

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF
LOUISIANA

Daniel Fontenot v. CorrectHealth St. Tammany, LLC, et al.

Fontenot · No. 2:25-cv-02394 · Decided March 25, 2026

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the Eastern District of Louisiana denied defendants’ Rule 12(b)(6) motion to dismiss claims arising from the alleged withholding of the plaintiff’s prescribed Xanax while he was detained at the St. Tammany Parish Jail. The court held that the complaint adequately alleged deliberate indifference to serious medical needs and a policy sufficient to support a Monell claim, while allowing discovery to determine the individual defendants’ involvement.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the Eastern District of Louisiana
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Jay C. Zainey
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the Eastern District of Louisiana
DECIDED	March 25, 2026
DOCKET	2:25-cv-02394
DISPOSITION	other
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	The defendants moved under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 12(b)(6) to dismiss Fontenot's 42 U.S.C. § 1983 complaint alleging deliberate indifference to serious medical needs and a policy-based claim against CorrectHealth. The court denied the motion.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	On a Rule 12(b)(6) motion, the court accepts well-pleaded factual allegations as true, draws reasonable inferences in the plaintiff's favor, and determines whether the complaint states a plausible claim for relief. Conclusory allegations, unwarranted factual inferences, and legal conclusions are not accepted as true.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	Unpublished district court order; precedential status is unknown from the supplied text.

PARTIES

Daniel Fontenot v. CorrectHealth St. Tammany, LLC, RN Michelle Coyne, RN Brittney Boihem, LPN Kayla Watkins, LPN Brenda Albarado, LPN Nicole Coleman, NP Kenneth Pitcher, Dr. Samuel Gore

TOPICS

motions to dismiss section 1983 prisoners rights civil rights fourteenth amendment

PRACTICE AREAS

civil rights constitutional law prisoner medical care federal civil procedure health law

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether Fontenot's complaint plausibly stated a claim for deliberate indifference to serious medical needs under § 1983 based on the alleged failure to provide or safely discontinue his prescribed Xanax.
2. Whether Fontenot plausibly alleged a policy or custom sufficient to support a Monell claim against CorrectHealth.
3. Whether the complaint should be dismissed for failing to identify with specificity each individual defendant's involvement in the alleged constitutional violation.

HOLDINGS

1. The complaint's factual allegations stated a claim for deliberate indifference to Fontenot's serious medical needs.
2. Fontenot alleged a policy sufficient to support a Monell claim against CorrectHealth.
3. The complaint was not subject to dismissal merely because Fontenot could not yet identify the precise involvement of each individual defendant; discovery was necessary to determine which defendants were potentially culpable.

KEY QUOTATIONS

"At the outset, Fontenot's factual allegations undisputedly state a claim for deliberate indifference to his serious medical needs." (p. 4)

"Under § 1983 individual defendants are only liable for their own acts not those of other actors but in this case discovery will be necessary to determine which of the individual defendants are potentially culpable for Fontenot's injuries." (p. 4)

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Fontenot was arrested on September 1, 2024, and transported to the St. Tammany Parish Jail with his prescribed medications, including Xanax, which he had taken for approximately twenty years. He allegedly informed jail medical personnel that he required the medication three times daily and that abrupt cessation could cause severe withdrawal, including seizures and death, but the medication was not provided. Approximately sixty hours after

his arrest, Fontenot suffered seizures, fell in the shower, sustained a concussion and scalp laceration requiring seven staples, and was hospitalized in intensive care through September 5, 2024.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Fontenot filed a § 1983 action based on the alleged withholding of his prescribed Xanax while he was incarcerated at the St. Tammany Parish Jail. The defendants moved to dismiss under Rule 12(b)(6), arguing that the complaint consisted of unsupported legal conclusions and lacked sufficient specificity. The court concluded that the complaint stated claims against the entity and potentially against the individual defendants and denied the motion, allowing discovery to determine the individual defendants' involvement.

DISPOSITION

other

CASES CITED

- *Gentilello v. Rege*, 627 F.3d 540, 544 (5th Cir. 2010)
- *Doe v. MySpace, Inc.*, 528 F.3d 413, 418 (5th Cir. 2008)
- *Ashcroft v. Iqbal*, 129 S. Ct. 1937, 1949-50 (2009)
- *Plotkin v. IP Axess, Inc.*, 407 F.3d 690, 696 (5th Cir. 2005)
- *Lormand v. US Unwired, Inc.*, 565 F.3d 228, 232 (5th Cir. 2009)
- *Tellabs, Inc. v. Makor Issues & Rights, Ltd.*, 551 U.S. 308 (2007)
- *Scheuer v. Rhodes*, 416 U.S. 232, 236 (1974)
- *Lovick v. Ritemoney, Ltd.*, 378 F.3d 433, 437 (5th Cir. 2004)
- *Bell Atlantic Corp. v. Twombly*, 550 U.S. 544, 555 (2007)
- *Monell v. N.Y. City Department of Social Services*, 436 U.S. 658 (1978)
- *City of Canton, Ohio v. Harris*, 489 U.S. 378, 385 (1989)
- *Springfield v. Kibbe*, 480 U.S. 257, 267 (1987) (O'Connor, J., dissenting)