

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF
MICHIGAN

Jamie Rieger v. Jeremy Howard, et al.

Rieger · No. 2:24-cv-12170 · Decided January 22, 2026

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the Eastern District of Michigan adopted a magistrate judge’s Report and Recommendation and granted Defendants Howard and Walton’s motion for summary judgment in Jamie Rieger’s prisoner civil rights action. The court dismissed with prejudice all claims against Howard and Walton and removed them from the case after no party filed objections.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the Eastern District of Michigan
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Brandy R. McMillion
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the Eastern District of Michigan
DECIDED	January 22, 2026
DOCKET	2:24-cv-12170
DISPOSITION	dismissed
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	Plaintiff brought a pro se prisoner civil-rights action alleging that prison officials failed to protect her from an inmate attack. Defendants Howard and Walton moved for summary judgment. After the magistrate judge recommended granting the motion, neither party filed objections, and the district court adopted the recommended disposition, granted summary judgment, and dismissed Howard and Walton with prejudice.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	When no party timely objects to a magistrate judge's Report and Recommendation, the district court is released from its duty to conduct an independent review and may accept the recommendation without expressing views on the merits.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	Unknown

TOPICS

- summary judgment
- prisoners rights
- section 1983
- civil procedure

PRACTICE AREAS

civil procedure

civil rights

prisoner litigation

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether the district court could adopt the magistrate judge's Report and Recommendation without conducting an independent merits review when neither party timely objected.
2. Whether Defendants Howard and Walton were entitled to summary judgment and dismissal of the claims against them.

HOLDINGS

1. A party's failure to timely object to a magistrate judge's Report and Recommendation releases the district court from its duty to independently review the matter, permitting the court to accept the recommendation without expressing views on the merits.
2. Defendants Howard and Walton's motion for summary judgment was granted, and all claims against them were dismissed with prejudice.
3. Failure to timely object to a magistrate judge's Report and Recommendation forfeits any further right to appeal.

KEY QUOTATIONS

"The failure to object to an R&R releases the Court from its duty to independently review the matter."
(PageID.211-212)

"all claims against Defendants Howard and Walton are DISMISSED WITH PREJUDICE" (PageID.212)

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Rieger, a prisoner at the Huron Valley Women's Correctional Facility, alleged that Defendants failed to protect her when another inmate attacked her. She sued Warden Jeremy Howard, Officers Nicole Goodwin and Jessica Fullove, and Deputy Eric Walton. The motion at issue concerned Howard and Walton, and Rieger conceded that her claims against Howard should be dismissed while disputing dismissal of Walton.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Jamie Rieger filed a prisoner civil-rights action against prison officials and an officer arising from an attack at the Huron Valley Women's Correctional Facility. Defendants Howard and Walton moved for summary judgment based on lack of personal involvement and failure to exhaust administrative remedies. Rieger conceded dismissal of her claims against Howard but opposed dismissal of Walton. Magistrate Judge Patti issued a Report and Recommendation recommending that the motion be granted; no objections were filed within the prescribed period, so the district court adopted the recommendation and dismissed the claims against Howard and Walton with prejudice.

DISPOSITION

dismissed

CASES CITED

- Thomas v. Arn, 474 U.S. 140, 149 (1985)
- Ivey v. Wilson, 832 F.2d 950, 957-58 (6th Cir. 1987)
- Berkshire v. Dahl, 928 F.3d 520, 530 (6th Cir. 2019)

OPINION

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT EASTERN DISTRICT OF MICHIGAN SOUTHERN DIVISION JAMIE RIEGER, Case No. 2:24-cv-12170 Plaintiff, Hon. Brandy R. McMillion v. United States District Judge JEREMY HOWARD, et al., Hon. Anthony P. Patti United States Magistrate Judge Defendants. _____/ ORDER ADOPTING RECOMMENDED DISPOSITION OF REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION (ECF NO. 28), GRANTING DEFENDANTS' MOTION FOR SUMMARY JUDGMENT (ECF NO. 25), AND DISMISSING DEFENDANTS HOWARD AND WALTON Plaintiff Jamie Rieger ("Rieger") filed this pro se prisoner civil rights case against Defendants Warden Jeremy Howard ("Howard"), Officers Nicole Goodwin and Jessica Fullove, and Deputy Eric Walton ("Walton") (collectively, "Defendants").

See generally ECF No. 1. Rieger alleges that Defendants failed to protect her when she was attacked by another inmate at the Huron Valley Women's Correctional Facility. Id. This matter was referred to Magistrate Judge Anthony P. Patti for all pretrial matters. ECF No. 22.

On March 18, 2025, Defendants Howard and Walton moved for summary judgment based on Rieger's failure to show any personal involvement of the Howard or Walton, and alternatively, because Rieger did not exhaust her claims against the two prior to filing suit. See generally ECF No. 25.

In Response, Rieger conceded that her claims against Howard should be dismissed. See ECF No. 26, PageID.186. However, she objects to the dismissal of Walton because she states Walton fails to meet his burden of demonstrating there is no dispute as to material facts on her claims. Id. at PageID.187.

On December 22, 2025, Magistrate Judge Patti issued a Report and Recommendation ("R&R") recommending that the Court grant Defendants' Motion for Summary Judgment. ECF No. 38. At the end of the R&R, the Magistrate Judge advised the parties that to seek review of her recommendation, they had to file specific objections with the Court within 14 days of service of the R&R.

Id. at PageID.211-212. As of the date of this Order, January 22, 2025—30 days since the Magistrate Judge issued the R&R—neither party has filed objections to the R&R or contacted the Court to ask for more time to file objections.

The failure to object to an R&R releases the Court from its duty to independently review the matter. See *Thomas v. Arn*, 474 U.S. 140, 149 (1985); see also *Ivey v. Wilson*, 832 F.2d 950, 957-58 (6th Cir. 1987) (explaining that a party’s failure to timely object to a report and recommendation allows a court to accept the recommendation “without expressing any views on the merits of the magistrate’s conclusions”).

Similarly, failure to object to an R&R forfeits any further right to appeal. See *Berkshire v. Dahl*, 928 F.3d 520, 530 (6th Cir. 2019) (recognizing that a party forfeits their right to appeal by failing to timely file objections to an R&R).

Accordingly, because neither party objected to the R&R, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that the Magistrate Judge’s recommended disposition of Defendants’ Motion is ADOPTED. IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that Defendants Howard and Walton’s Motion for Summary Judgment (ECF No. 25) is GRANTED. IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that all claims against Defendants Howard and Walton are DISMISSED WITH PREJUDICE, and they are dismissed from this matter.

IT IS SO ORDERED. Dated: January 22, 2026 s/Brandy R. McMillion Detroit, Michigan
BRANDY R. MCMILLION United States District Judge