

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF
ILLINOIS

Shung Moore v. Rob Jeffreys, Darren Galloway, Lt. Browning, Jay
Medley, Sgt. Huering, Sgt. Vaughn, Sgt. Thompson, Sgt. Crim, Sgt.
Kunath, Sgt. Bernard, Sgt. Williams, and Sgt. Dean

Moore · No. 25-cv-01567-SMY · Decided February 2, 2026

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the Southern District of Illinois dismissed Shung Moore’s 42 U.S.C. § 1983 action concerning allegedly frigid segregation-cell conditions at Shawnee Correctional Center. The court held that the claims were filed beyond Illinois’s two-year statute of limitations for personal-injury actions and dismissed the complaint with prejudice. The court directed the Clerk to close the case and enter judgment.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the Southern District of Illinois
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Staci M. Yandle
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the Southern District of Illinois
DECIDED	February 2, 2026
DOCKET	25-cv-01567-SMY
DISPOSITION	dismissed
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	Prisoner civil-rights action under 42 U.S.C. § 1983 screened under 28 U.S.C. § 1915A; the district court dismissed the complaint with prejudice as time-barred.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	Threshold screening under 28 U.S.C. § 1915A; dismissal is proper when the complaint is legally frivolous, malicious, fails to state a claim, or seeks damages from an immune defendant. A complaint may be dismissed at screening when its allegations establish as a matter of law that the claims are barred by the statute of limitations.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	nonprecedential

PARTIES

Shung Moore v. Rob Jeffreys, Darren Galloway, Lt. Browning, Jay Medley, Sgt. Huering, Sgt. Vaughn, Sgt. Thompson, Sgt. Crim, Sgt. Kunath, Sgt. Bernard, Sgt. Williams, Sgt. Dean

TOPICS

section 1983

prisoners rights

cruel and unusual punishment

equal protection

statute of limitations

PRACTICE AREAS

civil rights

prisoner litigation

constitutional law

civil procedure

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether the prisoner's § 1983 claims arising from alleged unconstitutional living conditions and differential treatment were barred by the applicable two-year statute of limitations.
2. Whether the district court could dismiss the complaint with prejudice during § 1915A screening because the complaint's allegations established that the claims were untimely.

HOLDINGS

1. The claims were time-barred because Illinois's two-year statute of limitations for personal-injury actions applies to the § 1983 claims, and Moore filed suit more than two years after the alleged injuries.
2. A district court may dismiss a complaint during threshold screening when the plaintiff pleads facts establishing that the claims are legally time-barred.

KEY QUOTATIONS

“Although the statute of limitations is typically raised as an affirmative defense, a plaintiff can plead himself out of court by alleging facts in a Complaint that establish no entitlement to relief as a matter of law.”

(Discussion)

“The Complaint (Doc. 1) is DISMISSED with prejudice as all federal constitutional claims are time-barred.”

(Disposition)

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Moore, an inmate, alleged that he endured extreme cold, inadequate heat, and the absence of plastic sheeting over a cell window while housed in segregation at Shawnee Correctional Center from December 21 through December 28, 2022. He alleged that he experienced shivering, coughing, and sneezing and complained to multiple correctional officials. He also alleged that segregation inmates were denied plastic sheeting provided to general-population inmates and that supervisory officials failed to maintain adequate heating and related equipment.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Shung Moore filed a pro se § 1983 complaint on August 11, 2025 concerning allegedly unconstitutional living conditions in segregation at Shawnee Correctional Center from December 21 through December 28, 2022. On statutory screening, the court concluded that the complaint itself established that the claims were filed more than two years after the alleged injuries. The court dismissed the action with prejudice and directed the Clerk to close the case and enter judgment.

DISPOSITION

dismissed

CASES CITED

- Bell Atlantic Corp. v. Twombly, 550 U.S. 544, 570 (2007)
- Chambers v. Cross, 788 F. App'x 1032, 1033 (7th Cir. 2019)
- Cesal v. Moats, 851 F.3d 714, 721-22 (7th Cir. 2017)
- O'Gorman v. City of Chicago, 777 F.3d 885, 888-89 (7th Cir. 2015)
- Hollander v. Brown, 457 F.3d 688, 691 n. 1 (7th Cir. 2006)