

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF
MICHIGAN, SOUTHERN DIVISION

Kawaii Staffney v. Unknown Richmond

Staffney · No. 1:24-cv-1102 · Decided March 4, 2026

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the Western District of Michigan adopts a magistrate judge’s report and recommendation granting Defendant Fidler’s motion for summary judgment. The court holds that Plaintiff failed to properly exhaust administrative remedies for his claim that Fidler denied him medical care after an alleged taser incident. The court concludes that the written grievance did not provide sufficient notice of that claim and that Plaintiff’s objections identified no error in the report and recommendation.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the Western District of Michigan, Southern Division
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Paul L. Maloney
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the Western District of Michigan, Southern Division
DECIDED	March 4, 2026
DOCKET	1:24-cv-1102
DISPOSITION	affirmed
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	Plaintiff objected to a magistrate judge's report and recommendation recommending that Defendant Fidler's motion for summary judgment be granted. The district court reviewed the objections and adopted the report and recommendation in full.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	The district court reviews de novo the portions of a magistrate judge's report and recommendation to which specific objections are made. 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, with reasonable inferences drawn for the nonmovant.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	nonprecedential
PARTIES	Kawaii Staffney v. Unknown Richmond

TOPICS

summary judgment

prisoners rights

civil procedure

constitutional law

PRACTICE AREAS

prisoner civil rights

civil procedure

federal litigation

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether Plaintiff properly exhausted administrative remedies for his claim that Defendant Fidler refused to take him for medical care.
2. Whether the magistrate judge's report and recommendation granting summary judgment to Defendant Fidler should be adopted after Plaintiff's objections.

HOLDINGS

1. Plaintiff failed to properly exhaust administrative remedies because the written grievance did not mention that Fidler refused to take him for medical care, and generalized notice of Fidler's involvement in an incident was insufficient.
2. Summary judgment was properly granted to Defendant Fidler because Plaintiff failed to exhaust administrative remedies for the claim against him.

KEY QUOTATIONS

“To serve those functions, prisoners must prove “proper exhaustion,” making “full use of the prison grievance process.”” (Section II)

“Giving notice that he was involved in an incident broadly is insufficient; it must give notice of the claims being asserted against him.” (Section II)

“Since Plaintiff has failed to identify any errors in the Magistrate Judge’s R&R, the R&R (ECF No. 24) is ADOPTED IN FULL.” (Section III)

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Plaintiff alleged that Defendant Richmond tased him, causing injury, and that Defendant Fidler refused to take him for medical attention. The relevant written grievance did not mention Fidler's alleged refusal to obtain medical care. Plaintiff argued that his conversation with Fidler and statements during an investigation provided sufficient notice, but the latter statements were not part of the record and the written grievance did not identify the specific medical-care claim.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Magistrate Judge Ray Kent recommended granting Defendant Fidler's motion for summary judgment. Plaintiff filed objections. The district court concluded that Plaintiff failed to exhaust administrative remedies as to the claim that Fidler denied him medical care, adopted the report and recommendation, and granted the motion for summary judgment.

DISPOSITION

affirmed

CASES CITED

- 806 F.2d 636, 637 (6th Cir. 1986) (per curiam)
- 465 F. App'x 448, 456 (6th Cir. 2012)
- 50 F.3d 373, 380 (6th Cir. 1995)
- 477 U.S. 242, 252 (1986)
- 148 F.4th 855, 861 (6th Cir. 2025)
- 548 U.S. 81, 93-95 (2006)
- No. 17-1919, 2018 WL 3854143, at *2 (6th Cir. Mar. 19, 2018)
- 851 F.3d 583, 596 (6th Cir. 2017)
- No. 2:19-cv-9, 2020 WL 5105035, at *3 (W.D. Mich. Aug. 31, 2020)

Retrieved from lawtools.ai · <https://lawtools.ai/cases/federal/united-states-district-court-for-the-western-district-of-mic/2026/kawaii-staffney-v-unknown-richmond-zggnmjtk>