

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF
INDIANA, NEW ALBANY DIVISION

Ryan Crum v. Brent Miller, Joey Richardson, Tyson Abbott, and
Sherry Patton

Crum · No. 4:23-cv-00132-TWP-KMB · Decided January 26, 2026

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the Southern District of Indiana grants Nurse Sherry Patton's unopposed motion for summary judgment on Ryan Crum's Fourteenth Amendment claim concerning allegedly inadequate medical care for dental injuries sustained while detained. The Court concludes that the evidence does not show that Patton acted purposefully, knowingly, or recklessly, or that her response was objectively unreasonable. Patton is terminated as a defendant, while the claims against the remaining defendants continue, with further proceedings and potential settlement discussions directed.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the Southern District of Indiana, New Albany Division
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Tanya Walton Pratt
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the Southern District of Indiana, New Albany Division
DECIDED	January 26, 2026
DOCKET	4:23-cv-00132-TWP-KMB
DISPOSITION	other
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	Defendant Sherry Patton moved for summary judgment on a pretrial detainee's Fourteenth Amendment inadequate-medical-care claim. The motion was unopposed.
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 evidence and draws reasonable inferences in favor of the nonmoving party, does not weigh evidence or make credibility determinations, and may treat properly supported factual assertions as undisputed when the opposing party fails to respond.

Even when a nonmovant fails to respond, the movant must still show that summary judgment is proper.

PRECEDENTIAL VALUE

Unknown; federal district court order

TOPICS

summary judgment

prisoners rights

due process

fourteenth amendment

civil rights

PRACTICE AREAS

civil rights

constitutional law

prisoner civil rights

civil procedure

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether Nurse Patton was entitled to summary judgment on Crum's Fourteenth Amendment claim that she provided constitutionally inadequate medical care.
2. Whether the undisputed evidence showed that Patton's conduct was objectively unreasonable and that she acted purposefully, knowingly, or recklessly with respect to the risk of harm.

HOLDINGS

1. A pretrial detainee's unconstitutional medical-care claim is evaluated under the objective-unreasonableness framework, requiring proof of an objectively serious medical need, a volitional act concerning that need, objectively unreasonable conduct under the circumstances, and purposeful, knowing, or perhaps reckless conduct with respect to the risk of harm.
2. Patton was entitled to summary judgment because the designated evidence did not establish objectively unreasonable conduct or purposeful, knowing, or reckless action with respect to Crum's medical needs.

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." (Section I)

"A defendant violates a pretrial detainee's due process right to constitutionally acceptable medical care if: (1) there was an objectively serious medical need; (2) the defendant committed a volitional act concerning the [plaintiff's] medical need; (3) that act was objectively unreasonable under the circumstances in terms of responding to the [plaintiff's] medical need; and (4) the defendant act[ed] "purposefully, knowingly, or perhaps even recklessly" with respect to the risk of harm." (Section III)

"Even where a non-movant fails to respond to a motion for summary judgment, the movant still has to show that summary judgment is proper given the undisputed facts." (Section I)

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Crum was booked into the Washington County Jail on August 2, 2021, after jail personnel allegedly knocked out some of his teeth by slamming him against a metal bedframe. His intake assessment did not identify injuries requiring immediate attention, and a later fourteen-day assessment noted tooth decay but no infection or swelling. After Crum submitted a medical request on August 31 describing a broken tooth, pain, and swelling, Nurse Patton evaluated him and conveyed her findings to Dr. Kevin Dew, who prescribed an antibiotic and ibuprofen. The record contained un rebutted expert evidence that Patton's actions were reasonable and within the medical standard of care.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Ryan Crum initiated the action in August 2023 and filed an amended complaint asserting Fourteenth Amendment claims against Brent Miller, Joey Richardson, Tyson Abbott, and Sherry Patton. Patton moved for summary judgment concerning medical care provided in 2021, and Crum did not respond. The court granted summary judgment to Patton, terminated her as a defendant, and left the claims against the other defendants pending.

DISPOSITION

other

CASES CITED

- *Khungar v. Access Community Health Network*, 985 F.3d 565, 572-73 (7th Cir. 2021)
- *Miller v. Gonzalez*, 761 F.3d 822, 827 (7th Cir. 2014)
- *Grant v. Trustees of Indiana University*, 870 F.3d 562, 573-74 (7th Cir. 2017)
- *Celotex Corp. v. Catrett*, 477 U.S. 317, 323 (1986)
- *Robinson v. Waterman*, 1 F.4th 480, 483 (7th Cir. 2021)
- *Kingsley v. Hendrickson*, 576 U.S. 389 (2015)
- *Miranda v. County of Lake*, 900 F.3d 335, 352, 353-54 (7th Cir. 2018)
- *Gonzalez v. McHenry County, Illinois*, 40 F.4th 824, 828 (7th Cir. 2022)
- *Williams v. Ortiz*, 937 F.3d 936, 942 (7th Cir. 2019)