

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF
KENTUCKY, CENTRAL DIVISION AT LEXINGTON

Jonathan Bernard Stanley, Jr. v. Bourbon County, Kentucky

Stanley · No. 5:24-CV-179-KKC · Decided March 11, 2026

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the Eastern District of Kentucky overruled Jonathan Bernard Stanley, Jr.'s objections to a magistrate judge's Report and Recommendation and adopted it in full. The court held that Stanley's filing did not specifically object to the recommendation and denied his apparent request to reopen discovery because he failed to participate in discovery and the requested information would not change the outcome. The court granted Bourbon County, Kentucky's motion for summary judgment concerning claims involving a leaking detention-center roof and allegedly inadequate medical care.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the Eastern District of Kentucky, Central Division at Lexington
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Karen K. Caldwell
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the Eastern District of Kentucky, Central Division at Lexington
DECIDED	March 11, 2026
DOCKET	5:24-CV-179-KKC
DISPOSITION	other
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	The district court reviewed de novo a magistrate judge's Report and Recommendation addressing the defendant's motion for summary judgment. The plaintiff filed an objection that requested discovery rather than specifically challenging the Report and Recommendation.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	De novo review of a magistrate judge's report and recommendation on a pretrial dispositive motion and of timely objections under 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1) and Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 72(b)(2). Objections must be specific; vague, general, or conclusory objections are treated as a failure to object.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	Unpublished federal district court opinion; precedential status is not identified as published or precedential in the source metadata.

PARTIES

Jonathan Bernard Stanley, Jr. v. Bourbon County, Kentucky

TOPICS

summary judgment

discovery dispute

prisoners rights

section 1983

civil procedure

PRACTICE AREAS

civil procedure

civil rights

prisoner litigation

summary judgment

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether Stanley's filing constituted a sufficiently specific objection to the magistrate judge's Report and Recommendation.
2. Whether discovery should be reopened to permit Stanley to obtain the information identified in his filing.
3. Whether the magistrate judge's recommendation granting summary judgment should be adopted based on failure to exhaust administrative remedies and alternative deficiencies in Stanley's claims.

HOLDINGS

1. A filing labeled as an objection does not satisfy the objection requirement when it is vague, general, or conclusory and does not specifically address the magistrate judge's findings. Stanley's filing therefore failed to constitute a legally sufficient objection.
2. Reopening or extending discovery was unwarranted because the requested information could have been obtained during the discovery period, Stanley was dilatory and unresponsive to discovery, and the additional discovery would not have changed the disposition.
3. The magistrate judge's recommendation to grant Bourbon County's motion for summary judgment was adopted. The claims were barred by failure to exhaust the detention center's grievance policy, and, alternatively, Stanley could not prevail because he failed to show that the leaky roof resulted from a Bourbon County policy or custom or that the medical treatment met the objective component of a deliberate-indifference claim.

KEY QUOTATIONS

"Because Stanley's motion does not meet the legal requirements for an objection, it is overruled." (Analysis, Section III)

"Because the additional discovery would not alter the Report and Recommendation, reopening discovery is not warranted." (Analysis, Section III)

"The Court ADOPTS the Magistrate Judge's Report and Recommendation (R. 30);" (Conclusion)

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Stanley, formerly incarcerated at the Bourbon County Detention Center, alleged that a leaking roof caused water to puddle on the floor and that he injured his shoulder and back after slipping while exiting a shower. He also alleged inadequate medical treatment and sought damages and injunctive relief. After the court dismissed the injunctive-relief claims, Stanley failed to respond to Bourbon County's interrogatories, document requests, and requests for admission, and did not otherwise participate in discovery during the five-month discovery period. His later filing requested additional discovery but did not specifically challenge the magistrate judge's findings.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Stanley filed a pro se civil-rights complaint concerning a leaky roof and alleged inadequate medical care at the Bourbon County Detention Center. The court dismissed his claims for injunctive relief and substituted Bourbon County as the sole remaining defendant. After Stanley failed to participate in discovery, Bourbon County moved for summary judgment. The magistrate judge recommended granting the motion based on failure to exhaust administrative remedies and, alternatively, deficiencies on the merits. The district court overruled Stanley's objection, adopted the recommendation, and granted summary judgment.

DISPOSITION

other

CASES CITED

- Baker v. Peterson, 67 Fed. Appx. 308, 310 (6th Cir. 2003)
- Cole v. Yukins, 7 F. App'x 354, 356 (6th Cir. 2001)
- Miller, 50 F.3d at 380
- McCready v. Kamminga, 113 Fed. App'x 47, 49 (6th Cir. 2004)
- CenTra, Inc. v. Estrin, 538 F.3d 402, 420 (6th Cir. 2008)
- Plott v. Gen. Motors Corp., 71 F.3d 1190, 1196–97 (6th Cir. 1995)
- Jones v. Northcoast Behavioral Healthcare Sys., 84 Fed. Appx. 597, 2003 WL 23140062, at *2 (6th Cir. 2003)
- Jourdan v. Jabe, 951 F.2d 108, 109 (6th Cir. 1991)
- Fields v. County of Lapeer, No. 99-2191, 2000 U.S. App. LEXIS 29182, 2000 WL 1720727, at *2 (6th Cir. Nov. 8, 2000)