

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

**GEORGE A. KRUEGER, JR, #R01396,** )

**Plaintiff,** )

**vs.** )

**Case No. 20-cv-00070-SMY**

**VENERIO M. SANTOS,** )

**DR. RITZ, and** )

**WARDEN OF CENTRALIA** )

**CORRECTIONAL CENTER,** )

**Defendants.** )

**MEMORANDUM AND ORDER**

**YANDLE, District Judge:**

Plaintiff George Krueger, an inmate of the Illinois Department of Corrections, filed this action pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983 for alleged deprivations of his constitutional rights. Plaintiff claims deliberate indifference in violation of the Eighth Amendment related to inadequate medical treatment for painful and bleeding hemorrhoids. This matter is now before the Court on Plaintiff’s “Amended Order to Show Cause for Preliminary Injunct[ive] Relief,” which the Court construes as a Motion for Preliminary Injunction. (Doc. 11). He also addresses his request for a preliminary injunction in his Amended Complaint. (Doc. 12, pp. 18-21). Specifically, Plaintiff seeks an order requiring Defendants to provide him with hemorrhoid removal surgery and an examination at a hospital to rule out cancer, Crohn’s disease, and any other disease. (Doc. 11, p. 2).

Defendant Thompson, who is a defendant solely for purposes of Plaintiff’s claims for injunctive relief, has filed a response to the motion. (Doc. 27). According to Defendant, Plaintiff is receiving medical care at Centralia Correctional Center and was seen by an outside medical expert for an examination of his hemorrhoids on September 11, 2020. (Doc. 27, p. 3; 27-2, p. 1; 31, p. 25). Plaintiff filed a Reply in which he acknowledges he was approved to see an outside

medial expert for examination and removal of his hemorrhoids. (Doc. 30). Therefore, Plaintiff has received the requested relief and his Motion (Doc. 11) is **DENIED as MOOT**.<sup>1</sup>

**IT IS SO ORDERED.**

**DATED: October 13, 2020**

*s/ Staci M. Yandle*  
**STACI M. YANDLE**  
**United States District Judge**

---

<sup>1</sup> Plaintiff's request that the Court continue this matter "to see into the future outcome" is without legal basis and therefore denied.