

Central District of Illinois

Civil prisoner cases needing Pro Bono Counsel

Any attorney interested in helping as Pro Bono counsel may contact the Pro Bono Coordinator for the Central District of Illinois, Marleen Cooke at 217-492-5204 or Marleen_Cooke@ilcd.uscourts.gov.

The Central District of Illinois Plan for Recruitment of Counsel has a cap of \$1,000.00 for reimbursement of expenses.

21-1197 – Croom v Kennedy, et al. - Plaintiff is an inmate with the Illinois Department of Corrections (“IDOC”). Although he is now housed at the IDOC’s Lawrence Correctional Center, Plaintiff’s claims arise from when he was housed at Pontiac. Plaintiff states that he suffers from a mental illness that makes it difficult for him to litigate this case on his own. The Court finds that the Complaint states two claims: (1) a claim based upon the conditions of his confinement at Pontiac’s North House and (2) a claim for deliberate indifference to his serious medical needs in violation of his Eighth Amendment Rights.

22-1053 – Padilla v Clark – Plaintiff has two claims against the Warden at the Illinois River Correctional Center: (1) an Eighth Amendment claim based upon the conditions of his confinement at Illinois River and (2) a deliberate indifference claim to his serious medical needs in violation of his Eighth Amendment rights.

21-2140 – Dupree v Duncan, et al. – Plaintiff is an inmate with the Illinois Department of Corrections (“IDOC”) who is imprisoned at the IDOC’s Decatur Correctional Center (“Decatur”). Plaintiff has two claims: (1) a deliberate indifference claim against Dr. Duncan and Dr. Morisetty and (2) a conditions of confinement claim against Warden Gray, both in violation of her Eighth Amendment rights.

21-2259 Joslin v Doe, et al. Plaintiff claims that on June 22, 2021, the Champaign County Police “tackled” and “slammed” him to the ground. (ECF 1: p. 5.) As a result, Plaintiff suffered fractures to his color bone and seven ribs and had a tube inserted to drain fluid from his lung. Plaintiff has alleged enough facts to proceed with a Fourteenth Amendment excessive force claim against Defendant John Doe for the events alleged on June 22, 2021.

22-3010 DeVost v Davis - The Plaintiff has some mental illness and is taking psychotropic medications, and so, it is hard for him to litigate the case on his own. Although he is now at the IDOC’s Jacksonville Correctional Center, Plaintiff’s claims arise from when he was detained at the Sangamon County Jail. Plaintiff’s Complaint states two claims: (1) an excessive force claim against Defendants Dale Davis, Joshua Davis, Matthew Dowis, and Mark Terlecki in violation of his Fourth and Fourteenth Amendment Due Process rights and (2) a medical claim in violation of his Fourteenth Amendment Due Process rights against Defendants Jack Campbell, Lt. A. Conrad, and Sarah Lehmann.

20-4048 – Moore v Scott Plaintiff, a civil detainee, alleges that officials at Rushville Treatment and Detention facility interfered with his ability to practice his religion by denying his requests for a second weekly group religious service, possession of a nationality card, and use of two flags during religious services. Plaintiff's claims under the Religious Land Use and Institutionalized Persons Act (RLUIPA) and the First Amendment as they relate to these denials survived summary judgment, and the matter is currently set for final pretrial conference and jury trial on January 23, 2023 at 10:30 a.m. and February 27, 2023, respectively.