

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF CONNECTICUT

Ian Wright v. Angel Quiros, et al.

Wright · No. No. 3:23-cv-949 (SRU) · Decided June 8, 2026

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the District of Connecticut denied Ian Wright’s renewed motion for relief from judgment under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 60(b)(1) and (6). The court reaffirmed its prior grant of summary judgment for the defendants on Wright’s Eighth Amendment claims, concluding that no reasonable jury could find deliberate indifference and that qualified immunity applied. The court noted that Wright could continue pursuing relief through his pending appeal to the Second Circuit.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the District of Connecticut
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Stefan R. Underhill
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the District of Connecticut
DECIDED	June 8, 2026
DOCKET	No. 3:23-cv-949 (SRU)
DISPOSITION	other
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	Plaintiff moved under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 60(b)(1) and (6) for relief from a final judgment granting defendants summary judgment. The district court denied the renewed motion.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	Relief under Rule 60(b)(1) requires a qualifying mistake, inadvertence, surprise, or excusable neglect; relief under Rule 60(b)(6) requires extraordinary circumstances and grounds not encompassed by Rule 60(b)(1)-(5).
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	unpublished district court order
PARTIES	Ian Wright v. Angel Quiros, et al.

TOPICS

- motion for reconsideration
- qualified immunity
- prisoners rights
- section 1983
- summary judgment

PRACTICE AREAS

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether Wright demonstrated a mistake, inadvertence, surprise, or excusable neglect warranting relief from judgment under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 60(b)(1).
2. Whether Wright demonstrated extraordinary circumstances and a ground not covered by Rule 60(b)(1)-(5) warranting relief under Rule 60(b)(6).
3. Whether the court's prior determination that defendants were entitled to summary judgment on the Eighth Amendment claims and qualified immunity was erroneous.

HOLDINGS

1. Wright was not entitled to relief under Rule 60(b)(1) because the court did not make a qualifying mistake in its prior analysis of his Eighth Amendment claims.
2. Wright was not entitled to relief under Rule 60(b)(6) because he did not demonstrate extraordinary circumstances and his asserted grounds were addressed by Rule 60(b)(1).
3. Defendants were protected by qualified immunity because it was objectively reasonable, particularly in light of the lack of contrary precedent, for them to believe that their conduct did not violate the Eighth Amendment.

KEY QUOTATIONS

"I did not make a "mistake" under Rule 60(b)(1), and there are not "extraordinary circumstances" warranting relief under Rule 60(b)(6)." (at 3)

"Furthermore, in the absence of any argument to the contrary by Wright, I reiterate that the doctrine of qualified immunity shields the Defendants, because it was objectively reasonable, especially considering the lack of precedent to the contrary, for each of the Defendants to believe that their conduct did not violate the Eighth Amendment." (at 3)

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Wright, a Connecticut prisoner housed at Osborn Correctional Institution, alleged that DOC District Administrator Rodriguez, Osborn Warden Guadarrama, and Food Service Supervisor Wilcox violated the Eighth Amendment through their handling of his exposure to COVID-19. He also asserted a Connecticut state-law recklessness claim. The court previously determined that no reasonable jury could find deliberate indifference by any defendant and that qualified immunity applied.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Wright brought a 42 U.S.C. § 1983 action alleging that prison officials violated the Eighth Amendment by exposing him to COVID-19 and asserting a state-law recklessness claim. The court granted defendants' motion for summary judgment, entered judgment for defendants, and declined supplemental jurisdiction over the state-law claim. Wright's untimely Rule 59(e) motion was construed as a Rule 60(b) motion; after an appeal was filed

and stayed, he renewed the Rule 60(b) motion. The court denied the renewed motion, concluding that Wright had shown neither a Rule 60(b)(1) mistake nor extraordinary circumstances under Rule 60(b)(6).

DISPOSITION

other

CASES CITED

- Banister v. Davis, 590 U.S. 504, 507-08 (2020)
- Triestman v. Federal Bureau of Prisons, 470 F.3d 471, 476
- Kemp v. United States, 596 U.S. 528, 532 (2022)
- BLOM Bank SAL v. Honickman, 605 U.S. 204, 215 (2025)

OPINION

Wright

PER CURIAM.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

DISTRICT OF CONNECTICUT

IAN WRIGHT,

Plaintiff, v. No. 3:23-cv-949 (SRU) ANGEL QUIROS, et al., Defendants.

ORDER ON PLAINTIFF’S MOTION FOR RECONSIDERATION

The plaintiff, Ian Wright, is a pro se prisoner in the custody of the Connecticut Department of Correction (“DOC”). He filed this action under 42 U.S.C. § 1983 to complain about his exposure to COVID-19 while housed at Osborn Correctional Institution (“Osborn”). See Sec. Am. Compl., Doc. No. 12; Initial Review Order, Doc. No. 13. Specifically, Wright claims that DOC District Administrator Rodriguez, Osborn Warden Guadarrama, and Food Service Supervisor Wilcox (collectively, “Defendants”) violated his rights under the Eighth Amendment to the United States Constitution and behaved recklessly under Connecticut state law. Initial Review Order, Doc. No. 13, at 7, 10. On September 30, 2025, I granted the Defendants’ Motion for Summary Judgment, doc. no. 53. See Doc. No. 76. In doing so, I concluded that Wright could not prevail, as a matter of law, on his Eighth Amendment claims against the three Defendants, and I declined to exercise supplemental jurisdiction over Wright’s state law recklessness claims. *Id.* at 27. Accordingly, judgment entered in favor of Defendants on October 1, 2025. Doc. No. 77. On November 18, 2025, Wright filed a motion to alter or amend the judgment under Rule 59(e) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure. First Mot. for Relief from J., Doc. No. 80. That motion was filed more than 28 days after the entry of judgment, making it untimely. *Banister v. Davis*, 590 U.S. 504, 507-08 (2020) (noting that the time allowed under Rule 59(e) to file a motion to amend or alter a judgment “is short—28 days from entry of the judgment, with no possibility of an extension”); Fed. R. Civ. P. 6(b)(2) (prohibiting extensions to Rule 59(e)’s deadline). But because the

submissions of self-represented plaintiffs should be reviewed with “special solicitude,” *Triestman v. Federal Bureau of Prisons*, 470 F.3d 471, 476 (citation omitted), and Rule 60 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure would allow Wright to request similar relief without facing Rule 59’s strict time bar, I construed Wright’s Rule 59(e) motion to alter and amend the judgment as a Rule 60(b) motion for relief from judgment. 11/24/2025 Order, Doc. No. 83. A day later, on November 25, 2025, Wright filed his Notice of Appeal to the Second Circuit. Doc. No. 84. After he requested clarification on my decision to construe his motion as a Rule 60(b) motion, I explained to Wright that he could proceed in one of two ways. He could either: (1) pursue his Rule 60(b) motion, or (2) waive his Rule 60(b) motion and pursue his pending appeal to the Second Circuit. Order Denying Mot. for Reargument or Reconsideration, Doc. No. 92, at 2. Although Wright filed a notice on December 16, 2025 stating that he wished to pursue his Rule 60(b) motion, he did not timely withdraw his appeal before the Second Circuit. 1/16/2026 Order, Doc. No. 100. Consequently, I denied his Rule 60(b) motion without prejudice and instructed him that if he wished to pursue his Rule 60(b) motion, he would need to obtain a stay from the Second Circuit and refile his Rule 60(b) motion. *Id.* Wright complied with my order by filing a renewed motion for relief from judgment and by obtaining a stay of his appeal from the Second Circuit. Sec. Mot. for Relief from J., Doc. No. 2 101; USCA Order, Doc. No. 103. As a result, I now consider Wright’s pending Rule 60(b) motion. In his renewed Rule 60(b) motion, Wright argues that he is entitled to relief under both Rule 60(b)(1) and (6). Pl.’s Brief in Supp. of Rule 60(b) Mot., Doc. No. 101, at 3. Rule 60(b)(1) allows a court to relieve a party from a final judgment based on “mistake, inadvertence, surprise, or excusable neglect[.]” Fed. R. Civ. P. 60(b)(1). The word “mistake” in Rule 60(b)(1) “includes a judge’s errors of law.” *Kemp v. United States*, 596 U.S. 528, 532 (2022). Rule 60(b)(6), on the other hand, is a catchall provision that allows a court to afford relief for “any other reason that justifies relief.” Fed. R. Civ. P. 60(b)(6). Under Rule 60(b)(6), a movant may receive relief only by demonstrating “extraordinary circumstances” and showing that “the asserted grounds for relief are not recognized in clauses (1)-(5) of the Rule.” *BLOM Bank SAL v. Honickman*, 605 U.S. 204, 215 (2025) (internal quotations omitted). Wright argues that I erred in my analysis of the Eighth Amendment’s objective and subjective requirements. Pl.’s Brief in Supp. of Rule 60(b) Mot., Doc. No. 101, at 4-17. I disagree. Even if Wright’s Eighth Amendment claims satisfy the objective prong, I affirm my earlier decision that no reasonable jury could conclude that any Defendant acted with deliberate indifference to Wright’s substantial risk of harm. See Ruling on Mot. for Summary J., Doc. No. 76, at 21-26. Furthermore, in the absence of any argument to the contrary by Wright, I reiterate that the doctrine of qualified immunity shields the Defendants, because it was objectively reasonable, especially considering the lack of precedent to the contrary, for each of the Defendants to believe that their conduct did not violate the Eighth Amendment. See *id.* at 22, 24, 26. 3 Therefore, I deny Wright’s Rule 60(b) Motion, Doc. No. 101. I did not make a “mistake” under Rule 60(b)(1), and there are not “extraordinary circumstances” warranting relief under Rule 60(b)(6). I advise Wright that if he still disagrees with my decision to grant summary

judgment in favor of the Defendants, he may pursue relief through his pending appeal to the Second Circuit. SO ORDERED at Bridgeport, Connecticut this 8th day of June 2026. /s/ Stefan R. Underhill Stefan R. Underhill United States District Judge 4

Retrieved from lawtools.ai · <https://lawtools.ai/cases/federal/united-states-district-court-for-the-district-of-connecticut/2026/ian-wright-v-angel-quiros-et-al-2pofm8o0>