

SCANNED

#

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

FOR THE MIDDLE DISTRICT OF TENNESSEE NASHVILLE DIVISION

OKOSK

Lance Thomas Sandifer

RECEIVED  
IN CLERK'S OFFICE

v.

JUN 16 2014

Ashley Sparks, et al.

U. S. DISTRICT COURT  
MID. DIST. TENN.

This opposition and Plaintiff's memorandum (CDIS No 58) were received after the Court's Order granting the supervisor Defendants motion to DENY (CDIS No. 51). These papers are deemed motions to reconsider but are DENIED as the grounds allegations are insufficient to unparalyze Sean Brantley, Ben Killingsworth and Arvil Chapman's motion to dismiss filed through counsel. The defendants claim they, as supervisors, cannot be held liable for their ratification of officer Sparks action because defendants shall not be held responsible superior theory is an insufficient basis for liability under § 1983. They also say I attempt to allege a constitutional violation as to my grievances. I do not. I only mention my grievances because that's the way I went about seeking protection from officer Sparks, and the grievance are my proof that defendants Sean Brantley, Ben Killingsworth, and Arvil Chapman show deliberate indifference to my plight. Due to their ratification of the violations, and their deliberate indifference, ~~the~~ aforementioned defendants are entitled to not dismissal but persecution.

Comes now the plaintiff, Lance Thomas Sandifer, in opposition to the defendants, Sean Brantley, Ben Killingsworth and Arvil Chapman's motion to dismiss filed through counsel. The defendants claim they, as supervisors, cannot be held liable for their ratification of officer Sparks action because defendants shall not be held responsible superior theory is an insufficient basis for liability under § 1983. They also say I attempt to allege a constitutional violation as to my grievances. I do not. I only mention my grievances because that's the way I went about seeking protection from officer Sparks, and the grievance are my proof that defendants Sean Brantley, Ben Killingsworth, and Arvil Chapman show deliberate indifference to my plight. Due to their ratification of the violations, and their deliberate indifference, ~~the~~ aforementioned defendants are entitled to not dismissal but persecution.

In support of this motion I, the plaintiff, rely on the ~~contemporaneously~~ contemporaneously filed memorandum of law, a declaration, and a grievance.

Respectfully submitted,

L. Sandifer

Lance Sandifer, plaintiff

57