

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE CENTRAL DISTRICT OF
ILLINOIS

OBrian Henigan v. Janie Sigler, et al.

Henigan v. Sigler · No. 26-cv-3027 · Decided May 29, 2026

SUMMARY

This is a scheduling order issued in a pro se civil rights action in the United States District Court for the Central District of Illinois. It establishes discovery procedures and deadlines, including a November 30, 2026 discovery cutoff and a December 29, 2026 deadline for summary judgment motions.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the Central District of Illinois
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Jonathan E. Hawley
DECIDED	May 29, 2026
DOCKET	26-cv-3027
DISPOSITION	other
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	Scheduling order in a pro se prisoner civil-rights action after service of process and as the case entered the discovery phase.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	nonprecedential
PARTIES	OBrian Henigan v. Janie Sigler, et al.

TOPICS

- discovery dispute
- summary judgment
- motion to amend
- sanctions
- civil procedure

PRACTICE AREAS

- civil procedure
- civil rights
- prisoner rights
- federal discovery

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

- What discovery, amendment, disclosure, filing, and dispositive-motion procedures and deadlines should govern the action as it entered discovery?
- What procedures should apply to identifying and substituting Doe defendants?

3. If exhaustion of administrative remedies is required, when must exhaustion-related summary-judgment motions be filed?

HOLDINGS

1. The court ordered the parties to comply with the discovery procedures, disclosure obligations, and deadlines set out in the scheduling order, including a November 30, 2026 discovery deadline and a December 29, 2026 deadline for summary-judgment motions.
2. Any motion for leave to amend filed more than 21 days after an answer or other responsive pleading must comply with Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 15, attach a complete proposed amended complaint, and be filed within 90 days of the scheduling order.
3. If Doe defendants were named, Plaintiff had to move to substitute their real names within 60 days of entry of the order, or risk dismissal of the Doe defendants without prejudice absent good cause.
4. If exhaustion of administrative remedies was required under 42 U.S.C. § 1997e(a), any motion for summary judgment addressing exhaustion was due within 30 days of the order, and discovery would not be stayed unless Defendants moved for a stay.

KEY QUOTATIONS

“Failure to follow the instructions in this order may result in sanctions, including dismissal of this case.”

(Introductory paragraphs)

“A motion to compel cannot be filed until after a party has failed to adequately respond to a discovery request.” (Paragraph 20)

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

The action is a civil-rights case brought by a pro se plaintiff who was detained or incarcerated. All defendants had been served, and the case was ready to enter discovery. The court addressed anticipated discovery involving medical records, grievances, incident reports, disciplinary decisions, Doe defendants, depositions, subpoenas, and expert testimony.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Plaintiff filed a civil-rights action and proceeded pro se. All defendants had been served, and the court found no pending issues requiring discussion. The court entered a scheduling order establishing discovery procedures and deadlines, including deadlines for exhaustion-related summary-judgment motions, discovery, amendments, expert disclosures, and dispositive motions.

DISPOSITION

other

CASES CITED

- Ott v. City of Milwaukee, 682 F.3d 552, 557 (7th Cir. 2012)

