

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE MIDDLE DISTRICT OF
FLORIDA, FORT MYERS DIVISION

Jorge Sanguinetti v. Collier County, Kevin Rambosk, Adam Dillman,
John Scaduto, David Drucks, Michael Puka, and David Crisp, Jr.

Sanguinetti · No. 2:21-cv-529-JLB-KCD · Decided February 20, 2026

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the Middle District of Florida grants defendants’ motions for summary judgment in Jorge Sanguinetti’s civil-rights action arising from his arrest and use of force by Collier County Sheriff’s Office deputies. The court concludes, among other things, that the plaintiff failed to establish municipal liability under 42 U.S.C. § 1983 and that probable cause defeated several false-arrest, false-imprisonment, and malicious-prosecution claims. The excerpt also addresses the handling of video evidence and the plaintiff’s improperly filed notice of clarification.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the Middle District of Florida, Fort Myers Division
WRITING FOR THE COURT	John L. Badalamenti
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the Middle District of Florida, Fort Myers Division
DECIDED	February 20, 2026
DOCKET	2:21-cv-529-JLB-KCD
DISPOSITION	other
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	Plaintiff brought claims under 42 U.S.C. §§ 1981 and 1983 and Florida law arising from his arrest and the force used during the arrest. The remaining defendants moved for summary judgment, and the court granted both motions.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	Summary judgment is appropriate 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 viewed evidence and drew reasonable inferences in the nonmovant's favor, except where video evidence squarely contradicted the nonmovant's account; it did not weigh evidence or make credibility determinations.

PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	unpublished district court opinion
PARTIES	Jorge Sanguinetti v. Collier County, Kevin Rambosk, Adam Dillman, John Scaduto, David Drucks, Michael Puka, David Crisp, Jr.

TOPICS

summary judgment

section 1983

qualified immunity

police misconduct

municipal liability

PRACTICE AREAS

civil rights

constitutional law

civil procedure

municipal law

government liability

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether summary judgment was proper on Sanguinetti's § 1983 claims against Collier County and the sheriff in his official capacity for failure to establish a policy or custom causing a constitutional violation.
2. Whether probable cause defeated Sanguinetti's state and federal false-arrest, false-imprisonment, and malicious-prosecution claims.
3. Whether the deputies were entitled to qualified immunity on the Florida battery and § 1983 excessive-force claims.
4. Whether the deputies were entitled to qualified immunity on the § 1983 failure-to-intervene claim.
5. Whether Sanguinetti established intentional race discrimination under 42 U.S.C. § 1981.
6. Whether Sanguinetti's Florida negligent-supervision and negligent-training claims failed for lack of an underlying tort and, as to training, sovereign immunity.

HOLDINGS

1. Claims against Collier County and the sheriff in his official capacity failed because Sanguinetti did not establish a constitutional violation, a deliberately indifferent policy or custom, or a causal connection between a policy or custom and the alleged injury. A single incident is insufficient to establish the longstanding and widespread practice ordinarily required for municipal liability.
2. Probable cause defeated Sanguinetti's state and federal false-arrest and false-imprisonment claims and his state and federal malicious-prosecution claims. Deputy Scaduto had probable cause to arrest Sanguinetti for trespass because lounge employees requested assistance in removing him and Scaduto ordered him to leave, yet he remained.
3. The deputies were entitled to qualified immunity on the § 1983 excessive-force claim, and the related Florida battery claim failed. The force used to remove, subdue, and handcuff Sanguinetti was reasonable under the circumstances, and Sanguinetti did not show a clearly established right prohibiting the officers' conduct.
4. The deputies were entitled to qualified immunity on Sanguinetti's failure-to-intervene claim because there was probable cause for the arrest and no excessive force.

5. Sanguinetti's equal-protection claim under §§ 1981 and 1983 failed because he did not allege or present evidence that defendants intentionally discriminated against him on the basis of race.
6. The Florida negligent-supervision and negligent-training claims failed because Sanguinetti did not establish an underlying tortious act outside the scope of employment. In addition, governmental immunity barred the negligent-training claim because decisions concerning police training are discretionary governmental functions.

KEY QUOTATIONS

“When opposing parties tell two different stories, one of which is blatantly contradicted by the record, so that no reasonable jury could believe it, a court should not adopt that version of the facts for purposes of ruling on a motion for summary judgment.” (10-12)

“A determination that an officer used excessive force ‘requires careful attention to the facts and circumstances of each particular case’ while ‘recogniz[ing] that the right to make an arrest . . . necessarily carries with it the right to use some degree of physical coercion or threat thereof to effect it.’” (22)

“The second and third methods “are generally known as ‘obvious clarity’ cases.”” (27-28)

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

On July 14, 2017, Sanguinetti and friends attempted to enter the Cavo Lounge in Naples, Florida, but lounge employees denied entry because of dress-code and suspected intoxication concerns and asked the group to leave. After an altercation involving Sanguinetti and Collier County deputies, officers forcibly removed him, used strikes, pepper spray, a taser, takedowns, and handcuffing measures, and arrested him for battery on a law-enforcement officer, resisting an officer, disorderly intoxication, and trespass. Sanguinetti disputed whether he grabbed a manager, shoved an officer, punched an officer, or resisted, but the court found that the video and undisputed circumstances supported probable cause and reasonable force. Jail intake documented bruises, abrasions, thumb discomfort, and numbness, but no serious visible injury.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Sanguinetti filed suit on July 15, 2021. The court dismissed portions of the initial pleadings because they constituted an impermissible shotgun pleading and permitted successive amendments. After the Fourth Amended Complaint became operative, certain claims were settled or dismissed, defendants answered, and the remaining defendants moved for summary judgment. The court granted both motions, struck Sanguinetti's Notice of Clarification, directed entry of judgment, and closed the case.

DISPOSITION

other

CASES CITED

- Wahl v. McIver, 773 F.2d 1169, 1174 (11th Cir. 1985)
- Betty K Agencies, Ltd. v. M/V MONADA, 432 F.3d 1333, 1339 (11th Cir. 2005)

- *Perez v. Wells Fargo N.A.*, 774 F.3d 1329, 1342 (11th Cir. 2014)
- *Gilmour v. Gates, McDonald & Co.*, 382 F.3d 1312, 1315 (11th Cir. 2004)
- *Anderson v. Liberty Lobby, Inc.*, 477 U.S. 242, 248, 251-52 (1986)
- *Hinson v. Bias*, 927 F.3d 1103, 1115-16 (11th Cir. 2019)
- *Latimer v. Roaring Toyz, Inc.*, 601 F.3d 1224, 1237 (11th Cir. 2010)
- *Rojas v. Florida*, 285 F.3d 1339, 1341-42 (11th Cir. 2002)
- *Daniels v. Twin Oaks Nursing Home*, 692 F.2d 1321, 1324 (11th Cir. 1982)
- *Scott v. Harris*, 550 U.S. 372, 378, 380-81 (2007)
- *Baxter v. Roberts*, 54 F.4th 1241, 1257-58 & n.12 (11th Cir. 2022)
- *Johnson v. City of Miami Beach*, 18 F.4th 1267, 1269 (11th Cir. 2021)
- *Hutton v. Strickland*, 919 F.2d 1531, 1542 (11th Cir. 1990)
- *Cook ex rel. Estate of Tessier v. Sheriff of Monroe County, Florida*, 402 F.3d 1092, 1115-16 (11th Cir. 2005)
- *Monell v. Department of Social Services of City of New York*, 436 U.S. 658, 690-94 (1978)
- *City of Canton, Ohio v. Harris*, 489 U.S. 378, 385 (1989)
- *Marantes v. Miami-Dade County*, 649 F. App'x 665, 672 (11th Cir. 2016)
- *Gold v. City of Miami*, 151 F.3d 1346, 1351 (11th Cir. 1998)
- *Craig v. Floyd County, Georgia*, 643 F.3d 1306, 1310 (11th Cir. 2011)
- *Washington v. Howard*, 25 F.4th 891, 899, 902 (11th Cir. 2022)
- *Crocker v. Beatty*, 995 F.3d 1232, 1244 (11th Cir. 2021)
- *United States v. Saunders*, 476 F.2d 5, 7 (5th Cir. 1973)
- *Watkins v. Dubreuil*, 820 F. App'x 940, 944 (11th Cir. 2020)
- *Burns v. GCC Beverages, Inc.*, 502 So. 2d 1217, 1218 (Fla. 1986)
- *Evans v. Hightower*, 117 F.3d 1318, 1320 (11th Cir. 1997)
- *Rivas v. Freeman*, 940 F.2d 1491, 1496 (11th Cir. 1991)
- *City of Miami v. Sanders*, 672 So. 2d 46, 47 (Fla. 3d DCA 1996)
- *Sullivan v. City of Pembroke Pines*, 161 F. App'x 906, 911 (11th Cir. 2006)
- *DaSilva v. Lamberti*, No. 08-62106, 2010 WL 680925, at *1 (S.D. Fla. Feb. 24, 2010)
- *Jordan v. Mosley*, 487 F.3d 1350, 1354 (11th Cir. 2007)
- *Baker v. City of Madison, Alabama*, 67 F.4th 1268, 1278 (11th Cir. 2023)
- *Simmons v. Bradshaw*, 879 F.3d 1157, 1163 (11th Cir. 2018)
- *Myrick v. Fulton County, Georgia*, 69 F.4th 1277, 1297 (11th Cir. 2023)
- *Piazza v. Jefferson County*, 923 F.3d 947, 951 (11th Cir. 2019)
- *Storck v. City of Coral Springs*, 354 F.3d 1307, 1314 (11th Cir. 2003)
- *Holloman ex rel. Holloman v. Harland*, 370 F.3d 1252, 1265-66 (11th Cir. 2004)
- *Gaines v. Wardynski*, 871 F.3d 1203, 1208-09 (11th Cir. 2017)
- *Lee v. Ferraro*, 284 F.3d 1188, 1194, 1198 (11th Cir. 2002)
- *Jackson v. Sauls*, 206 F.3d 1156, 1165 (11th Cir. 2000)

- *Mobley v. Palm Beach County Sheriff Department*, 783 F.3d 1347, 1356 (11th Cir. 2015)
- *Zivojinovich v. Barner*, 525 F.3d 1059, 1073 (11th Cir. 2008)
- *Nolin v. Isbell*, 207 F.3d 1253, 1258 n.4 (11th Cir. 2000)
- *Pinto v. Rambosk*, No. 2:19-CV-551-JLB-MRM, 2021 WL 3406253, at *13 (M.D. Fla. Aug. 4, 2021)
- *Cendan v. Trujillo*, 779 F. App'x 688, 690 (11th Cir. 2019)
- *Quinette v. Reed*, 805 F. App'x 696, 704 (11th Cir. 2020)
- *Hadley v. Gutierrez*, 526 F.3d 1324, 1330 (11th Cir. 2008)
- *Mullenix v. Luna*, 577 U.S. 7, 12 (2015)
- *Loftus v. Clark-Moore*, 690 F.3d 1200, 1204 (11th Cir. 2012)
- *Santamorena v. Georgia Military College*, 147 F.3d 1337, 1340 n.6 (11th Cir. 1998)
- *Coffin v. Brandau*, 642 F.3d 999, 1015 (11th Cir. 2011)
- *Kinnon v. Arcoub Gopman & Associates*, 490 F.3d 886, 891 (11th Cir. 2007)
- *Inman v. American Paramount Financial*, 517 F. App'x 744, 748 (11th Cir. 2013)
- *Acts Retirement-Life Communities, Inc. v. Estate of Zimmer*, 206 So. 3d 112, 114-15 (Fla. 4th DCA 2016)
- *Department of Environmental Protection v. Hardy*, 907 So. 2d 655, 660-61 (Fla. 5th DCA 2005)
- *Harrison v. Red Bull Distribution Co.*, 2019 WL 1117022, at *2 (M.D. Fla. Mar. 11, 2019)
- *Malicki v. Doe*, 814 So. 2d 347, 362 (Fla. 2002)
- *Footstar Corp. v. Doe*, 932 So. 2d 1272, 1278 (Fla. 2d DCA 2006)
- *Gutman v. Quest Diagnostics Clinical Laboratories, Inc.*, 707 F. Supp. 2d 1327, 1331-32 (S.D. Fla. 2010)
- *Johnson v. Scott*, 2013 WL 5928931, at *6 (M.D. Fla. Nov. 1, 2013)
- *Gualtieri v. Bogle*, 343 So. 3d 1267, 1275 (Fla. 2d DCA 2022)
- *Henderson v. Bowen*, 737 So. 2d 532, 534-35 (Fla. 1999)
- *Pollock v. Florida Department of Highway Patrol*, 882 So. 2d 928, 933 (Fla. 2004)
- *Kaisner v. Kolb*, 543 So. 2d 732, 737 (Fla. 1989)
- *Whitaker v. Miami-Dade County*, 126 F. Supp. 3d 1313, 1330 (S.D. Fla. 2015)