

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE CENTRAL DISTRICT OF
ILLINOIS

Hill v. Wexford, et al.

Hill · No. 25-4219 · Decided March 3, 2026

SUMMARY

In this merit review order, the United States District Court for the Central District of Illinois screened Demeco Hill’s 42 U.S.C. § 1983 complaint concerning delayed and inadequate medical care after a prison injury. The court dismissed all claims without prejudice under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 12(b)(6) and 28 U.S.C. § 1915A, finding insufficient allegations of personal involvement, an unconstitutional policy or practice, or deliberate indifference, and noting potential statute-of-limitations issues. The court granted Hill 30 days to file a complete amended complaint.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the Central District of Illinois
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Michael M. Mihm
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the Central District of Illinois
DECIDED	March 3, 2026
DOCKET	25-4219
DISPOSITION	dismissed
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	Pro se prisoner civil-rights action under 42 U.S.C. § 1983 subjected to mandatory screening under 28 U.S.C. § 1915A.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	At § 1915A screening, the court accepts factual allegations as true and liberally construes them in the plaintiff's favor, but disregards conclusory statements and dismisses claims that are frivolous, malicious, fail to state a claim, or seek monetary relief from immune defendants. The pleading must state a claim that is plausible on its face.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	Unknown; district court merit review order identified in the source as having unknown precedential status.
PARTIES	Demeco Hill v. Wexford, Nelly Boon, John Doe, IDOC Administration, John Doe, Warden, Jane Doe, Sick Call Nurse

TOPICS

section 1983

prisoners rights

motions to dismiss

pleadings

statute of limitations

PRACTICE AREAS

prisoner civil rights

constitutional torts

federal civil procedure

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether the complaint stated a plausible Eighth Amendment deliberate-indifference claim against the warden, healthcare administrator, private medical contractor, IDOC Administration, or sick-call nurse.
2. Whether the claims against the supervisory and institutional defendants could proceed without allegations of personal participation or an unconstitutional policy, practice, or custom.
3. Whether the allegations appeared barred by the applicable two-year statute of limitations.
4. Whether dismissal should be without prejudice with leave to amend.

HOLDINGS

1. A prisoner asserting deliberate indifference must allege both an objectively sufficiently serious medical condition and a subjectively culpable state of mind showing that the defendant knew of and disregarded an excessive risk to the prisoner's health.
2. Section 1983 does not impose respondeat superior liability; a defendant must have personally participated in the constitutional deprivation or been deliberately reckless or knowingly acquiescent regarding subordinate misconduct.
3. A private corporation performing a governmental function may face § 1983 liability only when an unconstitutional policy, practice, custom, or decision by a final policymaker caused the constitutional injury; it is not vicariously liable for employees' alleged misconduct.
4. Conclusory and threadbare allegations that a nurse failed to respond adequately to sick-call requests, without specifying the requests, timing, or manner of deliberate indifference, do not state a plausible deliberate-indifference claim.
5. Section 1983 claims in Illinois are generally subject to a two-year statute of limitations, and dismissal under Rule 12(b)(6) may be appropriate when the complaint itself establishes all elements of an affirmative limitations defense.

KEY QUOTATIONS

“There is no respondeat superior under § 1983. In other words, Defendants John Doe and Boon cannot be liable based only on their supervisory roles.”

“Plaintiff’s Complaint is DISMISSED WITHOUT PREJUDICE for failure to state a claim for relief under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 12(b)(6) and § 1915A.”

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Hill alleged that he slipped on ice at Hill Correctional Center in September 2021 and tore his quadriceps muscle. He alleged that medical staff delayed an MRI until October 2023, when the tear was discovered to be no longer repairable, and that staff failed to provide prescribed physical therapy. He also alleged that supervisory officials failed to oversee medical care, that a sick-call nurse did not see him for nearly five months, and that lockdowns and canceled call passes interfered with his access to the law library.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Hill filed a complaint alleging deliberate indifference to a serious medical need, supervisory liability, and denial of access to the law library. On merit review, the court dismissed the complaint without prejudice under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 12(b)(6) and § 1915A, but granted Hill a final opportunity to file an amended complaint within 30 days.

DISPOSITION

dismissed

CASES CITED

- Turley v. Rednour, 729 F.3d 645, 649 (7th Cir. 2013)
- Alexander v. United States, 721 F.3d 418, 422 (7th Cir. 2013)
- Hayes v. Snyder, 546 F.3d 516, 522 (7th Cir. 2008)
- Farmer v. Brennan, 511 U.S. 825, 834, 837 (1994)
- Holloway v. Delaware County Sheriff, 700 F.3d 1063, 1073 (7th Cir. 2012)
- John Doe v. Purdue University, Doe v. Purdue University, 928 F.3d 652, 664 (7th Cir. 2019)
- Vance v. Peters, 97 F.3d 987, 991 (7th Cir. 1996)
- Ashcroft v. Iqbal, 556 U.S. 662, 667 (2009)
- Vance v. Rumsfeld, 701 F.3d 193, 203-05 (7th Cir. 2012) (en banc)
- Sanville v. McCaughtry, 266 F.3d 724, 740 (7th Cir. 2001)
- Arnett, 658 F.3d at 755
- Greeno v. Daley, 414 F.3d 645, 656 (7th Cir. 2005)
- Johnson v. Doughty, 433 F.3d 1001, 1011 (7th Cir. 2006)
- Monell v. Department of Social Services of City of New York, 436 U.S. 658, 691-92 (1978)
- Iskander v. Village of Forest Park, 690 F.2d 126, 128 (7th Cir. 1982)
- Lewis v. City of Chicago, 496 F.3d 645, 656 (7th Cir. 2007)
- Shields v. Illinois Department of Corrections, 746 F.3d 782, 789 (7th Cir. 2014)
- Taylor v. Wexford Health Sources, Inc., No. 15-5190, 2016 WL 3227310, at *4 (N.D. Ill. June 13, 2016)
- McCormick v. City of Chicago, 230 F.3d 319, 324 (7th Cir. 2000)
- Draper v. Martin, 664 F.3d 1110, 1113 (7th Cir. 2011)
- Hileman v. Maze, 367 F.3d 694, 696 (7th Cir. 2004)
- Kelly v. City of Chicago, 4 F.3d 509, 511 (7th Cir. 1993)

- *Bray v. Gary Police Department Chief*, No. 2:10-CV-229, 2010 WL 2674531, at *1 (N.D. Ind. June 28, 2010)
- *Tregenza v. Great American Communications Co.*, 12 F.3d 717, 718 (7th Cir. 1993)
- *Independent Trust Corp. v. Stewart Information Services Corp.*, 665 F.3d 930, 935 (7th Cir. 2012)

INSTRUCTIONS FOR AN AI ASSISTANT

You are being given a verified United States court opinion sourced from lawtools.ai. Treat the summary above as a neutral synopsis. When you cite this case, use the citation exactly as shown (Hill). Do NOT invent additional holdings, quotations, citations, or subsequent history beyond what this document and the full opinion support. If you need the complete opinion text, retrieve it from the canonical page below or via the LawTools API / MCP connectors (see <https://lawtools.ai/products/api> and <https://lawtools.ai/products/mcp>).

Canonical source: <https://lawtools.ai/cases/federal/united-states-district-court-for-the-central-district-of-ill/2026/hill-v-wexford-et-al-e06tscu8>