

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF
ILLINOIS

Jamir Jordan v. Ms. Lloyd et al.

Jordan · No. 3:23-cv-2327-DWD · Decided January 12, 2026

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the Southern District of Illinois granted Defendants’ motion for sanctions after Plaintiff failed to respond to discovery requests, court orders, and the sanctions motion. The court dismissed the action with prejudice under Federal Rules of Civil Procedure 37(b), 37(d), and 41(b) for failure to participate in discovery and prosecute the case.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the Southern District of Illinois
WRITING FOR THE COURT	David W. Dugan
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the Southern District of Illinois
DECIDED	January 12, 2026
DOCKET	3:23-cv-2327-DWD
DISPOSITION	dismissed
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	Defendants moved for sanctions after Plaintiff failed to respond to discovery, comply with orders compelling discovery, or respond to the sanctions motion. The district court granted the motion and dismissed the action with prejudice.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	unpublished

TOPICS

- sanctions
- discovery dispute
- civil procedure
- prisoners rights
- civil rights

PRACTICE AREAS

- civil procedure
- prisoner civil rights litigation
- discovery sanctions

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

- Whether Plaintiff's repeated failure to participate in discovery and comply with Court orders warranted dismissal with prejudice as a sanction under Federal Rules of Civil Procedure 37(b), 37(d), and 41(b).

HOLDINGS

1. A plaintiff's repeated failure to respond to discovery, comply with orders compelling discovery, and respond to a sanctions motion warranted dismissal with prejudice under Federal Rules of Civil Procedure 37(b), 37(d), and 41(b).

KEY QUOTATIONS

- “The Court finds that Plaintiff has failed to comply with its orders, failed to participate in the discovery process, and failed to prosecute this matter.”* (at 2)
- “Consequently, the Motion for Sanctions (Doc. 53) is GRANTED, and this matter is DISMISSED with prejudice pursuant to Federal Rules of Civil Procedure 37(b), 37(d), and 41(b).”* (at 2)

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Defendants served Plaintiff with two sets of interrogatories and one set of requests for production on August 5, 2025, but Plaintiff did not provide responses by the September 5 deadline or after Defendants' good-faith follow-up. Plaintiff also failed to respond to the motion to compel and to two Court orders directing him to participate in discovery, despite repeated warnings that noncompliance could result in sanctions or dismissal. Plaintiff ultimately failed to respond to Defendants' motion for sanctions or otherwise communicate with the Court.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Defendants served Plaintiff with interrogatories and requests for production. After Plaintiff failed to respond, Defendants moved to compel, and the Court ordered Plaintiff to respond and later granted the motion to compel after Plaintiff continued not to participate. Following additional warnings and Plaintiff's continued failure to respond, Defendants moved for sanctions. The Court granted sanctions, dismissed the case with prejudice, and directed the Clerk to close the case.

DISPOSITION

dismissed

CASES CITED

- James v. McDonald's Corp., 417 F.3d 672, 681 (7th Cir. 2005)

OPINION

Jordan

PER CURIAM.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF ILLINOIS

JAMIR JORDAN,)

) Plaintiff,)) vs.) Case No. 3:23-cv-2327-DWD) MS. LLOYD et. al.,)) Defendants.)

MEMORANDUM AND ORDER

DUGAN, District Judge: This matter is before the Court to address Plaintiff's lack of participation in this case. To date, Plaintiff has failed to respond to discovery requests, two Court orders (Docs. 49 and 52), and to Defendants' Motion for Sanctions (Doc. 53). Defendants served Plaintiff with two sets of interrogatories and one set of requests to produce on August 5, 2025. Plaintiff's responses were due by September 5, 2025. On September 11, 2025, after not having received any responses, Defendants sent Plaintiff a letter in a good faith effort to obtain them without court action. Following Plaintiff's failure to respond, Defendants filed a motion to compel. (Doc. 48). The Court ordered Plaintiff to respond to the motion by October 17, 2025. (Doc. 49). The Court advised Plaintiff that a party who fails to participate in the discovery Page 1 of 3 process or comply with court orders may have his case dismissed for lack of prosecution and/or as a sanction. (Doc. 49). Plaintiff failed to respond to the Court's order or provide interrogatory answers. (Doc. 52). Accordingly, on October 27, 2025, the Court granted the motion to compel. (Doc. 52). The Court directed the Clerk to send Plaintiff additional copies of the outstanding discovery requests and ordered Plaintiff to provide complete responses. (Doc. 52). Plaintiff was, once again, warned that failure to participate in discovery or comply with the Court's orders may result in sanctions, including dismissal of his case. (Doc. 52). On December 9, 2025, Defendants filed a motion for sanctions indicating that Plaintiff still had not responded to discovery or otherwise communicated with Defendants. (Doc. 53). To date, Plaintiff has not responded to the motion for sanctions or otherwise communicated with the Court. The Court finds that Plaintiff has failed to comply with its orders, failed to participate in the discovery process, and failed to prosecute this matter. Consequently, the Motion for Sanctions (Doc. 53) is GRANTED, and this matter is DISMISSED with prejudice pursuant to Federal Rules of Civil Procedure 37(b), 37(d), and 41(b). See generally *James v. McDonald's Corp.*, 417 F.3d 672, 681 (7th Cir. 2005). The Court DIRECTS Page 2 of 3 the Clerk to close the case and to enter judgment accordingly. IT IS SO ORDERED. DATED: January 12, 2026 s/David W. Dugan

DAVID W. DUGAN

United States District Judge Page 3 of 3