

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF KANSAS

Teill Reynolds v. Mabel Adams, et al.

Reynolds v. Adams · No. 5:24-cv-03132-JAR; Case No. 24-3132-JAR · Decided May 14, 2026

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the District of Kansas grants Defendants’ motion for summary judgment in a prisoner civil-rights action concerning medical treatment for Plaintiff Teill Reynolds’s fractured wrist. The court holds that Plaintiff failed to establish deliberate indifference under the Eighth Amendment against medical providers Mabel Adams and Dr. Bryan Wilson, including claims based on delayed care. The court declines to exercise supplemental jurisdiction over Plaintiff’s Kansas negligence and intentional-infliction-of-emotional-distress claims.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the District of Kansas
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Julie A. Robinson
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the District of Kansas
DECIDED	May 14, 2026
DOCKET	5:24-cv-03132-JAR; Case No. 24-3132-JAR
DISPOSITION	other
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	Plaintiff, proceeding pro se and in forma pauperis, brought claims under 42 U.S.C. § 1983 for deliberate indifference to serious medical needs and delayed medical care, along with Kansas-law negligence and intentional-infliction-of-emotional-distress claims. Defendants Adams and Wilson moved for summary judgment; Plaintiff moved to amend his summary-judgment motion, and Defendants moved to strike that motion.
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 evidence and reasonable inferences are viewed in the light most favorable to the nonmoving party. For the Eighth Amendment medical-care claims, the court applied the objective and subjective components of deliberate indifference and required substantial harm for a delayed-care claim.

PRECEDENTIAL VALUE

unpublished district court memorandum and order; precedential status unknown

TOPICS

section 1983 prisoners rights summary judgment cruel and unusual punishment civil procedure

PRACTICE AREAS

prisoner civil rights constitutional torts medical malpractice and health law federal civil procedure

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether Adams was deliberately indifferent under the Eighth Amendment by initially denying Reynolds access to the emergency clinic and directing him to follow the nonemergency sick-call procedure.
2. Whether Adams's conduct caused substantial harm sufficient to support an Eighth Amendment delayed-medical-care claim.
3. Whether Dr. Wilson was deliberately indifferent under the Eighth Amendment by treating and splinting Reynolds's wrist at the prison, rather than transferring him to a hospital for an immediate x-ray and surgery.
4. Whether Reynolds could maintain a separate deliberate-indifference claim under the Fourteenth Amendment when he was a convicted inmate rather than a pretrial detainee.
5. Whether the court should exercise supplemental jurisdiction over Reynolds's Kansas-law negligence and intentional-infliction-of-emotional-distress claims after resolving all federal claims.

HOLDINGS

1. A convicted inmate's medical-care claim is governed by the Eighth Amendment, not the Fourteenth Amendment, which applies to pretrial detainees; Reynolds's separate Fourteenth Amendment claim was foreclosed as a matter of law.
2. Adams was entitled to summary judgment because the evidence did not show that she knew of and disregarded an excessive risk to Reynolds's health or safety. Her direction that Reynolds use the nonemergency sick-call process, based on her understanding of the prison medical-care procedure and her belief that he was not in immediate distress, did not establish deliberate indifference.
3. Reynolds failed to show that the delay attributable to Adams caused substantial harm, such as lifelong handicap, permanent loss, or considerable pain, and therefore could not establish an Eighth Amendment violation.
4. Dr. Wilson was entitled to summary judgment because he did not refuse to treat Reynolds, stabilized the wrist, treated his pain, scheduled an x-ray for the next available date, and was not shown to have acted with deliberate indifference or to have caused substantial harm by not transferring Reynolds to a hospital immediately.

5. The court declined to exercise supplemental jurisdiction over the remaining Kansas-law negligence and intentional-infliction-of-emotional-distress claims and dismissed them without prejudice.

KEY QUOTATIONS

“Deliberate indifference involves ‘something more than mere negligence,’ but ‘something less than acts or omissions for the very purpose of causing harm or with knowledge that harm will result.’” (Section III.A)

“Nonetheless, ‘a deliberate indifference claim will arise when ‘a medical professional completely denies care although presented with recognizable symptoms which potentially create a medical emergency.’” (Section III.A.1.a)

“There is no support in the record for Plaintiff’s assertion that his condition warranted emergency care off site.” (Section III.A.2)

“Notions of comity and federalism demand that a state court try its own lawsuits, absent compelling reasons to the contrary.” (Section III.B)

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Reynolds, an inmate at Lansing Correctional Facility, fractured his wrist in a shower fall on June 15, 2023. Adams turned him away from the emergency clinic during his first visit on June 16 because she believed the injury was nonemergent and instructed him to use the ordinary sick-call procedure; he returned later that day and was treated. Dr. Wilson had the wrist splinted, ordered pain and anti-inflammatory medication, and scheduled an x-ray for the following Monday because the facility's x-ray technician had left for the weekend. The x-ray confirmed a distal-radius fracture, and Reynolds underwent outpatient surgery on June 20, 2023, with records indicating that he healed well.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

The action originally named eight defendants. The claims against KDOC, Centurion, and several KDOC employees were dismissed, leaving Adams and Wilson. The district court granted Defendants' motion for summary judgment on the federal claims, declined supplemental jurisdiction over the state-law claims, dismissed those claims without prejudice, and ruled that Plaintiff's motion to amend and Defendants' motion to strike were moot.

DISPOSITION

other

CASES CITED

- City of Harriman v. Bell, 590 F.3d 1176, 1181 (10th Cir. 2010)
- Bones v. Honeywell International, Inc., 366 F.3d 869, 875 (10th Cir. 2004)
- Wright ex rel. Trust Co. of Kan. v. Abbott Labs., Inc., 259 F.3d 1226, 1231–32 (10th Cir. 2001)
- Thomas v. Metropolitan Life Insurance, 631 F.3d 1153, 1160 (10th Cir. 2011)

- *Anderson v. Liberty Lobby, Inc.*, 477 U.S. 242, 248, 256 (1986)
- *Spaulding v. United Transportation Union*, 279 F.3d 901, 904 (10th Cir. 2002)
- *Adams v. American Guarantee & Liability Insurance*, 233 F.3d 1242, 1246 (10th Cir. 2000)
- *Mitchell v. City of Moore*, 218 F.3d 1190, 1197–98 (10th Cir. 2000)
- *Celotex Corp. v. Catrett*, 477 U.S. 317, 327 (1986)
- *Conaway v. Smith*, 853 F.2d 789, 794 (10th Cir. 1988)
- *Hall v. Bellmon*, 935 F.2d 1106, 1110 (10th Cir. 1991)
- *Hastings v. Campbell*, 47 F. App'x 559, 560 (10th Cir. 2002)
- *Sanchez v. Guzman*, 105 F.4th 1285, 1299 (10th Cir. 2024)
- *Strain v. Regalado*, 977 F.3d 984, 989, 994 (10th Cir. 2020)
- *Estelle v. Gamble*, 429 U.S. 97, 104 (1976)
- *Farmer v. Brennan*, 511 U.S. 825, 835, 837 (1994)
- *Miller v. Glanz*, 948 F.2d 1562, 1569 (10th Cir. 1991)
- *Prince v. Sheriff of Carter County*, 28 F.4th 1033, 1044, 1047 (10th Cir. 2022)
- *Sealock v. Colorado*, 218 F.3d 1205, 1209, 1211 (10th Cir. 2000)
- *Hunt v. Uphoff*, 199 F.3d 1220, 1224 (10th Cir. 1999)
- *Mata v. Saiz*, 427 F.3d 745, 753 (10th Cir. 2005)
- *Lucas v. Turn Key Health Clinics, LLC*, 58 F.4th 1127, 1137, 1139 (10th Cir. 2023)
- *Requena v. Roberts*, 893 F.3d 1195, 1216 (10th Cir. 2018)
- *Garrett v. Stratman*, 254 F.3d 946, 950 (10th Cir. 2001)
- *Al-Turki v. Robinson*, 762 F.3d 1188, 1192–93 (10th Cir. 2014)
- *Kikumura v. Osagie*, 461 F.3d 1269, 1292 (10th Cir. 2006)
- *City of Chicago v. International College of Surgeons*, 522 U.S. 156, 172–73 (1997)
- *Carnegie-Mellon University v. Cohill*, 484 U.S. 343, 350 (1988)
- *Ball v. Renner*, 54 F.3d 664, 669 (10th Cir. 1995)
- *Villalpando ex rel. Villalpando v. Denver Health & Hospital Authority*, 65 F. App'x 683, 688 (10th Cir. 2003)
- *United States v. Botefuhr*, 309 F.3d 1263, 1273 (10th Cir. 2002)
- *Thatcher Enterprises v. Cache County Corp.*, 902 F.2d 1472, 1478 (10th Cir. 1990)
- *Gaston v. Ploeger*, 297 F. App'x 738, 746 (10th Cir. 2008)