

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF
INDIANA

Damond Lamont McCauley, Jr. v. Murry Lt., et al.

McCauley · No. 1:25-cv-02481-JRO-MG · Decided March 17, 2026

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the Southern District of Indiana dismissed Damond Lamont McCauley, Jr.'s prisoner civil-rights complaint at the screening stage under 28 U.S.C. § 1915A. The court held that the complaint did not adequately allege personal involvement or deliberate indifference supporting an Eighth Amendment conditions-of-confinement claim and that several additional allegations were unrelated or lacked identified responsible defendants. The court granted McCauley leave to file an amended complaint by April 17, 2026.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the Southern District of Indiana
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the Southern District of Indiana
DECIDED	March 17, 2026
DOCKET	1:25-cv-02481-JRO-MG
DISPOSITION	dismissed
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	A prisoner brought a 42 U.S.C. § 1983 action alleging unconstitutional conditions of confinement. The district court screened the complaint under 28 U.S.C. § 1915A and dismissed it for failure to state a claim, while granting leave to amend.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	Under 28 U.S.C. § 1915A, the court must dismiss any portion of a prisoner complaint that is frivolous or malicious, fails to state a claim, or seeks monetary relief from an immune defendant. The court applies the Rule 12(b)(6) plausibility standard and accepts factual allegations as true at the pleading stage.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	unpublished district court order; nonprecedential
PARTIES	Damond Lamont McCauley, Jr. v. Murry Lt., Kmetz, Sollose

TOPICS

- motions to dismiss
- pleadings
- section 1983
- prisoners rights
- civil procedure

PRACTICE AREAS

civil rights

prisoner litigation

constitutional law

civil procedure

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether the complaint stated a conditions-of-confinement claim under the Eighth Amendment against Lt. Murray and Kmetz.
2. Whether the complaint stated a claim against Sollose when it contained no allegations of her personal involvement.
3. Whether the complaint improperly joined unrelated claims concerning medical care, medication, showers, grievances, and another cell placement.
4. Whether McCauley should be granted leave to amend after dismissal at the early screening stage.

HOLDINGS

1. The complaint failed to state a claim against Sollose because it contained no allegations establishing her personal involvement or a causal connection to the alleged constitutional deprivation.
2. The complaint failed to state an Eighth Amendment conditions-of-confinement claim because it did not allege sufficient facts concerning the duration and objective seriousness of the conditions or establish that Murray and Kmetz knowingly disregarded a substantial risk of serious harm.
3. Claims concerning inadequate medical care, medication, grievance processes, dirty showers, and separate cell conditions could not be pursued together merely as a general list of grievances without allegations connecting the defendants and events as required by Rule 20(a)(2).
4. The court granted McCauley leave to file an amended complaint because the case was at an early stage and amendment might cure the pleading deficiencies.

KEY QUOTATIONS

“When screening a complaint, the Court must dismiss any portion that is frivolous or malicious, fails to state a claim for relief, or seeks monetary relief against a defendant who is immune from such relief.” (Section I)

“A conditions-of-confinement claim includes objective and subjective components.” (Section III)

“The amended complaint will completely replace the original.” (Section IV)

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

McCauley, a prisoner at the Correctional Industrial Facility, alleged that he was placed in a restricted-housing cell containing sperm and feces on the walls and developed a rash. He also alleged that a later restricted-housing cell contained spiders, feces, flooding, and a broken light, and that the facility's restricted-housing unit lacked a porter to clean cells. He named Lt. Murray, Kmetz, and Sollose, but did not allege any conduct by Sollose or adequately explain the duration of the unsanitary conditions, the defendants' knowledge, or his efforts to obtain corrective action.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

McCauley filed a civil-rights complaint seeking monetary damages based on allegedly unsanitary cells, dirty showers, inadequate medical treatment, medication delay, and grievance-related matters. Before service on the defendants, the district court conducted the required prisoner screening, found that the complaint did not state a viable claim against any defendant, dismissed the complaint, and allowed McCauley until April 17, 2026, to file an amended complaint.

DISPOSITION

dismissed

CASES CITED

- Schillinger v. Kiley, 954 F.3d 990, 993 (7th Cir. 2020)
- Bell Atl. Corp. v. Twombly, 550 U.S. 544, 570 (2007)
- Ashcroft v. Iqbal, 556 U.S. 662, 678 (2009)
- Cesal v. Moats, 851 F.3d 714, 720 (7th Cir. 2017)
- Lisby v. Henderson, 74 F.4th 470, 472 (7th Cir. 2023)
- Colbert v. City of Chicago, 851 F.3d 649, 657 (7th Cir. 2017)
- Gillis v. Litscher, 468 F.3d 488, 491 (7th Cir. 2006)
- Giles v. Godinez, 914 F.3d 1040, 1051 (7th Cir. 2019)
- Farmer v. Brennan, 511 U.S. 825, 837 (1994)
- Thomas v. Blackard, 2 F.4th 716, 720 (7th Cir. 2021)
- Donald v. Wexford Health Sources, Inc., 982 F.3d 451, 458 (7th Cir. 2020)
- Lee v. Young, 533 F.3d 505, 509 (7th Cir. 2008)
- McBride v. Deer, 240 F.3d 1287, 1291-92 (10th Cir. 2001)
- Taylor v. Riojas, 592 U.S. 7, 9 (2020)
- Mitchell v. Kallas, 895 F.3d 492, 502-03 (7th Cir. 2018)
- Tate v. SCR Med. Transp., 809 F.3d 343, 346 (7th Cir. 2015)
- Abu-Shawish v. United States, 898 F.3d 726, 738 (7th Cir. 2018)
- Beal v. Beller, 847 F.3d 897, 901 (7th Cir. 2017)