

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF
TENNESSEE, EASTERN DIVISION

William Scott Howard, Sr. v. Madison County Jail Administration;
and John Does 1-100

Howard · No. 1:25-cv-01065-JDB-jay · Decided March 11, 2026

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the Western District of Tennessee adopted the magistrate judge’s report and recommendation recommending dismissal of William Scott Howard, Sr.’s amended complaint under 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B) for failure to state a claim. The court dismissed the action with prejudice and denied the plaintiff’s pending discovery and miscellaneous motions as moot after no party filed objections.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the Western District of Tennessee, Eastern Division
WRITING FOR THE COURT	J. Daniel Breen
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the Western District of Tennessee, Eastern Division
DECIDED	March 11, 2026
DOCKET	1:25-cv-01065-JDB-jay
DISPOSITION	dismissed
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	The district court reviewed a magistrate judge's report and recommendation recommending dismissal of Plaintiff's amended complaint for failure to state a claim under 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B). No party filed objections within the prescribed fourteen-day period.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	The district court reviewed the report and recommendation and the record after the objection period expired; the order does not state a separate standard of review.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	unpublished district court order; precedential status not stated

TOPICS

[motions to dismiss](#)

[waiver](#)

[section 1983](#)

[civil procedure](#)

PRACTICE AREAS

civil rights

civil procedure

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether the district court should adopt the magistrate judge's report and recommendation when no party filed objections within fourteen days.
2. Whether Plaintiff's amended complaint should be dismissed with prejudice under 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B) for failure to state a claim.
3. Whether Plaintiff's pending discovery and miscellaneous motions should be denied as moot following dismissal.

HOLDINGS

1. When the parties are notified that objections must be filed within fourteen days and no objections are filed before the deadline, the parties forfeit their objections, exceptions, and further appeal concerning the report and recommendation.
2. The amended complaint was dismissed with prejudice for failure to state a claim upon which relief may be granted under 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B).
3. Plaintiff's pending discovery and miscellaneous motions were denied as moot after the action was dismissed.

KEY QUOTATIONS

“Accordingly, upon review of the record, the report and recommendation (D.E. 25) is ADOPTED, Plaintiff’s action is DISMISSED WITH PREJUDICE, and all of Plaintiff’s pending discovery and miscellaneous motions (D.E. 12; D.E. 14; D.E. 16; D.E. 17; D.E. 18) are DENIED AS MOOT.”

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

William Scott Howard, Sr. filed an amended complaint against the Madison County Jail Administration and John Does 1-100. The magistrate judge recommended dismissal because the amended complaint failed to state a claim upon which relief could be granted. Plaintiff also had pending discovery and miscellaneous motions, which became moot upon dismissal.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Plaintiff filed an amended complaint. The matter was referred to Magistrate Judge Jon A. York, who recommended dismissal with prejudice under 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B). After the objection period expired without objections, the district court adopted the report and recommendation, dismissed the action with prejudice, and denied pending discovery and miscellaneous motions as moot.

DISPOSITION

dismissed

CASES CITED

- Berkshire v. Dahl, 928 F.3d 520, 530 (6th Cir. 2019)
- Kensu v. Haigh, 87 F.3d 172, 176 (6th Cir. 1996)

OPINION

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF
TENNESSEE EASTERN DIVISION

WILLIAM SCOTT HOWARD, SR., Plaintiff, v. No. 1:25-cv-01065-JDB-jay MADISON
COUNTY JAIL ADMINISTRATION; and JOHN DOES 1-100, Defendants.

ORDER ADOPTING REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION

Before the Court is the amended complaint of Plaintiff, William Scott Howard, Sr. (Docket Entry (“D.E.”) 23.)

By Administrative Order, this matter was referred to the United States magistrate judge for management of all pretrial matters and for determination and/or report and recommendation as appropriate. Admin. Order 2013-05.

After reviewing the complaint, Magistrate Judge Jon A. York recommended that Plaintiff’s amended complaint be dismissed with prejudice pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B) for failure to state a claim upon which relief may be granted. (D.E. 25 at PageID 59.) At the end of the report and recommendation, Judge York notified the parties that, if they disagreed with the recommendation, they were required to file an objection within fourteen days.

(Id.) He added that “failure to file objections within fourteen (14) days may constitute waiver and/or forfeiture of objections, exceptions, and further appeal.” (Id. (emphasis omitted)). No party has objected to the Magistrate Judge’s report and recommendation, and the time for doing so has expired. Consequently, each party has forfeited their objections to the report and recommendation.

See Berkshire v. Dahl, 928 F.3d 520, 530 (6th Cir. 2019) (quoting Kensu v. Haigh, 87 F.3d 172, 176 (6th Cir. 1996)). Accordingly, upon review of the record, the report and recommendation (D.E. 25) is ADOPTED, Plaintiff’s action is DISMISSED WITH PREJUDICE, and all of Plaintiff’s pending discovery and miscellaneous motions (D.E. 12; D.E. 14; D.E. 16; D.E. 17; D.E.

18) are DENIED AS MOOT. IT IS SO ORDERED this 11th day of March 2026. s/ J. DANIEL BREEN UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

Retrieved from lawtools.ai · <https://lawtools.ai/cases/state/united-states-district-court-for-the-western-district-of-tennessee-eastern-division-united-states-di/2026/william-scott-howard-sr-v-madison-county-jail-y6sf10wb>