Ramirez v. Godinez et al Doc. 166

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

CESILIO RAMIREZ,)		
Plaintiff,)		
vs.)	CASE NO.	13-1191-SCW
SALVADOR GODINEZ, JOHN DOE 1, JOHN)		
DOE 2, JOHN DOE 3, JOHN DOE 4, JOHN	ĵ		
DOE 5, WARDEN, RICHARD	ĺ		
HARRINGTON, KIMBERLY BUTLER,	j		
JOSEPH COWAN, DAVID DOBBS,	j		
MAYNARD HUDSON, TIMOTHY W. JONES,)		
DONALD LINDENBERG, CURTIS MOORE,)		
DARL PRANGE, MICHAEL QUIGLEY,)		
JERRY WHITOFF, CHRISTOPHER)		
WYNDELL,)		
)		
Defendant(s).)		

CECH IO DANIDEZ

JUDGMENT IN A CIVIL CASE

Defendant SALVADOR GODINEZ was dismissed without prejudice on December 11, 2013 by an Order entered Chief Judge Michael J. Reagan (Doc. 13).

Defendant WARDEN MENARD CORRECTIONAL CENTER was substituted by RICHARD HARRINGTON on March 18, 2014.

Defendants JOHN DOE 1, JOHN DOE 2, JOHN DOE 3, JOHN DOE 4 and JOHN DOE 5 were dismissed on January 7, 2015 by the filing of the Amended Complaint on (Doc. 56).

Defendant KIMBERLY BUTLER was dismissed without prejudice on February 15, 2015 by an Order entered by Magistrate Judge Williams (Doc. 72).

Defendant DAVID DOBBS, MAYNARD HUDSON, TIMOTHY W. JONES, DONALD LINDENBERG, CURTIS MOORE and DARL PRANGE were granted summary judgment on May 26, 2016 by an Order entered by Magistrate Judge Stephen C. Williams (Doc. 137).

Defendants MICHAEL QUIGLEY and JERRY WHITOFF were dismissed with prejudice

on July 17, 2017 by Magistrate Judge Stephen C. Williams (Doc.162).

The remaining claims came before this Court for jury trial. Plaintiff orally

dismissed remaining case with prejudice.

THEREFORE, Judgment is entered in favor of Defendants RICHARD HARRINGTON,

JOSEPH COWAN, DAVID DOBBS, MAYNARD HUDSON, TIMOTHY W. JONES, DONALD

LINDENBERG, CURTIS MOORE, DARL PRANGE and CHRISTOPHER WYNDELL and

against Plaintiff **CESILEO RAMIREZ**. All remaining claims are dismissed.

Plaintiff shall take nothing from this action.

The Plaintiff should take notice of the fact that he has 28 days from the date of this

judgment for filing a motion for new trial or motion to amend or alter judgment under Rule

59(b) or (e) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure. These deadlines for motions under

Rule 59 cannot be extended by the Court. The Plaintiff should also note that he has 30

days from the date of this judgment to file a notice of appeal. This period can only be

extended if excusable neglect or good cause is shown.

DATED this 18th day of July, 2017

JUSTINE FLANAGAN, ACTING CLERK

BY: <u>/s/ Angela Vehlewald</u> Deputy Clerk

Approved by <u>/s/ Stephen C. Williams</u>

United States Magistrate Judge Stephen C. Williams