Love v. Millard et al Doc. 55

Tuesday, 22 November, 2011 03:24:08 PM Clerk, U.S. District Court, ILCD

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE CENTRAL DISTRICT OF ILLINOIS SPRINGFIELD DIVISION

QUENTIN D. LOVE, Plaintiff,)	
rament,)	
V.)	10-CV-3197
)	
DR. CARADINE,)	
Defendant.)	

OPINION

SUE E. MYERSCOUGH, U.S. District Judge:

Plaintiff, proceeding pro se, pursues claims against Dr. Caradine, a dentist at Logan Correctional Center, for deliberate indifference to Plaintiff's need for dental treatment and pain relief. Plaintiff filed this case while incarcerated and has since been released.

Now before the Court is Dr. Caradine's motion for summary judgment. Plaintiff has not responded, even though he was warned that failure to do so would result in the Court accepting Dr. Caradine's proposed facts as true. (Rule 56 Notice, d/e 54). The Court has reviewed Dr. Caradine's proposed undisputed facts, which are supported

by specific cites to the record. Those facts show that Dr. Caradine was

not deliberately indifferent to any of Plaintiff's dental needs or his need

for pain relief. Accordingly, Dr. Caradine's summary judgment motion

will be granted.

IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED:

1) Dr. Caradine's motion for summary judgment is granted (d/e

52). The clerk of the court is directed to enter judgment in favor of Dr.

Caradine and against Plaintiff. All pending motions are denied as moot,

and this case is terminated, with the parties to bear their own costs.

2) If Plaintiff wishes to appeal this judgment, he must file a notice

of appeal with this court within 30 days of the entry of judgment. Fed.

R. App. P. 4(a)(4). A motion for leave to appeal in forma pauperis

should identify the issues Plaintiff will present on appeal. See Fed. R.

App. P. 24(a)(1)(c).

ENTERED: November 22, 2011

FOR THE COURT:

s/Sue E. Myerscough

SUE E. MYERSCOUGH UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

2