

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

JIMMY WAYNE DANTZLER,

Plaintiff,

v.

WISCONSIN DEPARTMENT OF  
CORRECTIONS, MILWAUKEE  
SECURE DETENTION FACILITY,  
and GEOFFREY SCHULTZE,

Defendants.

Case No. 24-CV-1415-JPS

**ORDER**

Plaintiff Jimmy Wayne Dantzler, an inmate confined at the Milwaukee Secure Detention Facility (“MSDF”), filed a pro se complaint under 42 U.S.C. § 1983 alleging that his constitutional rights were violated. ECF 1. On January 28, 2025, the Court screened the complaint, found that it failed to state a claim, and allowed Plaintiff to file an amended complaint. ECF No. 8. On February 18, 2025, Plaintiff filed an amended complaint. ECF No. 9. This Order screens Plaintiff’s amended complaint.

**1. SCREENING THE AMENDED COMPLAINT**

**1.1 Federal Screening Standard**

Under the Prison Litigation Reform Act, the Court must screen complaints brought by prisoners seeking relief from a governmental entity or an officer or employee of a governmental entity. 28 U.S.C. § 1915A(a). The Court must dismiss a complaint if the prisoner raises 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).

In determining whether a complaint states a claim, the Court applies the same standard that applies to dismissals under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 12(b)(6). *See Cesal v. Moats*, 851 F.3d 714, 720 (7th Cir. 2017) (citing *Booker-El v. Superintendent, Ind. State Prison*, 668 F.3d 896, 899 (7th Cir. 2012)). A complaint must include “a short and plain statement of the claim showing that the pleader is entitled to relief.” Fed. R. Civ. P. 8(a)(2). The complaint must contain enough facts, accepted as true, to “state a claim for relief that is plausible on its face.” *Ashcroft v. Iqbal*, 556 U.S. 662, 678 (2009) (quoting *Bell Atl. Corp. v. Twombly*, 550 U.S. 544, 570 (2007)). “A claim has facial plausibility when the plaintiff pleads factual content that allows a court to draw the reasonable inference that the defendant is liable for the misconduct alleged.” *Id.* (citing *Twombly*, 550 U.S. at 556).

To state a claim for relief under 42 U.S.C. § 1983, a plaintiff must allege that someone deprived him of a right secured by the Constitution or the laws of the United States and that whoever deprived him of this right was acting under the color of state law. *D.S. v. E. Porter Cnty. Sch. Corp.*, 799 F.3d 793, 798 (7th Cir. 2015) (citing *Buchanan–Moore v. County of Milwaukee*, 570 F.3d 824, 827 (7th Cir. 2009)). The Court construes pro se complaints liberally and holds them to a less stringent standard than pleadings drafted by lawyers. *Cesal*, 851 F.3d at 720 (citing *Perez v. Fenoglio*, 792 F.3d 768, 776 (7th Cir. 2015)).

## **1.2 Plaintiff’s Allegations**

Plaintiff brings this case against Defendants Wisconsin Department of Corrections (“DOC”), MSDF, and Geoffrey Schultze (“Schultze”). ECF No. 9 at 1. Plaintiff alleges that on September 10, 2024, he told staff at MSDF

that he planned to kill himself and that he needed to speak with psychological services. *Id.* at 2. Schutze came to tell property that Plaintiff was “doing this over property,” which was not true. *Id.* At approximately 11:00 a.m., Schutze brought a property bag with a razor blade in the bag. *Id.* at 2–3. The bag was clear and Schutze knew there was a razor blade in the bag. *Id.* Plaintiff then swallowed the razor blade. *Id.* As a result, Plaintiff spent four days at Aurora Sinai Hospital in pain. *Id.* Plaintiff alleges he was able to self-harm due to the deliberate indifference of MSDF staff. *Id.*

### 1.3 Analysis

The Court finds that Plaintiff may proceed on an Eighth Amendment deliberate-indifference claim against Defendant Schutze for his indifference to the risk of Plaintiff’s self-harm. The Eighth Amendment prohibits “cruel and unusual punishments” and “imposes a duty on prison officials to take reasonable measures to guarantee an inmate’s safety and to ensure that inmates receive adequate care.” *Phillips v. Diedrick*, No. 18-C-56, 2019 WL 318403, at \*2 (E.D. Wis. Jan. 24, 2019) (citing *Farmer v. Brennan*, 511 U.S. 825, 832 (1994)). While a prison official’s deliberate indifference to a prisoner’s substantial risk of serious harm violates the Eighth Amendment, not every claim by a prisoner that he did not receive adequate care will succeed. *Id.* (citing *Estelle v. Gamble*, 429 U.S. 97, 104–05 (1976)). To prevail on such a claim, a plaintiff will have to provide evidence showing that “(1) his medical need was objectively serious, and (2) the defendant[] consciously disregarded this need.” *Berry v. Lutsey*, 780 F. App’x 365, 368–69 (7th Cir. 2019) (citing *Farmer*, 511 U.S. at 834).

Prison staff have a duty to prevent inmates from causing serious harm to themselves. *Pittman ex rel. Hamilton v. County of Madison*, 746 F.3d 766, 775–76 (7th Cir. 2014). Before an official will be liable for ignoring a risk

of self-harm, however, the “risk of future harm must be sure or very likely to give rise to sufficiently imminent dangers.” *Davis-Clair v. Turck*, 714 F. App’x 605, 606 (7th Cir. 2018) (internal quotation marks omitted). The question of when that risk of future harm becomes “sure or very likely to give rise to sufficiently imminent dangers” depends on the circumstances of the case. *See, e.g., Freeman v. Berge*, 441 F.3d 543, 546–47 (7th Cir. 2006) (explaining that “at some point,” to ensure a prisoner is not “seriously endangering his health,” prison officials would have a duty and right to step in and force a prisoner on a hunger strike to take nourishment); *see also Davis v. Gee*, No. 14-cv-617, 2017 WL 2880869, at \*3–4 (W.D. Wis. July 6, 2017) (holding that to show a constitutional injury, the harm must present an objectively, sufficiently serious risk of serious damage to future health; swallowing a handful of Tylenol fails to do that).

Here, the Court finds that Plaintiff states sufficient factual allegations to proceed against Schulze for an Eighth Amendment deliberate-indifference claim. Plaintiff alleges that Schultze knew Plaintiff wanted to kill himself and asked to see psychological services. Plaintiff also alleges that Schultze knowingly gave Plaintiff the razor blade that Plaintiff used to self-harm. As such, at the pleading stage, the Court finds that Plaintiff may proceed on an Eighth Amendment claim against Schultze for his deliberate indifference to the serious risk of Plaintiff’s self-harm.

The Court does not find, however, that Plaintiff can proceed against Defendants DOC or MSDF. A prison is not a “person” for the purposes of § 1983 and therefore not a suable entity. *See Smith v. Knox Cnty. Jail*, 666 F.3d 1037, 1040 (7th Cir. 2012) (“[T]he district court was correct that, in listing the Knox County Jail as the sole defendant, [Plaintiff] named a non-suable entity.”). Similarly, “states and their agencies are not ‘persons’ subject to

suit under 42 U.S.C. § 1983.” *Johnson v. Supreme Court of Ill.*, 165 F.3d 1140, 1141 (7th Cir. 1999). This means that “[n]either the State of Wisconsin nor the State’s Department of Corrections is a proper defendant.” *Andreola v. Wisconsin*, 171 F. App’x 514, 515 (7th Cir. 2006). As such, the Court will dismiss DOC and MSDF from this action for the failure to state a claim against them.

## 2. CONCLUSION

In light of the foregoing, the Court finds that Plaintiff may proceed on the following claim pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915A(b):

**Claim One:** Eighth Amendment deliberate-indifference claim against Defendant Schultze for his indifference to the serious risk of Plaintiff’s self-harm.

Defendant should take note that, within forty-five (45) days of service of this Order, he is to file a summary judgment motion that raises all exhaustion-related challenges. The Court will issue a scheduling order at a later date that embodies other relevant deadlines.

Accordingly,

**IT IS ORDERED** that Defendants DOC and MSDF be and the same are hereby **DISMISSED** from this action;

**IT IS FURTHER ORDERED** that under an informal service agreement between the Wisconsin Department of Justice and this Court, a copy of the amended complaint and this Order have been electronically transmitted to the Wisconsin Department of Justice for service on Defendant **Schultze**;


**IT IS FURTHER ORDERED** that under the informal service agreement, Defendant shall file a responsive pleading to the amended complaint within sixty (60) days;

**IT IS FURTHER ORDERED** that Defendant raise any exhaustion-related challenges by filing a motion for summary judgment within forty-five (45) days of service; and

**IT IS FURTHER ORDERED** if Defendant contemplates a motion to dismiss, the parties must meet and confer before the motion is filed. Defendants should take care to explain the reasons why he intends to move to dismiss the complaint, and Plaintiff should strongly consider filing an amended complaint. The Court expects this exercise in efficiency will obviate the need to file most motions to dismiss. Indeed, when the Court grants a motion to dismiss, it typically grants leave to amend unless it is “certain from the face of the complaint that any amendment would be futile or otherwise unwarranted.” *Harris v. Meisner*, No. 20-2650, 2021 WL 5563942, at \*2 (7th Cir. Nov. 29, 2021) (quoting *Runnion ex rel. Runnion v. Girl Scouts of Greater Chi. & Nw. Ind.*, 786 F.3d 510, 524 (7th Cir. 2015)). Therefore, it is in both parties’ interest to discuss the matter prior to motion submissions. Briefs in support of, or opposition to, motions to dismiss should cite no more than ten (10) cases per claim. No string citations will be accepted. If Defendant files a motion to dismiss, Plaintiff is hereby warned that he must file a response, in accordance with Civil Local Rule 7 (E.D. Wis.), or he may be deemed to have waived any argument against dismissal and face dismissal of this matter with prejudice

Dated at Milwaukee, Wisconsin, this 10th day of March, 2025.

BY THE COURT:

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read "J.P. Stadtmueller", is written over a horizontal line. The signature is stylized and somewhat cursive.

J. P. Stadtmueller  
U.S. District Judge

Plaintiffs who are inmates at Prisoner E-Filing Program institutions shall submit all correspondence and case filings to institution staff, who will scan and e-mail documents to the Court. Prisoner E-Filing is mandatory for all inmates at Columbia Correctional Institution, Dodge Correctional Institution, Green Bay Correctional Institution, Oshkosh Correctional Institution, Waupun Correctional Institution, and Wisconsin Secure Program Facility.

Plaintiffs who are inmates at all other prison facilities, or who have been released from custody, will be required to submit all correspondence and legal material to:

Office of the Clerk  
United States District Court  
Eastern District of Wisconsin  
362 United States Courthouse  
517 E. Wisconsin Avenue  
Milwaukee, Wisconsin 53202

**DO NOT MAIL ANYTHING DIRECTLY TO THE COURT'S CHAMBERS.** If mail is received directly to the Court's chambers, **IT WILL BE RETURNED TO SENDER AND WILL NOT BE FILED IN THE CASE.**

Plaintiff is further advised that failure to timely file any brief, motion, response, or reply 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. **IF PLAINTIFF FAILS TO PROVIDE AN UPDATED ADDRESS TO THE COURT AND MAIL IS RETURNED TO THE COURT AS UNDELIVERABLE, THE COURT WILL DISMISS THIS ACTION WITHOUT PREJUDICE.**