

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
DISTRICT OF MAINE

JUSTIN KENNAWAY,	)	
	)	
Plaintiff	)	
	)	
v.	)	1:22-cv-00036-JDL
	)	
SHAWN GILLEN, et al.,	)	
	)	
Defendants	)	

**RECOMMENDED DECISION AFTER REVIEW OF COMPLAINT**

Plaintiff filed a complaint and an application to proceed in forma pauperis, which application the Court granted. (Complaint, ECF No. 1; Application, ECF No. 2; Order, ECF No. 3.) In accordance with the in forma pauperis statute, a preliminary review of Plaintiff’s complaint is appropriate. 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2). Additionally, Plaintiff’s complaint is subject to screening “before docketing, if feasible or ... as soon as practicable after docketing,” because plaintiff is “a prisoner seek[ing] redress from a governmental entity or officer or employee of a governmental entity.” 28 U.S.C. § 1915A(a).

Following a review of Plaintiff’s allegations, I recommend the Court dismiss the complaint.

**FACTUAL ALLEGATIONS**

Plaintiff alleges he has been confined at the Aroostook County Jail since August 2021. He asserts that jail employees refused to provide a mattress for the first five days of his confinement. Plaintiff maintains that as the result of sleeping on a steel bunk without

a mattress, he experienced pain in his back and neck that has persisted. Plaintiff alleges that Defendants, including medical personnel, did not adequately treat his condition.

### LEGAL STANDARD

The federal in forma pauperis statute, 28 U.S.C. § 1915, is designed to ensure meaningful access to the federal courts for those persons unable to pay the costs of bringing an action. When a party is proceeding in forma pauperis, however, “the court shall dismiss the case at any time if the court determines,” *inter alia*, that the action is “frivolous or malicious” or “fails to state a claim on which relief may be granted.” 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B). “Dismissals [under § 1915] are often made *sua sponte* prior to the issuance of process, so as to spare prospective defendants the inconvenience and expense of answering such complaints.” *Neitzke v. Williams*, 490 U.S. 319, 324 (1989).

In addition to the review contemplated by § 1915, Plaintiff’s complaint is subject to screening under the Prison Litigation Reform Act because Plaintiff currently is incarcerated and seeks redress from governmental entities and officers. *See* 28 U.S.C. § 1915A(a), (c). The § 1915A screening requires courts to “identify cognizable claims or dismiss the complaint, or any portion of the complaint, if the complaint (1) is frivolous, malicious, or fails to state a claim ...; or (2) seeks monetary relief from a defendant who is immune from such relief.” 28 U.S.C. § 1915A(b).

When considering whether a complaint states a claim for which relief may be granted, courts must assume the truth of all well-plead facts and give the plaintiff the benefit of all reasonable inferences therefrom. *Ocasio-Hernandez v. Fortuno-Burset*, 640 F.3d 1, 12 (1st Cir. 2011). A complaint fails to state a claim upon which relief can be

granted if it does not plead “enough facts to state a claim to relief that is plausible on its face.” *Bell Atlantic Corp. v. Twombly*, 550 U.S. 544, 570 (2007). “A self-represented plaintiff is not exempt from this framework, but the court must construe his complaint ‘liberally’ and hold it ‘to less stringent standards than formal pleadings drafted by lawyers.’” *Waterman v. White Interior Sols.*, No. 2:19-cv-00032-JDL, 2019 WL 5764661, at \*2 (D. Me. Nov. 5, 2019) (quoting *Erickson v. Pardus*, 551 U.S. 89, 94 (2007)). “This is not to say that pro se plaintiffs are not required to plead basic facts sufficient to state a claim.” *Ferranti v. Moran*, 618 F.2d 888, 890 (1st Cir. 1980).

### DISCUSSION

The Eighth Amendment prohibition on cruel and usual punishments governs prisoners’ treatment after conviction, and the Due Process Clause of the Fourteenth Amendment imposes similar obligations while prisoners are in pre-trial custody. *See City of Revere v. Massachusetts Gen. Hosp.*, 463 U.S. 239, 243 (1983). “Prison officials have a duty to provide humane conditions of confinement; prison officials must ensure that inmates receive adequate food, clothing, shelter, and medical care, and must take reasonable measures to guarantee the safety of the inmates.” *Giroux v. Somerset Cnty.*, 178 F.3d 28, 31 (1st Cir. 1999) (citations and quotation marks omitted). To establish constitutional liability, a plaintiff must satisfy an objective standard by showing he or she was “incarcerated under conditions posing a substantial risk of serious harm,” and a plaintiff must satisfy a subjective standard by showing that the defendant “acted, or failed to act, with ‘deliberate indifference to inmate health or safety.’” *Id.* (quoting *Farmer v. Brennan*, 511 U.S. 825, 834).

The objective standard evaluates the seriousness of the risk of harm. There must be “a sufficiently substantial ‘risk of serious damage to [the inmate’s] future health.’” *Farmer*, 511 U.S. at 843 (quoting *Helling v. McKinney*, 509 U.S. 25, 35 (1993)). A medical need is “serious” if it has been diagnosed by a physician as mandating treatment or is so obvious that even a lay person would recognize a need for medical intervention. *Leavitt*, 645 F.3d at 497; *Gaudreault v. Mun. of Salem*, 923 F.2d 203, 208 (1st Cir. 1990), *cert. denied*, 500 U.S. 956 (1991)). The subjective standard concerns the culpability of the defendant. Deliberate indifference is akin to criminal recklessness, “requiring actual knowledge of impending harm, easily preventable.” *Feeney v. Corr. Med. Servs.*, 464 F.3d at 162 (quoting *Watson v. Caton*, 984 F.2d 537, 540 (1st Cir. 1993)). The focus of the deliberate indifference analysis “is on what the jailers knew and what they did in response.” *Burrell v. Hampshire Cnty.*, 307 F.3d 1, 8 (1st Cir. 2002).

Courts have uniformly rejected Eighth Amendment claims based on the temporary deprivation of a mattress resulting only in discomfort or pain in muscles or joints. *See Jones v. Toombs*, 77 F.3d 482 (6th Cir. 1996) (“The defendants did not violate Jones’s Eighth Amendment rights by depriving him of a mattress for a two week period”); *Alfred v. Bryant*, 378 F. App’x 977, 980 (11th Cir. 2010) (“Objectively speaking, sleeping on a steel bed without a mattress for eighteen days, though uncomfortable, is not so extreme as to violate contemporary standards of decency”); *Rascon v. Douglas*, 718 F. App’x 587, 592 (10th Cir. 2017) (finding no authority to support Eighth Amendment violation from having

to sleep without a mattress for four nights).<sup>1</sup> Plaintiff, therefore, has not alleged an actionable Eighth Amendment claim.

The other discernible legal claims in the complaint also fail. Plaintiff's assertion that the medical care was inadequate are insufficient without more factual support. *See Miranda v. Munoz*, 770 F.2d 255, 259 (1st Cir. 1985) (“[W]here a prisoner has received some medical attention and the dispute is over the adequacy of the treatment, federal courts are generally reluctant to second guess medical judgments”) (quotations and modifications omitted); *Young v. Wells Fargo, N.A.*, 717 F.3d 224, 231 (1st Cir. 2013) (courts “disregard conclusory allegations that merely parrot the relevant legal standard” when assessing whether a plaintiff has stated a plausible claim). Plaintiff's due process claim regarding Defendants' handling of his administrative grievances fails because inmates have no protected interest in jail and prison grievance procedures. *See Leavitt v. Allen*, 46 F.3d 1114 (1st Cir. 1995) (“prison regulations which establish a grievance procedure cannot give rise to a liberty interest because they confer only procedural protections, not substantive rights, upon the inmates who may use the grievance procedures”).

### CONCLUSION

Based on the foregoing analysis, following a review of Plaintiff's complaint in accordance with 28 U.S.C. §§ 1915 and 1915A, I recommend the Court dismiss the complaint.

---

<sup>1</sup> The lack of a mattress can be a factor leading to an actionable Eighth Amendment claim in unusual circumstances, *see Pierce v. Cty. of Orange*, 526 F.3d 1190, 1224 (9th Cir. 2008) (lack of a proper mattress combined with prisoner's disability led to bed sores), but Plaintiff's allegations do not rise to the level courts have recognized as sufficient to state a claim.

**NOTICE**

A party may file objections to those specified portions of a magistrate judge's report or proposed findings or recommended decisions entered pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(B) for which de novo review by the district court is sought, together with a supporting memorandum, within fourteen (14) days of being served with a copy thereof.

Failure to file a timely objection shall constitute a waiver of the right to de novo review by the district court and to appeal the district court's order.

/s/ John C. Nivison  
U.S. Magistrate Judge

Dated this 18th day of February, 2022.