

**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

OPINION

Harold

PER CURIAM.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
EASTERN DISTRICT OF LOUISIANA
SANHAZ 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 grants the Plaintiff’s motion. 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 Americans 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*, 551 U.S. 89, 94 (2007) (pro se pleadings are “to be liberally construed,” and “a pro se litigant’s pleadings are to be liberally construed,” 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 proper motion. (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. *TSheee j aJoilh inss soinm vp. lTy aan bguipiladhinoag, Paanrd. , Jaasil such*, is an improper defendant in a Section 1983 action. *report and recommend, aNtioo.n C Va d2o1p-t1e6d98*, 2022 WL 1547764, at *5 (E.D. La. Apr. 25, 2022), , No. CV 21-1698, 2022 WL Robinson v. Pinion 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 daetcecnortido nP ofartceilri tvy. iSst .m Beerrnelayr da Pbauril. dJainilg, not a 'person' subject to suit under 42 U.S.C. § 1983."); adopted , Civ. A. No. 15-5716, 2015 WL 1032C3o8le8m3,a ant *v1. Tne.1rr (eEb.Don. Lnae. PDaerc.. 2Cr1i,m 2.0 J1u5s)t,. Complex, 2016 WL 687655 (E.D. La. Feb. 19, 2016); III. C,o Cnicvl.u As. iNono. 13-4325, 2013 WL 6004051, at *5 (E.D. La. Nov. 13, 2013). FITo rI Sth OeR foDrEeRgoEiDng reasons, DISMISSED AS MOOT IN PART DENIED IN P tAhRatT the Motion to Amend (rec. doc. 40) is and as futile.1 5th May New Orleans, Louisiana, this _____ day of _____, 2026. _____

MICHAEL B. NORTH

UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE