

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF
ILLINOIS

Kraig Payne v. James E. Shadid, Hulick, James Robinson, Paul O.
Watkiss, Mark Loren Alanson, Lindsay Vanfleet Rose, Stephenson
Clayton, Enrique Ruiz, and John Guanzon

Payne · No. 3:25-cv-01008-SPM · Decided December 1, 2025

SUMMARY

The court dismissed Kraig Payne’s 42 U.S.C. § 1983 action with prejudice after concluding that the complaint improperly challenged rulings in an earlier federal case and failed to state a due process claim. The court held that the judge was protected by judicial immunity and that the Federal Tort Claims Act did not apply because the defendants were state employees. The dismissal was designated a strike under 28 U.S.C. § 1915(g), and the court denied a pending motion to show cause as moot.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the Southern District of Illinois
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Stephen P. McGlynn
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the Southern District of Illinois
DECIDED	December 1, 2025
DOCKET	3:25-cv-01008-SPM
DISPOSITION	dismissed
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	Screening of a state prisoner’s pro se complaint under 28 U.S.C. § 1915A.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	The complaint was reviewed under the screening standard of 28 U.S.C. § 1915A: dismissal is required for claims that are legally frivolous, malicious, fail to state a claim, or seek monetary relief from an immune defendant.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	nonprecedential
PARTIES	Kraig Payne v. James E. Shadid, Hulick, James Robinson, Paul O. Watkiss, Mark Loren Alanson, Lindsay Vanfleet Rose, Stephenson Clayton, Enrique Ruiz, John Guanzon

TOPICS

section 1983

prisoners rights

due process

subject matter jurisdiction

appellate procedure

PRACTICE AREAS

civil rights

prisoner litigation

federal civil procedure

constitutional law

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether Payne could use a new § 1983 action in the Southern District of Illinois to challenge rulings entered by a federal district judge in a prior case.
2. Whether Judge Shadid was entitled to judicial immunity from Payne's damages claim based on rulings made in the prior action.
3. Whether the allegations against the remaining defendants stated a due process claim.
4. Whether Payne's Federal Tort Claims Act claims fell within the court's jurisdiction when all defendants were state employees.
5. Whether the complaint should be dismissed with prejudice and without leave to amend.

HOLDINGS

1. A plaintiff may not use a new action in another federal district court to obtain review of an adverse ruling entered by a different federal district court; the proper avenue is appellate review.
2. A judge is immune from civil damages liability for acts performed in the judge's judicial capacity, even when the acts are alleged to have been erroneous or malicious.
3. The complaint failed to state a due process claim because Payne received a decision and had an opportunity to appeal, which constituted all the process due under the circumstances alleged.
4. The Federal Tort Claims Act does not provide jurisdiction over claims against state employees for alleged torts because the FTCA concerns torts committed by federal officials and claims against the United States.
5. Leave to amend was properly denied when the court determined that amendment would be futile because Payne could not state a valid § 1983 claim based on dissatisfaction with the prior ruling.

KEY QUOTATIONS

"The Court cannot sit in review of a fellow district judge's rulings."

"Plaintiff's 'only avenue for challenging a judge's decision is through the appeal process.'"

"Though his motion was not granted, and he lost the case, 'he received a decision, and he had the opportunity to appeal. This was all the process [Plaintiff] was due.'"

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Payne, an Illinois prisoner, previously litigated *Payne v. John* in the Central District of Illinois, where Judge James E. Shadid granted summary judgment and dismissed the action for failure to exhaust administrative

remedies. Payne alleged that documents and an affidavit concerning Administrative Review Board records were false or inaccurate and that the defendants failed to investigate the alleged discrepancies. He sought \$100 trillion in damages and characterized the defendants' conduct as a violation of due process.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Payne filed a § 1983 action alleging that a federal district judge and other defendants violated his due process rights in connection with the dismissal of an earlier civil action for failure to exhaust administrative remedies. He also asserted claims under the Federal Tort Claims Act. The court conducted preliminary screening under 28 U.S.C. § 1915A and dismissed the complaint and entire action with prejudice, denied a motion to show cause as moot, and directed the Clerk to close the case.

DISPOSITION

dismissed

CASES CITED

- Bradd v. Leinenweber, No. 07 C 6101, 2008 WL 11504103, at *1
- United States v. Balogun, 971 F. Supp. 1215, 1237 (N.D. Ill. 1997)
- Brushwood v. Litscher, No. 00-C-357-C, 2000 WL 34229420, at *1 (W.D. Wisc. Aug. 21, 2000)
- Forrester v. White, 484 U.S. 219, 228 (1988)
- Stump v. Sparkman, 435 U.S. 349, 356-57, 362-63 (1978)
- Pierson v. Ray, 386 U.S. 547 (1967)
- Talley v. United States, No. 22-cv-01711, 2023 WL 5162048, at *8 (M.D. Penn. July 5, 2023)
- Always Towing & Recovery Inc. v. City of Milwaukee, Always Towing & Recovery, Inc. v. City of Milwaukee, 2 F.4th 695, 707 (7th Cir. 2021)
- Owens v. Hinsley, 635 F.3d 950, 956 (7th Cir. 2011)
- Lucien v. Jockisch, 133 F.3d 464, 467 (7th Cir. 1998)
- Ammons v. Gerlinger, 547 F.3d 724, 725-26 (7th Cir. 2008)
- Sloan v. Lesza, 181 F.3d 857, 858-59 (7th Cir. 1999)
- Payne v. John, No. 24-2041 (7th Cir. Ill. Sept. 20, 2024)