

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF
ILLINOIS

Keywuan Melvin v. C/O Carlisle, C/O Johnson, C/O Stover, Lt.
Clark, Sgt. Bridwell, Marsh, Robinson, Sgt. Hollis, C/O Stark, C/O
Narsh, C/O Cooper, C/O Emmas, and Dr. Bell

Melvin · No. 3:25-cv-01824-GCS · Decided March 12, 2026

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the Southern District of Illinois conducted preliminary screening under 28 U.S.C. § 1915A of Keywuan Melvin’s 42 U.S.C. § 1983 complaint concerning alleged deliberate indifference to his medical needs after he swallowed rusty nail clippers. The court allowed the Eighth Amendment deliberate-indifference medical claim to proceed against the named defendants, while dismissing claims concerning premature removal from crisis watch and sexual comments during a search.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the Southern District of Illinois
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Gilbert C. Sison
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the Southern District of Illinois
DECIDED	March 12, 2026
DOCKET	3:25-cv-01824-GCS
DISPOSITION	other
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	Prisoner civil-rights action under 42 U.S.C. § 1983 undergoing preliminary screening under 28 U.S.C. § 1915A.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	Under 28 U.S.C. § 1915A, the court must dismiss any portion of a prisoner complaint that is frivolous, malicious, fails to state a claim upon which relief may be granted, or seeks damages from an immune defendant. At screening, factual allegations in a pro se complaint are liberally construed, and the complaint must contain enough facts to state a plausible claim.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	unpublished, nonprecedential district-court memorandum and order
PARTIES	Keywuan Melvin v. C/O Carlisle, C/O Johnson, C/O Stover, Lt. Clark, Sgt. Bridwell, Marsh, Robinson, Sgt. Hollis, C/O Stark, C/O Narsh,

TOPICS

prisoners rights

section 1983

civil rights

constitutional law

civil procedure

PRACTICE AREAS

prisoner civil rights

constitutional litigation

medical-care claims

federal civil procedure

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether Melvin stated an Eighth Amendment deliberate-indifference claim against the named defendants based on their alleged failure to obtain emergency medical treatment after he swallowed rusty nail clippers.
2. Whether Melvin stated an Eighth Amendment deliberate-indifference claim against Robinson based on her alleged premature removal of him from crisis watch.
3. Whether Stover's alleged sexual comments during a strip search and metal-detector examination stated an Eighth Amendment cruel-and-unusual-punishment claim.
4. Whether claims against individuals not named in the complaint's caption and allegations of state-law official misconduct could proceed in the § 1983 action.

HOLDINGS

1. The complaint stated a colorable deliberate-indifference claim against Carlisle, Johnson, Stover, Clark, Bridwell, Marsh, Robinson, Hollis, Stark, Narsh, Cooper, Emmas, and Bell because Melvin alleged an objectively serious medical condition and that each defendant knew of the risk yet failed to obtain medical assistance.
2. Count 2 was dismissed for failure to state a claim because the allegation that Robinson removed Melvin from crisis watch without researching his condition described, at most, negligence or malpractice rather than deliberate indifference.
3. Count 3 was dismissed because Stover's alleged single instance of sexual comments during a strip search and metal-detector examination, without allegations that other prisoners overheard the comments, that Melvin was placed at risk of assault, or that he suffered mental distress, did not rise to an Eighth Amendment violation.
4. Claims against a John Doe correctional officer and Jane Doe nurses not named in the complaint's caption were dismissed without prejudice because individuals not identified as defendants in the caption are not treated as parties.

KEY QUOTATIONS

“Deliberate indifference is demonstrated where a prison official acted or failed to act despite his/her knowledge of a serious risk of harm.”

“The Eighth Amendment does not give prisoners entitlement to “demand specific care” or “the best care possible,” but only requires “reasonable measures to meet a substantial risk of serious harm.””

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Melvin, an IDOC inmate, alleged that after being placed on crisis watch for suicidal and homicidal feelings, he swallowed rusty nail clippers and repeatedly informed correctional officers and mental-health providers that he needed emergency medical attention. He alleged that the defendants failed to obtain medical care despite his reports of vomiting and defecating blood, and that an x-ray later showed the nail clippers in his stomach; he eventually passed them with substantial blood. He also alleged that Robinson prematurely removed him from crisis watch and that Stover made sexual comments during a strip search and metal-detector examination.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Keywuan Melvin filed a pro se complaint seeking monetary damages for alleged deliberate indifference to serious medical and mental-health conditions and for alleged cruel and unusual punishment. The court conducted its preliminary review under 28 U.S.C. § 1915A, allowed the deliberate-indifference claim concerning swallowed nail clippers to proceed against all named defendants, dismissed the mental-health claim against Robinson and the sexual-comment claim against Stover for failure to state a claim, and directed service of the complaint on the defendants.

DISPOSITION

other

CASES CITED

- Rodriguez v. Plymouth Ambulance Service, 577 F.3d 816, 821 (7th Cir. 2009)
- Bell Atlantic Corp. v. Twombly, 550 U.S. 544, 570 (2007)
- Myles v. United States, 416 F.3d 551, 551-552 (7th Cir. 2005)
- Archie v. City of Racine, 847 F.2d 1211, 1217 (7th Cir. 1988) (en banc), cert. denied, 489 U.S. 1065 (1989)
- Rasho v. Elyea, 856 F.3d 469, 475 (7th Cir. 2017)
- Farmer v. Brennan, 511 U.S. 825, 842 (1994)
- Estelle v. Gamble, 429 U.S. 97, 106 (1976)
- Sanville v. McCaughtry, 266 F.3d 724, 734 (7th Cir. 2001)
- Snipes v. DeTella, 95 F.3d 586, 591 (7th Cir. 1996)
- Forbes v. Edgar, 112 F.3d 262, 267 (7th Cir. 1997)
- DeWalt v. Carter, 224 F.3d 607, 612 (7th Cir. 2000)
- Savory v. Cannon, 947 F.3d 409, 423 (7th Cir. 2020)
- Lisle v. Welborn, 933 F.3d 705, 718 (7th Cir. 2019)
- Beal v. Foster, 803 F.3d 356, 357 (7th Cir. 2015)

