of the failure-to-protect claim.

DISPOSITION

other

Retrieved from lawtools.ai · <https://lawtools.ai/cases/federal/united-states-district-court-for-the-district-of-kansas/2026/david-l-woodward-v-holly-shaw-et-al-s2hqwfvgg>