

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF
WISCONSIN

James D. Green v. Dr. Sara English

Green v. English · No. Case No. 25-cv-0532-bhl · Decided April 20, 2026

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the Eastern District of Wisconsin granted Dr. Sara English’s motion for summary judgment in James D. Green’s 42 U.S.C. § 1983 action alleging deliberate indifference to serious wrist pain. The court held that, although a jury could find an objectively serious medical condition, the evidence did not support deliberate indifference because Dr. English responded to the requests she received, ordered diagnostic testing, recommended treatment, and lacked notice of later complaints.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the Eastern District of Wisconsin
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Brett H. Ludwig
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the Eastern District of Wisconsin
DECIDED	April 20, 2026
DOCKET	Case No. 25-cv-0532-bhl
DISPOSITION	dismissed
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	Plaintiff brought a 42 U.S.C. § 1983 Eighth Amendment deliberate-indifference claim concerning medical care. Defendant moved for summary judgment, and the district court granted the motion and dismissed the action.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	Summary judgment is appropriate when there is no genuine dispute as to any material fact and the movant is entitled to judgment as a matter of law. The court construes reasonable inferences in favor of the nonmoving party, but the opposing party must identify specific evidentiary facts showing a genuine issue for trial.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	unknown
PARTIES	James D. Green v. Dr. Sara English

TOPICS

section 1983

prisoners rights

cruel and unusual punishment

summary judgment

civil procedure

PRACTICE AREAS

civil rights

constitutional law

prisoner medical care

civil procedure

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether the summary-judgment record established a genuine dispute that Dr. English was deliberately indifferent to Green's objectively serious wrist-pain condition in violation of the Eighth Amendment.
2. Whether Green's disagreement with English's treatment choices, including her recommendation that he use anti-inflammatory medication, was sufficient to establish an Eighth Amendment violation.
3. Whether English could be liable for later health-services requests that were not routed to her and to which nurses responded.

HOLDINGS

1. Although the record could support a finding that Green suffered from an objectively serious medical condition, no reasonable jury could find that Dr. English was deliberately indifferent to that condition. English promptly responded to the requests she received, ordered diagnostic testing, recommended treatment, and sought additional information from Green.
2. A prisoner's disagreement with a doctor's chosen course of treatment, without more, does not establish deliberate indifference under the Eighth Amendment.
3. English could not be deliberately indifferent to later complaints of pain that she did not receive or know about, and she was not personally responsible for the nurses' responses to those requests.

KEY QUOTATIONS

"The summary judgment record supports a jury issue on the first element of Green's claim but not the second."

"In other words, while a jury could reasonably conclude that Green suffered from an objectively serious medical condition, it could not reasonably conclude that Dr. English was deliberately indifferent to that condition."

"Green may have preferred to speak with Dr. English in person, but he "is not entitled to demand specific care," nor is he "entitled to the best care possible; he is entitled to reasonable measures to meet a substantial risk of serious harm" to him, and Dr. English took those measures."

"Dr. English is therefore entitled to summary judgment."

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Green, an inmate, complained of severe wrist and nerve pain. Dr. English responded to the health-services requests that reached her by increasing medication, requesting information about prior effective treatments, ordering a comparative EMG, recommending anti-inflammatory medication, and reviewing the resulting EMG.

Later health-services requests were triaged by nurses and were not routed to English; other providers observed normal wrist range of motion without swelling or edema. The court concluded that English took reasonable measures and lacked knowledge of the later complaints attributed to her.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Green, an incarcerated plaintiff proceeding pro se, sued Dr. Sara English under § 1983. After discovery, English moved for summary judgment on February 4, 2026. The district court concluded that the record could support an objectively serious medical condition but could not support deliberate indifference by English, granted summary judgment, and dismissed the case.

DISPOSITION

dismissed

CASES CITED

- Anderson v. Liberty Lobby, Inc., 477 U.S. 242, 248 (1986)
- Foley v. City of Lafayette, 359 F.3d 925, 928 (7th Cir. 2004)
- Siegel v. Shell Oil Co., 612 F.3d 932, 937 (7th Cir. 2010)
- Parent v. Home Depot U.S.A., Inc., 694 F.3d 919, 922 (7th Cir. 2012)
- Gabb v. Wexford Health Sources, Inc., 945 F.3d 1027, 1033 (7th Cir. 2019)
- Pyles v. Fahim, 771 F.3d 403, 408 (7th Cir. 2014)
- Petties v. Carter, 836 F.3d 722, 727-28 (7th Cir. 2016)
- Forbes v. Edgar, 112 F.3d 262, 267 (7th Cir. 1997)
- Williams v. Shah, 927 F.3d 476, 482 (7th Cir. 2019)
- Lord v. Beahm, 952 F.3d 902, 905 (7th Cir. 2020)