

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF
LOUISIANA

Sanchaz Harold v. Jordan Joshlin, et al.

Harold · No. No. 25-792 · Decided May 15, 2026

SUMMARY

The court construes the plaintiff’s pleading entitled “In Regard to Order” as a motion to amend. The court denies the motion in part as futile and dismisses it in part as moot, explaining that two proposed defendants were no longer parties, one proposed defendant was already named, and the Tangipahoa Parish Jail is not a proper § 1983 defendant.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the Eastern District of Louisiana
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Michael B. North
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the Eastern District of Louisiana
DECIDED	May 15, 2026
DOCKET	No. 25-792
DISPOSITION	other
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	Plaintiff moved to amend his complaint to add Sheriff Gerald Sticker and the Tangipahoa Parish Jail as defendants. The court construed a filing entitled “In Regard to Order” as a motion to amend.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	unpublished district court order; nonprecedential

TOPICS

- motion to amend
- section 1983
- prisoners rights
- civil procedure
- ada / disability

PRACTICE AREAS

- civil procedure
- prisoner civil rights
- disability discrimination

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether the motion to amend was moot as to Sheriff Gerald Sticker because he was already a named defendant who had appeared through counsel.

2. Whether amendment to add the Tangipahoa Parish Jail as a defendant was futile because the jail is not a proper person or entity subject to suit under 42 U.S.C. § 1983.
3. Whether amendment was necessary to add Jordan Joshlin and Terry Lane when those defendants had already been dismissed without prejudice for failure of service.

HOLDINGS

1. The request to add Jordan Joshlin and Terry Lane was unnecessary because they were no longer defendants after dismissal without prejudice for failure to serve.
2. The request to add Sheriff Gerald Sticker was moot because he was already a named defendant and had appeared through counsel.
3. The Tangipahoa Parish Jail is not a proper defendant in a § 1983 action because it is merely a building or facility and is not a person subject to suit under the statute.

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Plaintiff, who alleged that he is legally blind, claimed that jail officials failed to accommodate him under the Americans with Disabilities Act and failed to provide adequate protection and medical treatment. He sought, among other things, placement in the jail's medical dormitory and monetary damages. He sought to add Sheriff Gerald Sticker and the Tangipahoa Parish Jail as defendants because he could not provide service addresses for Jordan Joshlin and Terry Lane.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Plaintiff filed a pro se action under 42 U.S.C. § 1983 alleging mistreatment and inadequate accommodation and medical care while incarcerated at the Tangipahoa Parish Jail. Three defendants had previously been dismissed without prejudice for failure to serve, and the district court adopted a report and recommendation concerning dismissal of Jordan Joshlin and Terry Lane under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 4(m). The court denied the motion to amend in part as moot and in part as futile.

DISPOSITION

other

CASES CITED

- Erickson v. Pardus, 551 U.S. 89, 94 (2007)
- Johnson v. Tangipahoa Par. Jail, No. CV 21-1698, 2022 WL 1547764, at *5 (E.D. La. Apr. 25, 2022)
- Robinson v. Pinion, No. CV 21-1698, 2022 WL 1540610 (E.D. La. May 16, 2022)
- Coleman v. Terrebonne Parish Criminal Justice Complex, Civ. A. No. 05-6364, 2006 WL 2710443, at *3 (E.D. La. Sept. 19, 2006)
- Coleman v. Terrebonne Parish Criminal Justice Complex, Civ. A. No. 15-5716, 2015 WL 10323883, at *1 n.1 (E.D. La. Dec. 21, 2015)
- C.C. v. City of New Orleans, Civ. A. No. 13-4325, 2013 WL 6004051, at *5 (E.D. La. Nov. 13, 2013)

OPINION

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT EASTERN DISTRICT OF LOUISIANA SANCHAZ HAROLD CIVIL ACTION VERSUS NO. 25-792 JORDAN JOSHLIN, ET AL. SECTION “M” (5) ORDER AND REASONS Before the Court is a pleading entitled “In Regard to Order” (rec. doc. 40) filed by 1 Plaintiff, which this Court construes as a motion to amend given the relief requested therein. There is no opposition to the motion.

Having reviewed the motions and the case law, the Court concludes that Plaintiff filed this lawsuit under 42 U.S.C. § 1983 on April 22, 2025. (Rec. doc. 1). In short, Plaintiff maintains that he is legally blind under the American with Disabilities Act (“ADA”), 42 U.S.C. §§ 12101 (at 3). Plaintiff alleges that he has made numerous requests to various Defendants at the Tangipahoa Parish Jail (“Jail”) – where he is incarcerated – to treat him as legally blind under the ADA and, house him in the medical dorm at the Jail. (at 3).

He alleges numerous instances of mistreatment by prison staff, an inability to communicate with anyone outside of the prison, and various instances of neglect from both jail personnel – which led to an alleged broken jaw caused by a beating from other inmates – and the medical staff. (at 5-8). Plaintiff alleges that every time he asked for medical treatment, medical personnel informed him that he had to submit a request through See Erickson v. Pardus 1, 551 U.S. 89, 94 (2007) (pro se pleadings are “to be liberally construed,” and “a pro se litigant’s “kiosk machine,” but requests placed in the “kiosk machines” were never answered. ().

He maintains that he fears for his life in general population and should be housed in the medical dorm due to his blindness. (). He ultimately seeks monetary damages. (at 4). Three Defendants have already been dismissed without prejudice for failure to serve a motion for summary judgment. (Rec. docs. 34, 36, 39, 41).

In his motion, Plaintiff seeks to amend his complaint to add Sheriff Gerald Sticker and the Tangipahoa Parish Jail as Defendants in this lawsuit because he cannot provide the addresses to serve proposed Defendants Jordan Joshlin and Terry Lane. There are numerous problems with Plaintiff’s request.

First, this Court has already issued a report and recommendation to dismiss without prejudice Joshlin and Lane as Defendants for failure to serve under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 4(m). (Rec. doc. 34). The District Court adopted this Court’s report and recommendation. (Rec. doc. 36).

Accordingly, Joshlin and Lane are no longer even Defendants in this lawsuit so service is unnecessary at this time and under these circumstances. Second, Sheriff Gerald Sticker is already a named Defendant in this lawsuit and has appeared through counsel.

The Motion is thus moot in this regard. Third, adding the Tangipahoa Parish Jail as a Defendant in this lawsuit would be futile. The “Tangipahoa Parish Jail” is not a proper defendant with respect to

any type of Section 1983 claim. The court in *Sheehy v. Joil*, 2022 WL 1547764, at *5 (E.D. Va. 2022), is an improper defendant in a Section 1983 action. report and recommend, *Antioch v. Davidson*, 2022 WL 1547764, at *5 (E.D. Va. 2022).

La. Apr. 25, 2022), No. CV 21-1698, 2022 WL 1540610 (E.D. La. May 16, 2022); Civ. A. No. 05-6364, 2006 WL 2710443, at *3 (E.D. La. Sept. 19, 2006) (“[T]he Court finds that the claim against the ‘Tangipahoa Parish Jail,’ which plaintiff has named as a separate defendant, should be dismissed as frivolous and for failing to state a claim upon which relief may be granted.

A defendant is not a ‘person’ subject to suit under 42 U.S.C. § 1983.”); adopted, Civ. A. No. 15-5716, 2015 WL 1032308 (E.D. La. 2015); *Donna L. Paez v. Cr1, Inc.*, 2016 WL 687655 (E.D. La. Feb. 19, 2016); III. C. 13-4325, 2013 WL 6004051, at *5 (E.D. La. Nov. 13, 2013).

IT is the court's reasons, DISMISSED AS MOOT IN PART DENIED IN PART the Motion to Amend (rec. doc. 40) is and as futile. 15th May New Orleans, Louisiana, this _____ day of _____, 2026.

MICHAEL B. NORTH UNITED STATES
MAGISTRATE JUDGE