

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF
INDIANA, TERRE HAUTE DIVISION

Antonio Pettrie v. Campbell Nurse and Byrd Dr.

Pettrie · No. 2:25-cv-00284-JRO-MG · Decided March 18, 2026

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the Southern District of Indiana screened Antonio Pettrie’s prisoner civil-rights complaint alleging deliberate indifference to a serious medical need under the Eighth Amendment. The court allowed the damages claim against Nurse Practitioner Campbell to proceed, dismissed the claim against Dr. Byrd, terminated Dr. Byrd as a defendant, and directed service of process on Campbell.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the Southern District of Indiana, Terre Haute Division
WRITING FOR THE COURT	stin R. Olson
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the Southern District of Indiana
DECIDED	March 18, 2026
DOCKET	2:25-cv-00284-JRO-MG
DISPOSITION	other
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	Screening of a prisoner's civil-rights complaint under 28 U.S.C. § 1915A before service of process.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	Under 28 U.S.C. § 1915A, the court must dismiss claims that are frivolous, malicious, fail to state a claim, or seek monetary relief from an immune defendant. In assessing whether the complaint states a claim, the court applies the Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 12(b)(6) plausibility standard and accepts factual allegations as true at the pleading stage.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	unpublished district court screening order
PARTIES	Antonio Pettrie v. Campbell Nurse, Byrd Dr.

TOPICS

- prisoners rights
- section 1983
- civil rights
- pleadings
- motions to dismiss

PRACTICE AREAS

civil rights

prisoner litigation

constitutional law

medical care

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether Pettrie's allegations against Nurse Practitioner Campbell plausibly stated an Eighth Amendment deliberate-indifference claim under 42 U.S.C. § 1983.
2. Whether Pettrie's allegations against Dr. Byrd plausibly established that Byrd was subjectively aware of and deliberately indifferent to a serious medical need.
3. Whether the court should screen and dismiss any other claims under 28 U.S.C. § 1915A.

HOLDINGS

1. The complaint plausibly alleged that Campbell was deliberately indifferent to Pettrie's serious medical need, so the Eighth Amendment damages claim against Campbell may proceed.
2. The complaint failed to state a plausible Eighth Amendment deliberate-indifference claim against Dr. Byrd because it did not allege facts showing that Byrd knew the pinky finger required treatment or was subjectively aware that his conduct would harm Pettrie.
3. The court screened the complaint under 28 U.S.C. § 1915A, dismissed all claims other than the Eighth Amendment claim against Campbell, and directed service of process on Campbell.

KEY QUOTATIONS

“When screening a complaint, the Court must dismiss any portion that is frivolous or malicious, fails to state a claim for relief, or seeks monetary relief against a defendant who is immune from such relief.” (Part I)

“For an inmate to state a claim under § 1983 for medical mistreatment or the denial of medical care, the prisoner must allege “acts or omissions sufficiently harmful to evidence deliberate indifference to serious medical needs.”” (Part III)

“Deliberate indifference exists only when an official “knows of and disregards an excessive risk to inmate health or safety; the official must both be aware of facts from which the inference could be drawn that a substantial risk of serious harm exists, and he must also draw the inference.”” (Part III)

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Pettrie, an incarcerated person, alleged that he fell during recreation on May 14, 2024, injuring his face and breaking his pinky finger. He alleged that Nurse Practitioner Campbell dismissed the injury, refused treatment, and made a derogatory remark despite the apparent fracture. He further alleged that Dr. Byrd later treated the wrong finger and ordered incorrect follow-up care, leaving the finger deformed, immobile, and painful.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Antonio Pettrie filed a 42 U.S.C. § 1983 complaint alleging that Nurse Practitioner Campbell and Dr. Byrd were deliberately indifferent to his serious medical need after he injured his finger. The district court screened the

complaint, allowed the Eighth Amendment damages claim against Campbell to proceed, dismissed the claim against Byrd, terminated Byrd from the docket, and directed service on Campbell.

DISPOSITION

other

CASES CITED

- Schillinger v. Kiley, 954 F.3d 990, 993 (7th Cir. 2020)
- Bell Atl. Corp. v. Twombly, 550 U.S. 544, 570 (2007)
- Ashcroft v. Iqbal, 556 U.S. 662, 678 (2009)
- Cesal v. Moats, 851 F.3d 714, 720 (7th Cir. 2017)
- Lisby v. Henderson, 74 F.4th 470, 472 (7th Cir. 2023)
- Larry v. Goldsmith, 799 F. App'x 413, 416 (7th Cir. 2016)
- Clancy v. Off. of Foreign Assets Control of U.S. Dep't of Treasury, 559 F.3d 595, 606-07 (7th Cir. 2009)
- Estelle v. Gamble, 429 U.S. 97, 106 (1976)
- Farmer v. Brennan, 511 U.S. 825, 837-38 (1994)
- Johnson v. Dominguez, 5 F.4th 818, 824 (7th Cir. 2021)