

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF ILLINOIS**

<b>DERRICK L. CLAY,</b>	)	
	)	
<b>Plaintiff,</b>	)	
	)	
<b>vs.</b>	)	<b>CIVIL NO. 07-cv-509-JPG</b>
	)	
<b>ROGER WALKER, et al.,</b>	)	
	)	
<b>Defendants.</b>	)	

**MEMORANDUM AND ORDER**

**GILBERT, District Judge:**

Plaintiff, an inmate in the Menard Correctional Center, brings this action for deprivations of his constitutional rights pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983. This case is now before the Court for a preliminary review of the complaint pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915A, which provides:

- (a) **Screening.**— The court shall review, before docketing, if feasible or, in any event, as soon as practicable after docketing, a complaint in a civil action in which a prisoner seeks redress from a governmental entity or officer or employee of a governmental entity.
- (b) **Grounds for Dismissal.**— On review, the court shall 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 on which relief may be granted; or
  - (2) seeks monetary relief from a defendant who is immune from such relief.

28 U.S.C. § 1915A. An action or claim is frivolous if “it lacks an arguable basis either in law or in fact.” *Neitzke v. Williams*, 490 U.S. 319, 325 (1989). Upon careful review of the complaint and any supporting exhibits, the Court finds it appropriate to exercise its authority under § 1915A; portions of this action are subject to summary dismissal.

## **FACTS ALLEGED**

Plaintiff alleges that on November 29, 2006, he was handcuffed by Defendant Murray in preparation for a shower. A few minutes later, after his cell mate was removed from the cell, Murray and Prange allowed another inmate, Towns, into Plaintiff's cell; Towns proceeded to assault Plaintiff while Murray and Prange looked the other way.

After this assault, Plaintiff was taken to the medical unit for treatment, and he filed a report with Internal Affairs. Later, Murray visited him and threatened him with further abuse if he caused trouble. Plaintiff was then moved to another cell on the end of the range, where a large fan blew constantly. He further alleges that his clothes disappeared during the move, and he never got them back.

## **LEGAL CLAIMS**

In *Farmer v. Brennan*, 511 U.S. 825 (1994), the Supreme Court held that “prison officials have a duty ... to protect prisoners from violence at the hands of other prisoners.” *Id.* at 833 (internal citations omitted); *see also Luttrell v. Nickel*, 129 F.3d 933, 935 (7<sup>th</sup> Cir. 1997). In order for a plaintiff to succeed on a claim for failure to protect, he must show that he is incarcerated under conditions posing a substantial risk of serious harm, and that the defendants acted with “deliberate indifference” to that danger. *Id.*; *Reed v. McBride*, 178 F.3d 849, 852 (7<sup>th</sup> Cir. 1999). A plaintiff also must prove that prison officials were aware of a specific, impending, and substantial threat to his safety, often by showing that he complained to prison officials about a *specific* threat to his safety. *Pope v. Shafer*, 86 F.3d 90, 92 (7<sup>th</sup> Cir. 1996). In other words, Defendants had to know that there was a substantial risk that those who attacked Plaintiff would do so, yet failed to take any action. *Sanville v. McCaughtry*, 266 F.3d 724, 733-34 (7<sup>th</sup> Cir. 2001).

In this case, the allegations are not just that Murray and Prange failed to prevent the assault by Towns; Plaintiff claims that they actually facilitated it. Thus, the Court is unable to dismiss this claim against them at this time.

Plaintiff also presents a vague claim regarding the cold conditions in his cell. Prisoners have an Eighth Amendment right to adequate shelter, including a right to protection from cold. *See Dixon v. Godinez*, 114 F.3d 640, 642 (7<sup>th</sup> Cir. 1997). To assess whether cold cell temperatures constitute cruel and unusual punishment, courts must consider factors including “the severity of the cold; its duration; whether the prisoner has alternative means to protect himself from the cold; the adequacy of such alternatives; as well as whether he must endure other uncomfortable conditions as well as cold.” *Id.* at 644; *see also Palmer v. Johnson*, 193 F.3d 346 (5<sup>th</sup> Cir. 1999) (finding that exposure to extreme cold for 17 hours could constitute Eighth Amendment violation); *Henderson v. DeRobertis*, 940 F.2d 1055, 1058 (7<sup>th</sup> Cir. 1991) (finding that deprivation of blankets for four days in extreme cold could constitute Eighth Amendment violation). The cold need not present an imminent threat to the inmate’s health to implicate the Eighth Amendment. *See Dixon*, 114 F.3d at 642. Plaintiff’s allegations in this action simply do not rise to the level of an Eighth Amendment violation. Accordingly, this claim will be dismissed.

As for loss of his clothing, the only constitutional right that might be implicated by these facts is Plaintiff’s right, under the Fourteenth Amendment, to be free from deprivations of his property by state actors without due process of law. To state a claim under the due process clause of the Fourteenth Amendment, plaintiff must establish a deprivation of liberty or property *without due process of law*; if the state provides an adequate remedy, plaintiff has no civil rights claim. *Hudson v. Palmer*, 468 U.S. 517, 530-36 (1984) (availability of damages remedy in state claims

court is an adequate, post-deprivation remedy). The Seventh Circuit has found that Illinois provides an adequate post-deprivation remedy in an action for damages in the Illinois Court of Claims. *Murdock v. Washington*, 193 F.3d 510, 513 (7<sup>th</sup> Cir. 1999); *Stewart v. McGinnis*, 5 F.3d 1031, 1036 (7<sup>th</sup> Cir. 1993); 705 ILCS 505/8 (1995). Accordingly, Plaintiff has no claim under Section 1983.

#### **OTHER DEFENDANTS**

Plaintiff lists Carter, Walker and Hulick as defendants in the caption of his complaint. However, the statement of claim does not include any allegations against these defendants. “A plaintiff cannot state a claim against a defendant by including the defendant’s name in the caption.” *Collins v. Kibort*, 143 F.3d 331, 334 (7<sup>th</sup> Cir. 1998). *See also Crowder v. Lash*, 687 F.2d 996, 1006 (7<sup>th</sup> Cir. 1982) (director of state correctional agency not personally responsible for constitutional violations within prison system solely because grievance procedure made him aware of it and he failed to intervene). Accordingly, these three defendants will be dismissed from this action.

#### **SUPPLEMENT TO COMPLAINT (DOC. 7)**

In addition to including his trust fund statement, this document includes a grievance regarding an incident that occurred on August 23, 2007. This incident is completely unrelated to the claims presented in the complaint; therefore, the Court and all parties will disregard this filing. If Plaintiff wishes to pursue a claim regarding this incident, he may do so by filing a separate lawsuit.

#### **PENDING MOTIONS**

In his first motion (Doc. 10), Plaintiff explains that his property was lost, including his copy of the complaint. Therefore, he asks the Court to provide him with a copy. This motion is **GRANTED**; the Clerk shall send Plaintiff one copy of his complaint (Doc. 1) with his copy of this

order.

Plaintiff's second motion (Doc. 11) is essentially a transmittal letter accompanying his USM-285 forms. Therefore, as a motion, it is **MOOT**.

**DISPOSITION**

**IT IS HEREBY ORDERED** that Plaintiff's claims regarding cold conditions in his cell and loss of his clothing are **DISMISSED** from this action with prejudice.

**IT IS FURTHER ORDERED** that Defendants **CARTER, HULICK** and **WALKER** are **DISMISSED** from this action with prejudice. Dismissal of these claims and defendants constitutes one of Plaintiff's three allotted strikes. 28 U.S.C. § 1915(g). *See George v. Smith*, 507 F.3d 605, 607-08 (7<sup>th</sup> Cir. 2007); *Boriboune v. Berge*, 391 F.3d 852, 855 (7<sup>th</sup> Cir. 2004).

The Clerk is **DIRECTED** to prepare Form 1A (Notice of Lawsuit and Request for Waiver of Service of Summons) and Form 1B (Waiver of Service of Summons) for Defendants **MURRAY** and **PRANGE**. The Clerk shall forward those forms, USM-285 forms submitted by Plaintiff, and sufficient copies of the complaint to the United States Marshal for service.

The United States Marshal is **DIRECTED**, pursuant to Rule 4(c)(2) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, to serve process on Defendants **MURRAY** and **PRANGE** in the manner specified by Rule 4(d)(2) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure. Process in this case shall consist of the complaint, applicable forms 1A and 1B, and this Memorandum and Order. For purposes of computing the passage of time under Rule 4(d)(2), the Court and all parties will compute time as of the date it is mailed by the Marshal, as noted on the USM-285 form.

With respect to former employees of Illinois Department of Corrections who no longer can be found at the work address provided by Plaintiff, the Department of Corrections shall furnish the

Marshal with the Defendant's last-known address upon issuance of a court order which states that the information shall be used only for purposes of effectuating service (or for proof of service, should a dispute arise) and any documentation of the address shall be retained only by the Marshal. Address information obtained from I.D.O.C. pursuant to this order shall not be maintained in the court file, nor disclosed by the Marshal.

The United States Marshal shall file returned waivers of service as well as any requests for waivers of service that are returned as undelivered as soon as they are received. If a waiver of service is not returned by a defendant within **THIRTY (30) DAYS** from the date of mailing the request for waiver, the United States Marshal shall:

- Request that the Clerk prepare a summons for that defendant who has not yet returned a waiver of service; the Clerk shall then prepare such summons as requested.
- Personally serve process and a copy of this Order upon the defendant pursuant to Rule 4 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure and 28 U.S.C. § 566(c).
- Within ten days after personal service is effected, the United States Marshal shall file the return of service for the defendant, along with evidence of any attempts to secure a waiver of service of process and of the costs subsequently incurred in effecting service on said defendant. Said costs shall be enumerated on the USM-285 form and shall include the costs incurred by the Marshal's office for photocopying additional copies of the summons and complaint and for preparing new USM-285 forms, if required. Costs of service will be taxed against the personally served defendant in accordance with the provisions of Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 4(d)(2) unless the defendant shows good cause for such failure.

Plaintiff is **ORDERED** to serve upon defendant or, if appearance has been entered by counsel, upon that attorney, a copy of every further pleading or other document submitted for consideration by this Court. He shall include with the original paper to be filed with the Clerk of the Court a certificate stating the date that a true and correct copy of any document was mailed to defendant or his counsel. Any paper received by a district judge or magistrate judge which has not

been filed with the Clerk or which fails to include a certificate of service will be disregarded by the Court.

Defendants are **ORDERED** to timely file an appropriate responsive pleading to the complaint, and shall not waive filing a reply pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1997e(g).

Pursuant to Local Rule 72.1(a)(2), this cause is **REFERRED** to a United States Magistrate Judge for further pre-trial proceedings.

Further, this entire matter is hereby **REFERRED** to a United States Magistrate Judge for disposition, as contemplated by Local Rule 72.2(b)(2) and 28 U.S.C. § 636(c), *should all the parties consent to such a referral.*

Plaintiff is under a continuing obligation to keep the Clerk and each opposing party informed of any change in his whereabouts. This shall be done in writing and not later than seven (7) days after a transfer or other change in address occurs.

**IT IS SO ORDERED.**

**Dated: October 21, 2008.**

s/ J. Phil Gilbert  
**U. S. District Judge**