**Central District of Illinois**

**Civil prisoner cases needing Pro Bono Counsel – May 2024**

**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.**

**19-1213 Balle v Hobart** Plaintiff claims that due to unconstitutional conditions of confinement at the Pontiac Correctional Center he was injured in the course of his prison employment. Immediately prior to the events at issue, plaintiff had a job working in the dining room of the Pontiac Medium Security Unit where he is confined. Merit Review order dated 10/18/19 ruled that plaintiff’s claim proceed solely on deliberate indifference claim against Defendants Hobart and Doe Maintenance Supervisor**.** Summary judgement issued on 7/16/21 which was appealed 7/30/21. Mandate issued 8/8/23 which remanded case back to District Court. Case now proceeds on claims identified in Seventh Circuit Order.The Court has determined that based on the complexity of this case, which may involve expert testimony, Plaintiff's prior unsuccessful attempts to find his own attorney, and the Seventh Circuit's Order remanding the claim against Defendant Hobart (Doc. 55 ) Plaintiff would benefit from the representation of counsel.

**20-1437 Lemus v Tilden, et al**. The Plaintiff’s Claim is that the named Defendants violated the Plaintiff’s Eighth Amendment rights by deliberate indifference towards his serious medical needs. Specifically, Plaintiff claims that he was working on Pontiac Correctional’ s “snow crew” when he slipped and fell on the ice and injured his left shoulder. Plaintiff claims that defendants did not provide adequate care for this injury.

**21-1207 McArthur v Jackson** Plaintiff is incarcerated at Centralia Correctional Center.The Plaintiff’s claim is that the named Defendants violated the Plaintiff’s Eighth Amendment rights by acting with deliberate indifference towards his serious medical needs. Specifically, Plaintiff claims that Defendants were aware of his medical permit and his inability to work but that Defendants required him to work in the kitchen and gave him several disciplinary tickets when he refused to comply in violation of his Eighth Amendment rights.

**22-1088 Curry v Bantista** Plaintiff is incarcerated at Pontiac Correctional Center. Plaintiff states an Eighth Amendment claim for excessive force and harassment/humiliation and deliberate indifference to a serious mental health need.

**22-1237 Curry V Rambo et al**. Plaintiff is incarcerated at Pontiac Correctional Center and has brought suit alleging an Eighth Amendment claim for deliberate indifference to a serious medical need after his open heart surgery. This case proceeds on the Eighth Amendment deliberate indifference claim against Defendants Tilden, Rambo and Hansen. All other claims are dismissed.

**22-2212 Robles v Chacon** Plaintiff alleges violations of his constitutional rights while incarcerated at Danville Correctional Center. Plaintiff claims that a mental health professional at Danville diagnosed him with PTSD in 2020 and prescribed medication on which he overdosed. Case proceeds on the Eighth Amendment deliberate indifference claim against Defendant Chacon and the UnknownNurse.

**22-2267 Brown v Sapp** Plaintiff has brought this suit against correctional officers at the Champaign County Jail based upon his pretrial detention at the Jail. Plaintiff is now in the IDOC’s custody. Plaintiff is proceeding on two claims: (1) a Fourteenth Amendment Due Process violation based upon the conditions of his confinement at the Jail; and (2) a medical claim in violation of his Fourteenth Amendment Due Process. The case is still in discovery, but the summary judgment motion deadline is set for May 29.

**22-3028 Diaz v Green, et al.** The Plaintiff has two claims: (1) a Due Process claim against the Defendants in violation of his Fourteenth Amendment rights based upon his allegations that he did not have a proper/fair disciplinary hearing before impartial decisionmakers and (2) a conditions-of-confinement claim against Pontiac Warden John Burle in violation of his Eighth Amendment rights.

**24-2044 Ford v Ek, et al.** Plaintiff is incarcerated at Danville Correctional Center. Plaintiff’s Complaint states a claim against Defendants Jonathan Ek, Jennifer Chacon, and Michelle Babb for acting with deliberate indifference towards Plaintiff’s serious medical needs in violation of his Eighth Amendment rights.