

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF
WISCONSIN

Taurus Clyde Hill, II v. Co Acosta Miguel

Hill v. Miguel · No. 2:25-cv-01787-bhl · Decided February 6, 2026

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the Eastern District of Wisconsin dismissed Taurus Clyde Hill, II's amended 42 U.S.C. § 1983 complaint at the screening stage for failure to state a claim. The court rejected claims based on allegedly false conduct reports, disciplinary proceedings, retaliation, and excessive force, concluding that the allegations did not establish a constitutional violation or were too vague and speculative. The court assessed a strike under 28 U.S.C. § 1915(g) and directed the clerk to enter judgment.

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	February 6, 2026
DOCKET	2:25-cv-01787-bhl
DISPOSITION	dismissed
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	Screening of a pro se state-prisoner civil-rights complaint and amended complaint under 28 U.S.C. § 1915A.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	Under 28 U.S.C. § 1915A, the court must dismiss a prisoner complaint that is frivolous, malicious, fails to state a claim, or seeks monetary relief from an immune defendant. The complaint must comply with the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure and contain sufficient factual allegations to state a plausible claim for relief; allegations that merely raise speculation are insufficient.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	unpublished district court screening order

TOPICS

- prisoners rights
- section 1983
- civil rights
- due process
- appellate procedure

PRACTICE AREAS

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether allegations that prison officials filed false conduct reports state a constitutional claim.
2. Whether Hill stated a due-process claim based on disciplinary proceedings resulting in segregation.
3. Whether Hill stated a First Amendment retaliation claim based on conduct reports allegedly motivated by prior lawsuits.
4. Whether Hill stated an excessive-force claim based on officers allegedly jumping him and placing him in a chokehold.

HOLDINGS

1. Allegations that prison officials filed false conduct reports do not, standing alone, state a constitutional claim.
2. Hill failed to state a due-process claim because he did not plausibly allege a constitutionally protected liberty interest or deficient procedures.
3. Hill failed to state a First Amendment retaliation claim because he did not plausibly allege that his prior lawsuits motivated the defendants' conduct reports.
4. Hill failed to state an excessive-force claim because his allegation that officers jumped him and placed him in a chokehold was too vague and speculative to support an inference that force was used maliciously and sadistically to cause harm.

KEY QUOTATIONS

“To succeed on a due process claim stemming from a prison disciplinary proceeding, an inmate must demonstrate (1) a constitutionally protected liberty interest and (2) deficient procedures attendant to the deprivation of that interest.” (109 F.4th at 964)

“inmates facing only disciplinary action like segregation, rather than disciplinary action affecting the length of their carceral sentence, like a reduction in good-time credit,” (109 F.4th at 966)

“informal due process requires only that an inmate is provided (1) notice of the reasons for the inmate’s placement in segregation and (2) an opportunity to present his views, for instance, in a written statement or at a hearing.” (109 F.4th at 966)

“(1) he engaged in activity protected by the First Amendment; (2) he suffered a deprivation that would likely deter First Amendment activity in the future; and (3) the First Amendment activity was at least a motivating factor in the defendants’ decision to take the retaliatory action.” (792 F.3d at 783)

“whether force was applied in a good-faith effort to maintain or restore discipline or maliciously and sadistically for the very purpose of causing harm.” (358 F.3d at 503)

“the complaint’s allegations must be enough to raise a right to relief above the speculative level.” (550 U.S. at 555)

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Hill, a state prisoner, alleged that correctional officers issued false conduct reports after an argument concerning a late-night linen sweep and falsely accused him of using an insulting term and acting aggressively. He alleged that officers then used force, including placing him in a chokehold, when he resisted being taken to segregation. Hill received fifteen days in disciplinary segregation following one conduct report and alleged that the disciplinary process, the reports, the use of force, and the conduct reports were retaliatory for lawsuits he had filed against staff at another institution.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Hill filed a complaint under 42 U.S.C. § 1983. After the court found that the original complaint violated Federal Rules of Civil Procedure 8, 18, and 20, it allowed Hill to amend. Hill filed an amended complaint and later supplied missing pages. The court screened the amended complaint, found that it failed to state a claim, dismissed the action, imposed a strike under 28 U.S.C. § 1915(g), and directed entry of judgment.

DISPOSITION

dismissed

CASES CITED

- Schroeder v. Sawall, 747 F. App'x 429, 431 (7th Cir. 2019)
- Ealy v. Watson, 109 F.4th 958, 964 (7th Cir. 2024)
- Ealy v. Watson, 109 F.4th 958, 966 (7th Cir. 2024)
- Perez v. Fenoglio, 792 F.3d 768, 783 (7th Cir. 2015)
- Bridges v. Gilbert, 557 F.3d 541, 546 (7th Cir. 2009)
- Fillmore v. Page, 358 F.3d 496, 503 (7th Cir. 2004)
- Hudson v. McMillian, 503 U.S. 1, 6 (1992)
- Bell Atlantic Corp. v. Twombly, 550 U.S. 544, 555 (2007)
- House v. Belford, 956 F.2d 711, 720 (7th Cir. 1992)
- Williams v. Faulkner, 837 F.2d 304, 308 (7th Cir. 1988)
- Neitzke v. Williams, 490 U.S. 319 (1989)