

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF
ILLINOIS

Adonis R. Mickles v. Wexford Health Source Inc., Chad Jennins, Phil
Martin, Dr. Thomas, RN Murray, and RN Brayfield

Case No. 25-cv-00957-SPM · No. 25-cv-00957-SPM · Decided December 1, 2025

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the Southern District of Illinois conducted preliminary review under 28 U.S.C. § 1915A of Adonis R. Mickles's § 1983 complaint concerning alleged inadequate diabetes treatment in prison. The court dismissed without prejudice the claim based on allegedly administering the wrong insulin and dismissed claims against Wexford Health Source, Inc., Jennins, Martin, and Dr. Thomas, while allowing an Eighth Amendment medical-care claim against Nurses Murray and Brayfield to proceed provisionally. The court ordered Mickles to show cause why the case should not be dismissed for failure to exhaust administrative remedies and denied his motion for recruitment of counsel.

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	25-cv-00957-SPM
DISPOSITION	other
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	Pro se prisoner civil-rights action under 42 U.S.C. § 1983 subjected to preliminary review under 28 U.S.C. § 1915A. The court dismissed some claims without prejudice, allowed one deliberate-indifference claim to proceed provisionally against two nurses, denied recruitment of counsel, and ordered the plaintiff to show cause why the action should not be dismissed for failure to exhaust administrative remedies.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	Under 28 U.S.C. § 1915A, the court dismisses any portion of a prisoner complaint that is frivolous, malicious, fails to state a claim, or seeks damages from an immune defendant. At the pleading stage, allegations must satisfy the plausibility standard of Bell Atlantic Corp. v. Twombly. For deliberate-indifference claims, the plaintiff must

allege that the defendant knew of a serious risk of harm and consciously disregarded it.

PRECEDENTIAL VALUE

unpublished district-court memorandum and order; nonprecedential

TOPICS

prisoners rights

section 1983

cruel and unusual punishment

civil procedure

affirmative defenses

PRACTICE AREAS

civil rights

prisoner medical care

federal civil procedure

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether the complaint stated an Eighth Amendment deliberate-indifference claim based on Nurse Brayfield's alleged administration of the wrong insulin on one occasion.
2. Whether the complaint stated an Eighth Amendment deliberate-indifference claim against Dr. Thomas, Warden Jennins, and Medical Director Martin for allegedly inadequate diabetes care.
3. Whether the complaint stated a deliberate-indifference claim against Nurses Murray and Brayfield based on their alleged knowledge of and failure to respond to problems with Mickles's insulin schedule.
4. Whether the apparent failure to exhaust administrative remedies warranted dismissal before defendants answered or instead warranted an order to show cause.
5. Whether Mickles demonstrated sufficient efforts and need to justify recruitment of counsel at the preliminary stage.

HOLDINGS

1. A general allegation that Nurse Brayfield administered the wrong type of insulin on a single occasion did not plausibly allege that she consciously disregarded a serious risk of harm; Count 1 was dismissed without prejudice.
2. The complaint failed to state an Eighth Amendment claim against Dr. Thomas because it did not allege that Thomas was later informed that the prescribed diabetes treatment was inadequate or causing Mickles's condition to deteriorate; Count 2 was dismissed without prejudice as to Thomas.
3. The complaint failed to state a claim against Warden Jennins and Medical Director Martin because it did not allege their personal involvement or actual knowledge of the allegedly inadequate diabetes care, and supervisory status alone was insufficient; Count 2 was dismissed without prejudice as to them.
4. The allegations that Murray and Brayfield were told that Mickles's insulin schedule was causing health complications and nevertheless failed to provide or ensure necessary care were sufficient at screening to state an Eighth Amendment deliberate-indifference claim; Count 2 proceeded against them.
5. The court did not finally decide exhaustion but ordered Mickles to show cause why Count 2 and the entire action should not be dismissed because the complaint indicated that he filed his grievance on May 12, 2025, and filed suit on May 16, 2025, before completing the prison grievance process.

6. The motion for recruitment of counsel was denied because Mickles did not demonstrate sufficient efforts to obtain counsel independently and appeared capable of representing himself at the preliminary stage.

KEY QUOTATIONS

“The Eighth Amendment prohibits the deliberate indifference to a prisoner’s “serious medical needs,” as deliberate indifference “constitutes the unnecessary and wanton infliction of pain forbidden by the Constitution.”” (Discussion)

“For a prisoner to properly exhaust his administrative remedies, the prisoner must “file complaints and appeals in the place, and at the time, the prison’s administrative rules require.”” (Show Cause)

“Before the Court will order service on Defendants Murray and Brayfield, Plaintiff is ORDERED to show cause in writing as to why this case should not be dismissed for failure to exhaust his administrative remedies prior to initiating this lawsuit.” (Disposition)

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Mickles, an IDOC inmate at Robinson Correctional Center, alleged that he was diabetic and had previously monitored his blood sugar three times daily and received insulin at those intervals. He alleged that Dr. Thomas told him the facility did not perform Accu-Cheks or administer insulin at lunchtime, resulting in insulin being administered only twice daily and causing repeated blood-sugar drops, including near-diabetic-coma episodes from May 8 through May 10, 2025. Mickles further alleged that Nurses Murray and Brayfield were told about the problems but failed to correct them, and that Brayfield once administered the wrong insulin.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Adonis Mickles filed a § 1983 complaint concerning medical treatment of his diabetes while incarcerated. Before service, the district court conducted screening under § 1915A, dismissed the claims against Wexford Health Source Inc., dismissed the wrong-insulin claim and the inadequate-care claims against Jennins, Martin, and Dr. Thomas, and permitted the inadequate-care claim against Nurses Murray and Brayfield to proceed. The court withheld service and ordered Mickles to show cause because the complaint and attached exhibits suggested that he filed his grievance only four days before filing suit.

DISPOSITION

other

CASES CITED

- Otis v. Demarass, 886 F.3d 639, 644 (7th Cir. 2018)
- Collins v. Kibort, 143 F.3d 331, 334 (7th Cir. 1998)
- Rodriguez v. Plymouth Ambulance Serv., 577 F.3d 816, 828-29 (7th Cir. 2009)
- Giles v. Godinez, 914 F.3d 1040, 1049 (7th Cir. 2019)
- Bell Atlantic Corp. v. Twombly, 550 U.S. 544, 570 (2007)
- Brown v. Cascadden, No. 19-3511, 2022 WL 523083, at *1-2 (7th Cir. Feb. 22, 2022)

- Robbins v. Waupun Corr. Inst., 16-CV-1128, 2016 WL 5921822, at *3 (E.D. Wis. Oct. 2016)
- Morrison v. Utz, No. 11-CV-4110, 2012 WL 293548, at *2 (C.D. Ill. Jan. 31, 2012)
- Richmond v. Dart, No. 12 C 0954, 2012 WL 567245, at *2 (N.D. Ill. Feb. 17, 2012)
- Ehrenberg v. Wis. Dep't of Corr., No. 10 C 1022, 2010 WL 5089484 (E.D. Wis. Dec. 7, 2010)
- Davis v. Baker, No. 08 C 1310, 2010 WL 779502 (S.D. Ind. Feb. 26, 2010)
- Kirkwood v. Sirin, No. 06 C 0139, 2006 WL 587698, at *3 (E.D. Wis. Mar. 9, 2006)
- Ingram v. Brewer, 7-cv-00176, 2009 WL 464491, at *1-2 (E.D. Cal. Feb. 24, 2009)
- Pierson v. Hartley, 391 F.3d 898, 902 (7th Cir. 2004)
- Sanville v. McCaughtry, 266 F.3d 724, 740 (7th Cir. 2001)
- Pavey v. Conley, 544 F.3d 739, 740 (7th Cir. 2008)
- Pozo v. McCaughtry, 286 F.3d 1022, 1024-25 (7th Cir. 2002)
- Dole v. Chandler, 438 F.3d 804, 809 (7th Cir. 2006)
- Ross v. Blake, 578 U.S. 632, 639 (2016)
- Pavey v. Conley, 663 F.3d 899, 903 (7th Cir. 2011)
- Walker v. Thompson, 288 F.3d 1005, 1009 (7th Cir. 2002)
- Pruitt v. Mote, 503 F.3d 647, 654 (7th Cir. 2007)