

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF
WISCONSIN

**Eric Moseley v. Karen, Brett Wilkinson, Jamie Ralph, Tammy
Obrien, Tyler Timmerman, Dakota Reynolds, Paige Slater, Naomi
Michek, Justice Olmstead, Ethan Bodway, Sarah, and Cameron**

Moseley v. Karen · No. 26-cv-28-jdp · Decided April 13, 2026

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the Western District of Wisconsin dismissed Eric Moseley’s prisoner civil-rights complaint because it was too vague to satisfy Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 8 and did not explain each defendant’s personal involvement. The court granted Moseley until May 4, 2026, to file an amended complaint and warned that failure to do so would result in dismissal of the case.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the Western District of Wisconsin
WRITING FOR THE COURT	James D. Peterson
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the Western District of Wisconsin
DECIDED	April 13, 2026
DOCKET	26-cv-28-jdp
DISPOSITION	dismissed
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	Screening of a pro se prisoner civil-rights complaint under 28 U.S.C. §§ 1915 and 1915A.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	At screening under 28 U.S.C. §§ 1915 and 1915A, the court accepts the allegations as true, construes a pro se complaint generously, applies a less stringent standard than for lawyer-drafted pleadings, and dismisses claims that are frivolous, malicious, fail to state a claim, or seek damages from an immune defendant.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	unpublished district court opinion; precedential status not stated
PARTIES	Eric Moseley v. Karen, Brett Wilkinson, Jamie Ralph, Tammy Obrien, Tyler Timmerman, Dakota Reynolds, Paige Slater, Naomi Michek, Justice Olmstead, Ethan Bodway, Sarah, Cameron

TOPICS

pleadings

civil procedure

prisoners rights

section 1983

PRACTICE AREAS

prisoner civil rights

federal civil procedure

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether the complaint satisfied Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 8 by providing a short, plain, simple, concise, and direct statement showing entitlement to relief.
2. Whether the complaint adequately alleged each defendant's personal involvement in a constitutional deprivation.
3. Whether the complaint should be dismissed at screening under 28 U.S.C. §§ 1915 and 1915A, with leave to amend.

HOLDINGS

1. The complaint failed to satisfy Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 8 because its conclusory allegation that defendants violated constitutional rights did not provide fair notice of the claims or explain the factual basis for relief.
2. The complaint failed to state a claim against the named defendants because it did not allege how any particular defendant was personally involved in the alleged constitutional deprivation.
3. The complaint was dismissed at screening, but Moseley was granted a short opportunity to file an amended complaint correcting the pleading deficiencies.

KEY QUOTATIONS

“Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 8(a)(2) requires a complaint to include “a short and plain statement of the claim showing that the pleader is entitled to relief.”” (Analysis)

“Stated another way, Moseley must “present a story that holds together” under the relevant law.” (Analysis)

“Also, to state a claim against a particular defendant, Moseley must explain how they were personally involved in the constitutional deprivation.” (Analysis)

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Eric Moseley, an incarcerated person at the Grant County jail, alleged that jail staff disregarded prisoners' constitutional rights. He named twelve jail officials but alleged only that they violated more than one of the prisoners' constitutional rights, without identifying what any particular defendant did or how Moseley was harmed. The court found the allegations too brief and vague to state a claim but allowed Moseley an opportunity to amend.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Moseley, a prisoner proceeding without counsel, filed a complaint alleging generally that jail staff violated prisoners' constitutional rights. After Moseley made an initial partial filing-fee payment, the court screened the complaint, dismissed it for failure to state a claim, and granted him until May 4, 2026, to file an amended complaint.

DISPOSITION

dismissed

CASES CITED

- Arnett v. Webster, 658 F.3d 742, 751 (7th Cir. 2011)
- Taylor v. Salvation Army National Corporation, 110 F.4th 1017, 1028 (7th Cir. 2024)
- Colbert v. City of Chicago, 851 F.3d 649, 657 (7th Cir. 2017)
- Paul v. Marberry, 658 F.3d 702, 705 (7th Cir. 2011)

Retrieved from lawtools.ai · <https://lawtools.ai/cases/state/united-states-district-court-for-the-western-district-of-wisconsin-united-states-district-court-for/2026/eric-moseley-v-karen-brett-wilkinson-jamie-ralph-tammy-0cplcftx>