

Central District of Illinois

Civil cases needing Pro Bono Counsel

August 3, 2021

19-1025 Miguel Castillo v Billy Tyes, et al. - The pro se Plaintiff has an Eighth amendment claim alleging sexual assault on February 22, 2017. Plaintiff claims Officer Tyes conducted a pat down search and “massaged Plaintiff, grabbed his testicles, moaned in his ear, and bumped Plaintiff from behind touching his penis to Plaintiff’s buttocks.” Plaintiff is Spanish speaking, and the Court is unaware of how well he communicates in English. Defendants utilized a translator for his deposition. Summary judgment was not filed and discovery is closed. Case is ready to proceed to pretrial and trial.

19-1106 Aaron Hughes v Christian Bolte - On October 10, 2018, Defendant Bolte escorted Plaintiff, whose hands were cuffed behind his back. According to Plaintiff, Bolte tried to make it seem like Plaintiff violently turned into Bolte’s direction. Bolte reacted by grabbing Plaintiff’s handcuffs, lifting Plaintiff off his feet, and slamming Plaintiff’s head to the floor. Bolte then punched and kicked Plaintiff’s face, ribs, head, and back. As a result, Plaintiff received medical care for a one-centimeter-deep cut under his eye.

19-1360 – Roberto Gonzales v John Baldwin, et al. - Plaintiff suffers from mental illness; he is a Mexican -American with Spanish being his first language; he states that other prisoners have drafted most, if not all, of his pleadings; and he has asserted multiple claims (a total of 7). His claims are: (1) excessive force; (2) a state law battery claim; (3) a state law claim for the intentional infliction of emotional distress; (4) a failure to protect or to intervene claim; (5) a deliberate indifference to his serious medical needs and mental health claim; (6) a Due Process Claim based upon the lack of procedural protections that are required by the United States Supreme Court that were not afforded to him at his disciplinary hearing; and (7) a conditions of confinement claim.

19-1196 Nelson Young v Steven Meeks, et al. - Plaintiff alleges that he has cataracts in both eyes which have grown worse over several years. He alleges that, “[p]resently I cannot see anything out of my left eye. My vision in my left eye is a complete blur. My right eye is only slightly better. I cannot read anything unless it is held an inch or so from my face.” Defendants have allegedly refused to refer Plaintiff for consideration of cataract surgery because of a widespread practice or policy to delay cataract surgery until an inmate goes “completely blind.” (Compl. p. 5.) These allegations state a plausible Eighth Amendment claim for deliberate indifference to Plaintiff’s eye condition.

19-3067 Anjenai Bolden v Wyatt Risley, et al. - Plaintiff alleges that prison officials told other inmates that he was a sex offender. Plaintiff alleges that this, in turn, caused some inmates to attack him and others to offer protection in exchange for sexual favors and money. Plaintiff alleges that defendants failed to address his concerns and told him to break the rules by refusing housing. The Court found that Plaintiff stated an Eighth Amendment claim for failure to protect from harm. The case is currently pending Plaintiff’s response to Defendants’ motion for summary judgment. Jury trial and other hearing dates will be set, if necessary, after the Court rules upon Defendants’ motion.

20-3296 Kevas Balance v Sangamon County Jail – Plaintiff alleges that he was removed from the Jail’s medical unit and placed in general population despite recent hand surgery. Plaintiff was allegedly placed with aggressive, high risk detainees, where he was attacked.

20-4071 Jose Lopez v Roxanne Gragert, et al. - Plaintiff claims that he has reached a point where he has done all he knows how to do. Essentially, he states that his claim is complex, is against multiple defendants, and he has inadequate access to the law library. Plaintiff has stated a deliberate indifference claim.

21-1121 Jeffery Bryant v Wexford Medical Sources, et al. - Plaintiff alleges that Defendants all played a part in delaying the diagnosis of Plaintiff's kidney cancer for years, which led to Plaintiff having emergent surgery to remove part of his left kidney in December 2019. Plaintiff’s allegations state a plausible Eighth Amendment claim for deliberate indifference to Plaintiff's serious medical needs. The case will be sent for service per the standard procedures.

21-3014 Michael Bishop v Wexford, et al. - The Plaintiff has two claims in this case: (1) an Eighth Amendment deliberate indifference claim against Defendant Dr. Kayira and (2) a Monell claim against Defendant Wexford Healthcare. The Plaintiff claims that he needs counsel (and Judge Bruce has agreed to try to find counsel on these grounds) because he lacks the medical knowledge and legal skills necessary to litigate this complex medical claim (he injured his knee and does not think that the Doctor is treating him correctly) and because he has limited access to the law library.

21-3039 Ron Flemming v Stephanie Winters, et al. - Plaintiff filed this case after his release from prison. He alleges that a 7-day and 3-day delay in the refill of Plaintiff's eyedrops for severe glaucoma caused Plaintiff's eyesight to deteriorate more quickly. Wexford Health Sources, Inc., and a pharmacy technician, Stephanie Winters, are named as Defendants. Plaintiff attached to his motion to appoint pro bono counsel a letter from one of his physicians confirming that he is legally blind and is having difficulty serving Defendants.

21-4074 Timothy Sain v David Marcowitz, et al. - The Plaintiff claims that Defendants are not providing appropriate care for his hip condition. Plaintiff has stated a Due Process medical claim against the Defendants. Plaintiff states that he has no medical or legal knowledge. In fact, Plaintiff states that he had to have another detainee (Plaintiff is at Rushville) draft all of his pleadings, including his motion for 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.