## 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.

**18-4189 – Hardin v Wexford Healthcare, et al.** - Plaintiff is a currently within the custody of the Illinois Department of Human Services as a civil detainee at the Rushville Treatment and Detention Center (hereinafter "Rushville TDF") under an order committing him to a secure Department of Human Services facility pursuant to the Sexually Violent Persons Commitment Act. Defendant Wexford Health Sources, Inc. provides medical care to civil detainees at Rushville TDF pursuant to its contract with the Illinois Department of Human Services. Defendant Gregg Scott was the prior Director at Rushville TDF. Plaintiff alleges Defendants violated his constitutional rights under the Fourteenth Amendment to the United States Constitution by maintaining policies prohibiting the provision of testosterone treatment to residents at Rushville TDF. Plaintiff further alleges that Defendant alleged refusal to treat his hypogonadism (i.e., sex glands produce little or no hormones) amounts to "neglect" in violation of the Illinois Mental Health and Disabilities Code.

19-3143 Scott v Watson, et al Plaintiff proceeds pro se from his incarceration in the Pontiac Correctional Center. The claims in Plaintiff's complaint occurred during his incarceration at Western Illinois Correctional Center from June to October 2017, which he alleges against the following Defendant correctional officials: Cameron Watson, Warden; Fisher, Major; Haubrich and Ferguson, Lieutenants; Bowen, Remer, and Wessel, Correctional Pfficers; and six unidentified persons. Plaintiff alleges that beginning on June 15, 2017, Defendant John Doe sexually assaulted him by continuously patting Plaintiff down, pressing his groin area into Plaintiff's body, winking at Plaintiff, and waiting by Plaintiff's cell door every morning. After Plaintiff filed a grievance reporting Doe's conduct, Doe retaliated by confiscating Plaintiff's personal property from his cell without providing a receipt or returning the items. Plaintiff also alleges claims against the remaining Defendants for excessive force, harassment, conditions of confinement, and confiscation of personal property that Plaintiff asserts occurred on July 9, August 24, August 26, and September 6. Despite Plaintiff's characterization that these events establish "a campaign of retaliation and harassment. The Court finds that these claims belong in separate lawsuits because Plaintiff alleges different acts against different Defendants. Defendant Melvin will remain as a Defendant in this case for the sole purpose of facilitating the identification of Defendant Doe. The Court finds that Plaintiff has alleged enough facts to proceed with his First Amendment and Eighth Amendment claims against Defendant John Doe.

**20- 1362 – Thompson v Awada** Plaintiff proceeds pro se from his incarceration in the Illinois River Correctional Center. Plaintiff alleges that he has had so many teeth pulled that he needs dentures or

other oral prostheses in order to chew his food. The dentist, Dr. Awana, has refused to initiate that process for the stated reason that Plaintiff still has enough teeth to chew his food. Dr. Awana has also refused to initiate the process until Plaintiff pays for part or all of the procedure. Plaintiff alleges that he has lost over 40 pounds in the past year due to his difficulty eating. Plaintiff also alleges that he has been forced to chew primarily with his incisors, causing further damage to his remaining teeth. These allegations state a plausible Eighth Amendment claim for deliberate indifference to Plaintiff's serious need for dentures or other oral prostheses to enable Plaintiff to properly chew his food . The case is past summary judgment, settlement conference failed, and it is ready for a jury trial.

**21-2296 Davenport v Spence** The Plaintiff is currently at the IDOC's Shawnee Correctional Center but the basis for this case arose when he was a pretrial detainee at the Champaign County Jail. The Plaintiff has a single claim: i.e., that two Champaign County Correctional Officers violated his Fourteenth Amendment rights based upon the conditions of his confinement. Specifically, the Plaintiff alleges that he was injured on transport from the Champaign County Jail to the Stateville Correctional Center based upon the conditions inside the van and the reckless manner in which the Defendants were driving the van.