

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
EASTERN DISTRICT OF WISCONSIN**

---

**RICARDO GLOVER,**

**Plaintiff,**

**v.**

**Case No. 14-CV-87**

**PSY D. JONATHON DICKEY, STEVEN WIERENGA,  
JUDY P. SMITH, and DOUGLAS LAFOLLETT,**

**Defendants.**

---

**SCREENING ORDER**

Plaintiff, a Wisconsin state prisoner, filed a pro se complaint under 42 U.S.C. § 1983, alleging that his civil rights were violated. This matter comes before the court on plaintiff's petition to proceed in forma pauperis. He has been assessed and paid an initial partial filing fee of \$16.66.

The court is required to screen complaints brought by prisoners seeking relief against a governmental entity or officer or employee of a governmental entity. 28 U.S.C. § 1915A(a). The court must dismiss a complaint or portion thereof if the prisoner has raised claims that are legally "frivolous or malicious," that fail to state a claim upon which relief may be granted, or that seek monetary relief from a defendant who is immune from such relief. 28 U.S.C. § 1915A(b).

A claim is legally frivolous when it lacks an arguable basis either in law or in fact. Denton v. Hernandez, 504 U.S. 25, 31 (1992); Neitzke v. Williams, 490 U.S. 319, 325 (1989); Hutchinson ex rel. Baker v. Spink, 126 F.3d 895, 900 (7th Cir. 1997). The court may, therefore, dismiss a claim as frivolous where it is based on an indisputably meritless

legal theory or where the factual contentions are clearly baseless. Neitzke, 490 U.S. at 327. “Malicious,” although sometimes treated as a synonym for “frivolous,” “is more usefully construed as intended to harass.” Lindell v. McCallum, 352 F.3d 1107, 1109-10 (7th Cir. 2003) (citations omitted).

To state a cognizable claim under the federal notice pleading system, plaintiff is required to provide a “short and plain statement of the claim showing that [he] is entitled to relief[.]” Fed. R. Civ. P. 8(a)(2). It is not necessary for the plaintiff to plead specific facts and his statement need only “give the defendant fair notice of what the . . . claim is and the grounds upon which it rests.” Bell Atlantic Corp. v. Twombly, 550 U.S. 544, 555 (2007) (quoting Conley v. Gibson, 355 U.S. 41, 47 (1957)). However, a complaint that offers “labels and conclusions” or “formulaic recitation of the elements of a cause of action will not do.” Ashcroft v. Iqbal, 556 U.S. 662, 678 (2009) (quoting Twombly, 550 U.S. at 555). To state a claim, a complaint must contain sufficient factual matter, accepted as true, “that is plausible on its face.” Id. (quoting Twombly, 550 U.S. at 570). “A claim has facial plausibility when the plaintiff pleads factual content that allows the court to draw the reasonable inference that the defendant is liable for the misconduct alleged.” Id. (citing Twombly, 550 U.S. at 556). The complaint allegations “must be enough to raise a right to relief above the speculative level.” Twombly, 550 U.S. at 555 (citation omitted).

In considering whether a complaint states a claim, courts should follow the principles set forth in Twombly by first, “identifying pleadings that, because they are no more than conclusions, are not entitled to the assumption of truth.” Iqbal, 556 U.S. at 679. Legal conclusions must be supported by factual allegations. Id. If there are well-pleaded factual

allegations, the court must, second, “assume their veracity and then determine whether they plausibly give rise to an entitlement to relief.” Id.

To state a claim for relief under 42 U.S.C. § 1983, a plaintiff must allege that: 1) he was deprived of a right secured by the Constitution or laws of the United States; and 2) the deprivation was visited upon him by a person or persons acting under color of state law. Buchanan-Moore v. County of Milwaukee, 570 F.3d 824, 827 (7th Cir. 2009) (citing Kramer v. Village of North Fond du Lac, 384 F.3d 856, 861 (7th Cir. 2004)); see also Gomez v. Toledo, 446 U.S. 635, 640 (1980). The court is obliged to give plaintiff’s pro se allegations, “however inartfully pleaded,” a liberal construction. See Erickson v. Pardus, 551 U.S. 89, 94 (2007) (quoting Estelle v. Gamble, 429 U.S. 97, 106 (1976)).

Plaintiff is incarcerated at Oshkosh Correctional Institution (OSCI). He alleges that defendant Jonathon Dickey who is the psychologist supervisor at OSCI, denied plaintiff’s request to participate in Sex Offender Treatment-2, a treatment program required before parole. According to plaintiff, defendant Dickey’s refusal to permit plaintiff to enroll in the program was discriminatory and without rational basis because he required that plaintiff satisfy additional criteria which were not required of other inmates. (Compl. at 5 ¶ 6.) He claims that defendants violated his right to equal protection under the “class of one” theory. For relief, plaintiff seeks monetary damages, declaratory relief, and a permanent injunction.

Plaintiff may proceed on an equal protection class of one claim against defendant Dickey. See Village of Willowbrook v. Olech, 528 U.S. 562, 564 (2000); Swanson v. City of Chetek, 719 F.3d 780, 784 (7th Cir. 2013). However, he does not allege that the other defendants – OSCI Deputy Warden Steven Wierenga, OSCI Warden Judy Smith, Douglas

LaFollette<sup>1</sup> – were personally involved in his claim. Therefore, they will be dismissed. See Burks v. Raemisch, 555 F.3d 592, 595-96 (7th Cir. 2009).

#### PLAINTIFF'S REQUEST FOR PRELIMINARY INJUNCTION

Plaintiff seeks a preliminary injunction ordering defendants to stop discriminating against him and, to strike the sex offender treatment as a need for his treatment or allow him in the program to tell the truth about the facts surrounding his sexual assault conviction. A party seeking a preliminary injunction must demonstrate that he is reasonably likely to succeed on the merits, that he is experiencing irreparable harm that exceeds any harm his opponent will suffer if the injunction issues, that he lacks an adequate remedy at law, and that the injunction would not harm the public interest. Christian Legal Soc'y v. Walker, 453 F.3d 853, 859 (7th Cir. 2006). “If the moving party meets this threshold burden, the district court weighs the factors against one another in a sliding scale analysis . . . which is to say the district court must exercise its discretion to determine whether the balance of harms weighs in favor of the moving party or whether the nonmoving party or public interest will be harmed sufficiently that the injunction should be denied. Id.; see Joelner v. Vill. of Wash. Park, 378 F.3d 613, 619 (7th Cir. 2004).

Here, plaintiff alleges that defendant denied his request to participate in the treatment program without a rational basis and set forth additional criteria he must satisfy before enrolling such as a more recent parole recommendation for the program and acceptance of responsibility for his crime. Plaintiff also alleges that other offenders similar to him were permitted to enroll without having to satisfy the additional criteria. Without

---

<sup>1</sup> Plaintiff refers to Douglas LaFollette as the Secretary of the Department of Corrections, however, he is the Secretary of State of Wisconsin.

having heard from defendant, the court will not rule that defendant's alleged criteria are irrational. Thus, I find, at this stage of the proceedings, that plaintiff has not demonstrated a reasonable likelihood of success on the merits and his request for a preliminary injunction will be denied.

#### PLAINTIFF'S MOTION TO APPOINT COUNSEL

Plaintiff has filed a motion to appoint counsel. The court has discretion to recruit counsel to represent a litigant who is unable to afford one in a civil case. Navejar v. Iyiola, 718 F.3d 692, 696 (7th Cir. 2013); 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(1); Ray v. Wexford Health Sources, Inc., 706 F.3d 864, 866-67 (7th Cir. 2013). As a threshold matter, litigants must make a reasonable attempt to secure private counsel on their own. Pruitt v. Mote, 503 F.3d 647, 653 (7th Cir. 2007). If the plaintiff makes a reasonable attempt to secure counsel, the court must examine "whether the difficulty of the case – factually and legally – exceeds the particular plaintiff's capacity as a layperson to coherently present it." Navejar, 781 F.3d at 696 (citing Pruitt, 503 F.3d at 655). This inquiry focuses not only the plaintiff's ability to try his case, but also includes other "tasks that normally attend litigation" such as "evidence gathering" and "preparing and responding to motions." Id.

In this case, plaintiff has provided evidence that he has attempted to obtain legal counsel on his own. However, the issues in this case appear at this stage to be straightforward and uncomplicated. Moreover, plaintiff's filings indicate that he is capable of litigating this case himself. Therefore, at this time, the court does not believe that the presence of counsel is likely to make a difference in the outcome of this case. Accordingly, plaintiff's request for appointment of counsel is denied.

**IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED** that plaintiff's motion for leave to proceed in forma pauperis (Docket 2) is **GRANTED**.

**IT IS FURTHER ORDERED** that plaintiff's request for preliminary injunction is **DENIED**.

**IT IS FURTHER ORDERED** that plaintiff's motion to appoint counsel (Docket 4) is **DENIED**.

**IT IS FURTHER ORDERED** that defendants Steven Wierenga, Judy P. Smith, and Douglas LaFollette are **DISMISSED**.

**IT IS FURTHER ORDERED** that pursuant to an informal service agreement between the Wisconsin Department of Justice and this court, a copy of plaintiff's complaint and this order are being electronically sent today to the Wisconsin Department of Justice for service on the state defendant.

**IT IS ALSO ORDERED** that, pursuant to the informal service agreement between the Wisconsin Department of Justice and this court, defendants shall file a responsive pleading to the complaint within sixty days of receiving electronic notice of this order.

**IT IS FURTHER ORDERED** that the Secretary of the Wisconsin Department of Corrections or his designee shall collect from plaintiff's prison trust account the \$333.34 balance of the filing fee by collecting monthly payments from plaintiff's prison trust account in an amount equal to 20% of the preceding month's income credited to the prisoner's trust account and forwarding payments to the clerk of the court each time the amount in the account exceeds \$10 in accordance with 28 U.S.C. § 1915(b)(2). The payments shall be clearly identified by the case name and number assigned to this action.

**IT IS ALSO ORDERED** that copies of this order be sent to the warden of the institution where the inmate is confined.

Plaintiff is notified that from now on, he is required under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 5(a) to send a copy of every paper or document filed with the court to the opposing party or, if the opposing party is represented by counsel, to counsel for that party. Fed. R. Civ. P. 5(b). Plaintiff should also retain a personal copy of each document. If plaintiff does not have access to a photocopy machine, he may send out identical handwritten or typed copies of any documents. The court may disregard any papers or documents which do not indicate that a copy has been sent to the opposing party or that party's attorney, if the party is represented by an attorney.

Plaintiff is further advised that failure to make a timely submission may result in the dismissal of this action for failure to prosecute.

In addition, the parties must notify the Clerk of Court of any change of address. Failure to do so could result in orders or other information not being timely delivered, thus affecting the legal rights of the parties.

Dated at Milwaukee, Wisconsin, this 16th day of April, 2014.

s/ Lynn Adelman

---

LYNN ADELMAN  
District Judge