

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF
LOUISIANA, LAFAYETTE DIVISION

Yoandi Hernandez v. GEO Group, Inc. et al.

Civil Action No. 6:25-CV-01901 SEC P · No. Civil Action No. 6:25-CV-01901 SEC P · Decided March 30,
2026

SUMMARY

This memorandum order addresses a pro se civil rights complaint by an immigration detainee against GEO Group, wardens, and a detention officer. The court identifies deficiencies concerning supervisory liability, medical care, and retaliation claims and orders the plaintiff to amend his complaint within forty days. The order warns that failure to amend may result in dismissal under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 41(b).

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the Western District of Louisiana, Lafayette Division
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Carol B. Whitehurst
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the Western District of Louisiana, Lafayette Division
DECIDED	March 30, 2026
DOCKET	Civil Action No. 6:25-CV-01901 SEC P
DISPOSITION	other
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	Pro se civil-rights complaint by an immigration detainee referred to a magistrate judge for screening, review, report, and recommendation under 28 U.S.C. § 636 and 28 U.S.C. § 1915A.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	Under 28 U.S.C. § 1915A, the court must screen a prisoner civil-rights complaint and dismiss it if it is frivolous or fails to state a claim. At screening, the court accepts the plaintiff's allegations as true, but a complaint must contain sufficient factual matter to state a claim and may not rely on conclusory allegations.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	nonprecedential

TOPICS

- section 1983
- immigration detention
- prisoners rights
- pleadings
- civil procedure

PRACTICE AREAS

civil rights

prisoner litigation

immigration detention

federal civil procedure

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether the complaint satisfied the pleading and screening requirements of Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 8 and 28 U.S.C. § 1915A.
2. Whether Hernandez adequately pleaded the personal participation of supervisory defendants Warden Patterson and Warden Mayo in alleged constitutional violations.
3. Whether Hernandez provided sufficient facts to state claims for deliberate indifference to medical needs and retaliation.

HOLDINGS

1. The complaint did not provide sufficient factual detail to allow the court to evaluate the asserted constitutional claims, and Hernandez was required to amend the complaint to cure the identified deficiencies.
2. Hernandez was required to amend to identify what each supervisory defendant did or failed to do, when and where the conduct occurred, how each defendant participated in the alleged violation, and what injury resulted.
3. The medical-care and retaliation allegations were insufficiently specific, and Hernandez was required to amend them with facts concerning his medical conditions, treatment, requests for care, deliberate indifference, retaliatory acts, responsible persons, and evidence of retaliatory motive.

KEY QUOTATIONS

“A complaint is frivolous if it lacks an arguable basis in law or fact.”

“Rule 8 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure requires a pleading to contain “a short and plain statement of the claim showing that the pleader is entitled to relief.””

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Hernandez, an immigration detainee held at the Joe Corley Detention Center in Texas, alleged that while detained at the Pine Prairie ICE Processing Center in Louisiana he was subjected to repeated sexual advances by Officer Candice Hill. He also alleged that after cooperating with ICE personnel, Louisiana State Police, and GEO administrators regarding alleged contraband trafficking, he faced threats, retaliation, and deliberate indifference, while officials failed to provide meaningful protective measures. Hernandez further alleged delayed treatment for physical and mental-health needs and sought release or protective placement, injunctive relief, compensatory damages, and punitive damages.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Hernandez filed a civil-rights complaint against GEO Group, Inc., two wardens, and an officer concerning alleged sexual advances, retaliation, threats, deliberate indifference, and inadequate medical care while detained

at the Pine Prairie ICE Processing Center. The court found that the pleading lacked sufficient factual detail concerning supervisory participation, medical-care claims, and retaliation. Rather than dismissing at that time, the court ordered Hernandez to amend within forty days and warned that failure to comply could result in dismissal under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 41(b).

DISPOSITION

other

CASES CITED

- Gonzalez v. Wyatt, 157 F.3d 1016, 1019 (5th Cir. 1998)
- Doe v. Dallas Indep. Sch. Dist., 153 F.3d 211, 215 (5th Cir. 1998)
- Horton v. Cockrell, 70 F.3d 397, 400 (5th Cir. 1995)
- Bradley v. Puckett, 157 F.3d at 1025
- West v. Atkins, 487 U.S. 42, 48 (1988)
- Bynum v. Terrebonne Parish Consol. Gov't, 2011 WL 6654985, at *3 (E.D. La. Nov. 8, 2011)
- Ashcroft v. Iqbal, 556 U.S. 662 (2009)
- Schultea v. Wood, 47 F.3d 1427, 1433 (5th Cir. 1995)
- Spears v. McCotter, 766 F.2d 179 (5th Cir. 1985)
- Link v. Wabash R. Co., 82 S. Ct. 1386 (1962)