

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF
ILLINOIS, EASTERN DIVISION

Scott C. Redman v. United States of America

No. 23-CV-04529 (N.D. Ill. Feb. 17, 2026) · No. 23-CV-04529 · Decided February 17, 2026

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the Northern District of Illinois denied Scott C. Redman’s motion under 28 U.S.C. § 2255 as untimely. The court rejected equitable tolling, finding that Redman failed to demonstrate both diligent pursuit of his rights and extraordinary circumstances preventing timely filing.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the Northern District of Illinois, Eastern Division
WRITING FOR THE COURT	John Robert Blakey
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the Northern District of Illinois, Eastern Division
DECIDED	February 17, 2026
DOCKET	23-CV-04529
DISPOSITION	dismissed
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	Redman filed a motion under 28 U.S.C. § 2255 seeking to vacate, set aside, or correct his sentence. The district court denied the motion as untimely and denied the Government's motion to strike as moot.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	The court applied the statutory timeliness requirements of 28 U.S.C. § 2255(f) and the equitable-tolling standard requiring diligent pursuit of rights and an extraordinary circumstance that prevented timely filing. An evidentiary hearing is unnecessary when the motion and record conclusively show that the prisoner is entitled to no relief.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	Unpublished district court memorandum order and opinion; limited persuasive value and not binding precedent beyond the case.
PARTIES	Scott C. Redman v. United States of America

TOPICS

federal habeas corpus

post-conviction relief

statute of limitations

ineffective assistance

criminal procedure

PRACTICE AREAS

Federal post-conviction relief

Federal habeas corpus

Criminal procedure

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether Redman's § 2255 motion was timely under 28 U.S.C. § 2255(f)(1).
2. Whether equitable tolling excused Redman's approximately four-year delay in filing the § 2255 motion.
3. Whether an evidentiary hearing was required on Redman's § 2255 claims.

HOLDINGS

1. Redman's § 2255 motion was untimely because his conviction became final on July 16, 2018, and the one-year limitation period expired on July 16, 2019, nearly four years before he filed his motion.
2. Equitable tolling did not save Redman's untimely § 2255 motion because he failed to show both diligent pursuit of his rights and an extraordinary circumstance that prevented timely filing.
3. No evidentiary hearing was required because the motion and the existing records conclusively showed that Redman was not entitled to relief.

KEY QUOTATIONS

“Relief granted under § 2255 is “an extraordinary remedy because it asks the district court essentially to reopen the criminal process to a person who already has had an opportunity for full process.”” (Section II)

“Equitable tolling applies only if the movant can show: “(1) that he has been pursuing his rights diligently, and (2) that some extraordinary circumstance stood in his way and prevented timely filing.”” (Section III)

“This is not a case where counsel abandoned his client or repeatedly ignored his instructions or requests, and nothing in the record suggests that counsel’s conduct constitutes extraordinary circumstances justifying the four-year delay in filing the § 2255 motion.” (Section III)

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

A jury found Redman guilty on all counts of a ten-count indictment involving wire fraud, aggravated identity theft, false statements in a DEA application, and controlled-substance distribution. The district court sentenced him to 157 months, and the Seventh Circuit affirmed on April 17, 2018. Redman filed his § 2255 motion on July 13, 2023, alleging ineffective assistance by trial and appellate counsel and contending that trial counsel's alleged abandonment justified equitable tolling.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

A jury convicted Redman in 2016, and the district court sentenced him to 157 months' imprisonment in February 2017. The Seventh Circuit affirmed his conviction and sentence on April 17, 2018, and Redman did not seek

certiorari. He filed the present § 2255 motion on July 13, 2023, arguing ineffective assistance and equitable tolling; the district court rejected equitable tolling and denied the motion as untimely.

DISPOSITION

dismissed

CASES CITED

- *Almonacid v. United States*, 476 F.3d 518, 521 (7th Cir. 2007)
- *Torzala v. United States*, 545 F.3d 517, 521 (7th Cir. 2008)
- *Varela v. United States*, 481 F.3d 932, 935 (7th Cir. 2007)
- *Martin v. United States*, 789 F.3d 703, 706 (7th Cir. 2015)
- *United States v. Redman*, 887 F.3d 789, 792 (7th Cir. 2018)
- *Nolan v. United States*, 358 F.3d 480, 483 (7th Cir. 2004)
- *Carpenter v. Douma*, 840 F.3d 867, 870 (7th Cir. 2016)
- *Obriecht v. Foster*, 727 F.3d 744, 748 (7th Cir. 2013)
- *Holland v. Florida*, 560 U.S. 631, 649 (2010)
- *Lombardo v. United States*, 860 F.3d 547, 552–55 (7th Cir. 2017)
- *Menominee Indian Tribe of Wis. v. United States*, 577 U.S. 250, 256–57 (2016)
- *Baldayaque v. United States*, 338 F.3d 145, 152–53 (2d Cir. 2003)
- *Ademiju v. United States*, 999 F.3d 474, 477 (7th Cir. 2021)
- *Lee v. Cook County*, 635 F.3d 969, 973 (7th Cir. 2011)
- *Perez v. United States*, No. 13 C 4478 (N.D. Ill. Dec. 22, 2015)
- *Tucker v. Kingston*, 538 F.3d 732, 735 (7th Cir. 2008)