

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF
INDIANA, SOUTH BEND DIVISION

Glenn D. Chupp v. Centurion Health and Grant

Chupp · No. 3:26-CV-321-JD-JEM · Decided May 8, 2026

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the Northern District of Indiana dismissed Glenn D. Chupp’s amended prisoner complaint under 28 U.S.C. § 1915A for failure to state a claim. The court held that the allegations concerning medication, disciplinary write-ups, Centurion Health, and Mr. Grant did not plausibly establish that either defendant violated Chupp’s rights.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the Northern District of Indiana, South Bend Division
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Jon E. DeGuilio
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the Northern District of Indiana, South Bend Division
DECIDED	May 8, 2026
DOCKET	3:26-CV-321-JD-JEM
DISPOSITION	dismissed
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	Prisoner civil-rights complaint screened under 28 U.S.C. § 1915A after the plaintiff was granted leave to amend; the amended complaint was dismissed for failure to state a claim.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	Under 28 U.S.C. § 1915A, the court must review a prisoner complaint and dismiss it if it is frivolous or malicious, fails to state a claim upon which relief may be granted, or seeks monetary relief from an immune defendant. The complaint must contain sufficient factual matter to state a claim for relief that is plausible on its face.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	unpublished district court opinion

TOPICS

- pleadings
- prisoners rights
- civil rights
- civil procedure

PRACTICE AREAS

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether the amended prisoner complaint stated a plausible claim for relief against Centurion Health and Grant.
2. Whether dismissal under 28 U.S.C. § 1915A was proper after the plaintiff had already been given an opportunity to amend.

HOLDINGS

1. The amended complaint failed to state a claim because it did not allege sufficient facts from which it could plausibly be inferred that either defendant violated Chupp's rights.
2. Dismissal under 28 U.S.C. § 1915A was proper because the amended complaint still failed to state a claim after Chupp had been given an opportunity to correct the deficiencies in his original complaint.

KEY QUOTATIONS

“A document filed pro se is to be liberally construed, and a pro se complaint, however inartfully pleaded, must be held to less stringent standards than formal pleadings drafted by lawyers.” (94)

“to state a claim to relief that is plausible on its face.” (570)

“where the well-pleaded facts do not permit the court to infer more than the mere possibility of misconduct, the complaint has alleged—but it has not shown—that the pleader is entitled to relief.” (679)

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Chupp alleged that he was diagnosed with mental illness in 2018, arrived at Westville in 2021, was prescribed medication, and later resumed taking medication after completing Recovery While Incarcerated and having his sentence-modification request denied. He alleged that he received nine disciplinary write-ups because he was not taking medication, but did not explain how Centurion Health was responsible or identify Mr. Grant or describe his involvement.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Glenn D. Chupp filed a one-paragraph complaint that did not state a claim. The court granted leave to amend, but after reviewing the amended complaint, dismissed the action under 28 U.S.C. § 1915A because it still failed to allege facts plausibly showing that either defendant violated his rights.

DISPOSITION

dismissed

CASES CITED

- *Erickson v. Pardus*, 551 U.S. 89, 94 (2007)

- Bell Atlantic Corp. v. Twombly, 550 U.S. 544, 555, 570 (2007)
- Ashcroft v. Iqbal, 556 U.S. 662, 679 (2009)
- Swanson v. Citibank, N.A., 614 F.3d 400, 403 (7th Cir. 2010)

OPINION

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT NORTHERN DISTRICT OF INDIANA SOUTH BEND DIVISION GLENN D. CHUPP, Plaintiff, v. CAUSE NO. 3:26-CV-321-JD-JEM CENTURION HEALTH and GRANT, Defendants. OPINION AND ORDER Glenn D. Chupp, a prisoner without a lawyer, filed a one-paragraph complaint that did not state a claim. ECF 1. Chupp was granted leave to file an amended complaint.

ECF 3. Chupp filed an amended complaint. ECF 9. “A document filed pro se is to be liberally construed, and a pro se complaint, however inartfully pleaded, must be held to less stringent standards than formal pleadings drafted by lawyers.” *Erickson v. Pardus*, 551 U.S. 89, 94 (2007) (quotation marks and citations omitted). Nevertheless, under 28 U.S.C. § 1915A, the court must review the merits of a prisoner complaint and dismiss it if the action is frivolous or malicious, fails to state a claim upon which relief may be granted, or seeks monetary relief against a defendant who is immune from such relief.

Chupp alleges was diagnosed with mental illness in 2018. He alleges he arrived at Westville in 2021 and was prescribed medication. He says he later graduated from Recovery While Incarcerated without using medication. When his sentence modification was denied, he decided to take medication again. He says he has been given nine disciplinary write-ups because he was not taking medication.

He alleges Centurian is at fault, but he does not explain why. He also sues Mr. Grant, but he does not say who he is or how he was involved. This complaint, like the original before it, does not allege facts from which it can be plausibly inferred that either defendant violated his rights. A complaint must contain sufficient factual matter “to state a claim to relief that is plausible on its face.” *Bell Atlantic Corp. v. Twombly*, 550 U.S. 544, 570 (2007). “Factual allegations must be enough to raise a right to relief above the speculative level, on the assumption that all the allegations in the complaint are true (even if doubtful in fact).” *Twombly*, 550 U.S. at 555 (quotation marks, citations and footnote omitted). “[W]here the well-pleaded facts do not permit the court to infer more than the mere possibility of misconduct, the complaint has alleged—but it has not shown—that the pleader is entitled to relief.” *Ashcroft v. Iqbal*, 556 U.S. 662, 679 (2009) (cleaned up).

Thus, “a plaintiff must do better than putting a few words on paper that, in the hands of an imaginative reader, might suggest that something has happened to her that might be redressed by

the law.” Swanson v. Citibank, N.A., 614 F.3d 400, 403 (7th Cir. 2010) (emphasis in original). Chupp has was told his original complaint was insufficient and given the chance to amend.

He filed an amended complaint, but it too does not state a claim. For these reasons, this case is DISMISSED under 28 U.S.C. § 1915A because the amended complaint does not state a claim for which relief can be granted. SO ORDERED on May 8, 2026 /s/JON E. DEGUILIO JUDGE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT