

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF
INDIANA

Keandre Arnold v. Marts, et al.

Arnold · No. 1:25-cv-01390-JRO-MG · Decided April 29, 2026

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the Southern District of Indiana screens Keandre Arnold’s prisoner civil rights complaint under 28 U.S.C. § 1915A. The court dismisses claims against Mr. Lawson and Dr. Gaza, as well as certain claims concerning the initial suicide attempt, but allows Eighth Amendment excessive-force and deliberate-indifference claims to proceed against Sgts. Marts, Fish, and Surguy and Dr. Corvetta. The court directs service of process and terminates Mr. Lawson and Dr. Gaza as defendants.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the Southern District of Indiana
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Ju R. Olson
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the Southern District of Indiana
DECIDED	April 29, 2026
DOCKET	1:25-cv-01390-JRO-MG
DISPOSITION	other
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	Screening of a prisoner 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 or malicious, fail to state a claim, or seek monetary relief from an immune defendant. The court applies the Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 12(b)(6) plausibility standard, accepts factual allegations as true at the pleading stage, and construes pro se pleadings liberally.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	unpublished
PARTIES	Keandre Arnold v. Sgt. Marts, Sgt. Fish, Sgt. Surguy, Dr. Corvetta, Mr. Lawson, Dr. Gaza, Dr. Lawson

TOPICS

section 1983

prisoners rights

cruel and unusual punishment

pleadings

service of process

PRACTICE AREAS

civil rights

prisoner litigation

constitutional torts

civil procedure

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether the complaint stated a plausible Eighth Amendment excessive-force claim against Sgts. Marts, Fish, and Surguy.
2. Whether the complaint stated a plausible Eighth Amendment deliberate-indifference-to-medical-needs claim against Sgts. Marts, Fish, Surguy, and Dr. Corvetta.
3. Whether the complaint stated a claim against defendants against whom Arnold alleged no personal involvement or no facts showing actual knowledge of a substantial risk of serious harm.
4. Whether claims concerning the doctors' response to Arnold's first hanging attempt stated deliberate indifference rather than medical negligence.

HOLDINGS

1. A § 1983 claim must be dismissed at screening when the complaint contains no factual allegations connecting the defendant to the alleged constitutional deprivation. The claim against Mr. Lawson was dismissed.
2. To state an Eighth Amendment deliberate-indifference claim, a prisoner must plausibly allege that the official actually knew of a substantial risk of serious harm and disregarded that risk by failing to take reasonable measures to stop it.
3. The claims against Dr. Gaza and Dr. Corvetta concerning Arnold's first attempted hanging with bed strings were dismissed because the allegations showed that the doctors responded by maintaining suicide-watch status and did not plausibly establish actual knowledge of an additional substantial risk beyond the incident to which they responded.
4. The claims against Dr. Gaza were dismissed because Arnold did not allege that Dr. Gaza was notified of the second hanging attempt or any other suicide attempt before Dr. Corvetta removed suicide watch.
5. The Eighth Amendment excessive-force claims against Sgts. Marts, Fish, and Surguy and the Eighth Amendment deliberate-indifference-to-medical-needs claims against Sgts. Marts, Fish, Surguy, and Dr. Corvetta may proceed.

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.” (I. Screening Standard)

“The claims that shall proceed are the following: • Eighth Amendment excessive force claims against Sgts. Marts, Fish, and Surguy; and • Eighth Amendment deliberate indifference to medical need claims against Sgts. Marts, Fish, and Surguy, and Dr. Corvetta.” (III. Discussion of Claims)

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Arnold, a prisoner at Pendleton Correctional Facility, alleged that he attempted suicide on July 7, 2023. He alleged that correctional officers used force against him, failed to report the suicide attempt or obtain medical care, and later used chemical agent after another hanging attempt. He further alleged that medical personnel failed to maintain adequate suicide precautions, including that Dr. Corvetta later removed all suicide-prevention orders despite continued self-harm.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Arnold filed a prisoner civil-rights complaint alleging Eighth Amendment violations arising from suicide attempts, alleged excessive force, and alleged failures to provide medical care at Pendleton Correctional Facility. The court screened the complaint before service, dismissed claims against Mr. Lawson and Dr. Gaza and claims concerning the doctors' response to Arnold's first hanging attempt, allowed specified excessive-force and deliberate-indifference claims to proceed, and directed service of process.

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)
- Colbert v. City of Chicago, 851 F.3d 649, 657 (7th Cir. 2017)
- LaBrec v. Walker, 948 F.3d 836, 841 (7th Cir. 2020)
- Santiago v. Walls, 599 F.3d 749, 756, 758-59 (7th Cir. 2010)
- Dale v. Poston, 548 F.3d 563, 569 (7th Cir. 2008)
- Sinn v. Lemmon, 911 F.3d 412, 419 (7th Cir. 2018)
- Gevas v. McLaughlin, 798 F.3d 475, 480 (7th Cir. 2015)
- Farmer v. Brennan, 511 U.S. 825, 837 (1994)
- Borello v. Allison, 446 F.3d 742, 747 (7th Cir. 2006)