

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

Charles A. Jameson v. Chalmers P. Wylie Ambulatory Care Center, et
al.

Case No. 2:24-cv-4023 (S.D. Ohio Feb. 9, 2026) · No. 2:24-cv-4023 · Decided February 9, 2026

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the Southern District of Ohio adopted a magistrate judge’s Report and Recommendation and dismissed Charles A. Jameson’s pro se action without prejudice. The dismissal was based on Jameson’s failure to timely serve the defendants under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 4(m) and failure to show cause or address service-related deficiencies in his objection.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the Southern District of Ohio, Eastern Division
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Algenon L. Marbley
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the Southern District of Ohio, Eastern Division
DECIDED	February 9, 2026
DOCKET	2:24-cv-4023
DISPOSITION	dismissed
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	Plaintiff objected to a magistrate judge's Report and Recommendation recommending dismissal without prejudice for failure to timely serve the defendants and failure to prosecute. The district court reviewed the objections de novo, overruled them, adopted the Report and Recommendation, and dismissed the action without prejudice.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	De novo review of the portions of a magistrate judge's Report and Recommendation to which a party specifically objects under 28 U.S.C. § 636(b) and Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 72(b)(3). General objections do not preserve issues for review, although pro se filings are construed liberally.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	unpublished

PARTIES

Charles A. Jameson v. Chalmers P. Wylie Ambulatory Care Center,
Department of Veterans Affairs

TOPICS

service of process

civil procedure

PRACTICE AREAS

civil procedure

service of process

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether the district court should adopt the magistrate judge's recommendation to dismiss the action without prejudice for failure to timely serve the defendants.
2. Whether Jameson's objection adequately challenged the magistrate judge's recommendation or established good cause for extending the time for service.

HOLDINGS

1. The objection was properly overruled because Jameson did not address the service-of-process or failure-to-prosecute grounds underlying the recommendation; the Report and Recommendation was therefore adopted.
2. Dismissal without prejudice was warranted because Jameson failed to serve the defendants within the Rule 4(m) period and failed to show good cause for an extension.

KEY QUOTATIONS

"If a defendant is not served within 90 days after the complaint is filed, the court . . . must dismiss the action without prejudice against the defendant or order that service be made within a specified time." (Opinion text)

"If a plaintiff demonstrates good cause for the failure to timely serve process, the court must extend the time for service. But absent a finding of good cause, the court retains discretion as to whether or not to enlarge that timeframe." (Opinion text)

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Jameson filed a pro se complaint against the Chalmers P. Wylie Ambulatory Care Center and the Department of Veterans Affairs on October 4, 2024. The record indicated that he had not effectuated service within 90 days as required by Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 4(m). In response to a show-cause order, Jameson submitted an affidavit concerning the merits and evidentiary materials but did not explain the failure to serve the defendants or establish good cause for an extension.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Jameson filed a pro se complaint on October 4, 2024. After it appeared that he had not served the defendants within the time required by Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 4(m), the magistrate judge issued a show-cause

order. Jameson's response addressed the merits of his claims rather than explaining the service failure. The magistrate judge recommended dismissal under Rule 41(b), and the district court adopted that recommendation after Jameson objected without addressing service or prosecution.

DISPOSITION

dismissed

CASES CITED

- Howard v. Secretary of Health & Human Services, 932 F.2d 505, 509 (6th Cir. 1991)
- Erickson v. Pardus, 551 U.S. 89, 94 (2007)
- United States v. Oakland Physicians Med. Ctr., LLC, 44 F.4th 565, 568 (6th Cir. 2022)

Retrieved from lawtools.ai · <https://lawtools.ai/cases/federal/united-states-district-court-for-the-southern-district-of-oh/2026/charles-a-jameson-v-chalmers-p-wylie-ambulatory-care-center-xeypydb5>