

## United States District Court, Northern District of Illinois

<b>Name of Assigned Judge or Magistrate Judge</b>	Joan H. Lefkow	<b>Sitting Judge if Other than Assigned Judge</b>	
<b>CASE NUMBER</b>	11 C 4728	<b>DATE</b>	July 18, 2011
<b>CASE TITLE</b>	Malcolm Patton (#2008-0083332) v. Tom Dart		

### DOCKET ENTRY TEXT:

Plaintiff's motion for leave to proceed *in forma pauperis* [#3] is granted. The Court authorizes the Cook County Jail trust fund account officer to begin making deductions from Plaintiff's fund account in accordance with this order until the entire \$350 filing fee is paid. The Clerk shall send a copy of this order to the Supervisor of Inmate Trust Fund Accounts, Cook County Dept. of Corrections Administrative Office, Division V, 2700 S. California, Chicago, IL 60608. However, summonses shall not issue at this time. The Court dismisses the complaint on file without prejudice. Plaintiff is granted thirty days in which to submit an amended complaint (plus a judge's copy and service copies). Failure to submit an amended complaint within thirty days of the date of this order will result in summary dismissal of this case. The Clerk is directed to provide Plaintiff with an amended civil rights complaint form and instructions along with a copy of this order.

■ [For further details see text below.]

Docketing to mail notices.

### STATEMENT

Plaintiff, Malcolm Patton, has brought this *pro se* civil rights action pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983. Plaintiff claims that Defendant Tom Dart subjected him to unconstitutional conditions of confinement, and deliberate indifference to a serious medical condition. More specifically, Plaintiff alleges that on January 9, 2011, he discovered mouse droppings in the sandwich he was eating at the Cook County Jail. He further alleges that he was not allowed to see medical personnel for over an hour, in spite of informing a correctional officer of his problem. The only Defendant named in Plaintiff's complaint is Cook County Sheriff Tom Dart.

Plaintiff's motion for leave to proceed *in forma pauperis* is granted. Pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915(b)(1), Plaintiff is assessed an initial partial filing fee of \$17.67. The supervisor of inmate trust accounts at the Cook County Jail is authorized and ordered to collect, when funds exist, the partial filing fee from Plaintiff's trust fund account and pay it directly to the Clerk of Court. After payment of the initial partial filing fee, the trust fund officer at Plaintiff's place of confinement is directed to collect monthly payments from Plaintiff's trust fund account in an amount equal to 20% of the preceding month's income credited to the account. Monthly payments collected from Plaintiff's trust fund account shall be forwarded to the Clerk of Court each time the amount in the account exceeds \$10 until the full \$350 filing fee is paid. All payments shall be sent to the Clerk, United States District Court, 219 S. Dearborn St., Chicago, Illinois 60604, attn: Cashier's Desk, 20th Floor, and shall clearly identify Plaintiff's name and the case number assigned to this action. The Cook County inmate trust account office shall notify transferee authorities of any outstanding balance in the event Plaintiff is transferred from the jail to another correctional facility.

However, Plaintiff must submit an amended complaint. Plaintiff names only one Defendant in his complaint: Cook County Sheriff Tom Dart. However, Tom Dart is seemingly named only in his supervisory capacity. Plaintiff has alleged no facts suggesting his direct, personal involvement, as required by *J.H. ex rel.*

**(CONTINUED)**

AWL

**STATEMENT (continued)**

*Higgin v. Johnson*, 346 F.3d 788, 793 (7th Cir. 2003), *inter alia*. Nor has Plaintiff indicated that the alleged violation of his constitutional rights occurred at his direction or with his knowledge and consent. *Id.* Section 1983 creates a cause of action based on personal liability and predicated upon fault; thus, “to be liable under § 1983, an individual defendant must have caused or participated in a constitutional deprivation.” *Pepper v. Village of Oak Park*, 430 F.3d 809, 810 (7th Cir. 2005) (citations omitted).

The mere fact that Defendant Dart holds a supervisory position is insufficient to establish liability, as the doctrine of *respondeat superior* (blanket supervisory liability) does not apply to actions filed under 42 U.S.C. § 1983. *See Sanville v. McCaughtry*, 266 F.3d 724, 740 (7th Cir. 2001). Section 1983 does not create collective or vicarious responsibility. *Id.* Supervisors cannot be held liable for the errors of their subordinates. *Birch v. Jones*, No. 02 C 2094, 2004 WL 2125416, at \*6 (N.D. Ill. Sep. 22, 2004) (Manning, J.), *citing Pacelli v. DeVito*, 972 F.2d 871, 877 (7th Cir. 1992). “Supervisors who are merely negligent in failing to detect and prevent subordinates’ misconduct are not liable.” *Chavez v. Illinois State Police*, 251 F.3d 612, 651 (7th Cir. 2001) (citations omitted). To be held liable under 42 U.S.C. § 1983, supervisors “must know about the conduct and facilitate it, approve it, condone it, or turn a blind eye for fear of what they might see. They must in other words act either knowingly or with deliberate, reckless indifference.” *Id.* In short, some causal connection or affirmative link between the action complained about and the official sued is necessary for § 1983 recovery. *Hildebrandt v. Illinois Dept. of Natural Resources*, 347 F.3d 1014, 1039 (7th Cir. 2003).

Additionally, Plaintiff is not alleging facts that could be construed as constituting a custom and policy sufficient to support an official capacity claim against Tom Dart. The government cannot be held liable for a constitutional violation in the absence of a custom, policy or practice that effectively caused or condoned the alleged constitutional violations. *See, e.g., Garrison v. Burke*, 165 F.3d 565, 571 (7th Cir. 1999); *Phelan v. Cook County*, 463 F.3d 773, 789 (7th Cir. 2006); *Monell v. Dep’t. of Soc. Serv. of City of New York*, 436 U.S. 658, 694 (1978). In the case at bar, Plaintiff does not suggest that there was an unconstitutional municipal policy or custom leading to the alleged constitutional violations. Therefore, there is no basis for liability on the part of Tom Dart in his official capacity.

Because Plaintiff has failed to state any facts suggesting that Defendant Dart was personally involved in—or even aware of—the alleged circumstances giving rise to the complaint, or that there was some unconstitutional custom and policy in place at his direction, he has failed to state a claim against Defendant Tom Dart. If Plaintiff chooses to submit an amended complaint, he must name the person, or persons, who he believes violated his rights, as Defendants. Plaintiff mentions a correctional officer in his complaint who refused him access to medical care, but does not name him. This correctional officer, as opposed to Tom Dart, would be an appropriate Defendant.

For the foregoing reasons, the Court dismisses the complaint on file without prejudice. Plaintiff is granted thirty days in which to submit an amended complaint on the Court’s required form. Plaintiff must write both the case number and the judge’s name on the amended complaint, sign it, and return it to the Prisoner Correspondent. As with every document filed with the Court, Plaintiff must provide an extra copy for the judge; he must also submit a service copy for each Defendant named in the amended complaint. Plaintiff is cautioned that an amended pleading supersedes the original complaint and must stand complete on its own. Therefore, all allegations against all Defendants must be set forth in the amended complaint, without reference to the original complaint. Any exhibits Plaintiff wants the Court to consider in its threshold review of the amended complaint must be attached, and each copy of the amended complaint must include complete copies of any and all exhibits. Plaintiff is advised to keep a copy for his files. The Clerk will provide Plaintiff with an amended civil rights complaint form and instructions along with a copy of this order. If Plaintiff fails to comply within thirty days, the case will be summarily dismissed. However, Plaintiff will still be responsible for paying the filing fee.