

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF
ILLINOIS

Scott Peters v. J.B. Pritzker, Latoya Hughes, Anthony Wills, Frank
Lawrence, Jolene Kuhnert, Jennifer Barker, Wexford Health
Sources, Inc., Kananbir Sandhu, David Eiland, Wyshnytzky, Miller,
Norten, Jane Doe #1, C. Runge, Sergeant Aikens, Lieutenant Purdy,
Angela Crain, Major Berneiz, Officer Walker, John Doe #1, Brunlee,
Bridges, Lieutenant Calewine, Carriage, Kwame Raoul, and
Jeremiah Brown

Peters · No. 25-cv-1759-NJR · Decided February 23, 2026

SUMMARY

The court denied Scott Peters’s motions and objections seeking reconsideration of the denial of preliminary injunctive relief in his 42 U.S.C. § 1983 action. The court held that Peters had not shown a basis for relief under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 59(e) or 60(b), had not presented newly discovered evidence or a manifest error, and sought relief beyond the dental and ADA-related claims in his complaint. The court also noted that Peters provided insufficient evidence concerning his current medical and dental care at Lawrence Correctional Center.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the Southern District of Illinois
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Nancy J. Rosenstengel
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the Southern District of Illinois
DECIDED	February 23, 2026
DOCKET	25-cv-1759-NJR
DISPOSITION	other
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	Plaintiff moved to stay proceedings and objected to the denial of his motions for temporary restraining order and preliminary injunction. He also sought leave to file a motion to alter or amend and asked the court to reconsider its denial of injunctive relief.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	A Rule 59(e) motion may be granted only upon a mistake of law or fact or newly discovered evidence that could not previously have been

	discovered. Rule 60(b) relief is an extraordinary remedy available only in exceptional circumstances, including mistake, inadvertence, surprise, or excusable neglect, and is not a vehicle for rehashing old arguments. A preliminary injunction must be tailored to the claims in the complaint, and the movant must demonstrate, among other requirements, a likelihood of success on the merits and irreparable harm.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	Unpublished district court memorandum and order; persuasive rather than precedential except as otherwise provided by applicable law.
PARTIES	Scott Peters v. J.B. Pritzker, Latoya Hughes, Anthony Wills, Frank Lawrence, Jolene Kuhnert, Jennifer Barker, Wexford Health Sources, Inc., Kananbir Sandhu, David Eiland, Wyshnytzky, Miller, Norten, Jane Doe #1, C. Runge, Sergeant Aikens, Lieutenant Purdy, Angela Crain, Major Berneiz, Officer Walker, John Doe #1, Brunlee, Bridges, Lieutenant Calewine, Carriage, Kwame Raoul, Jeremiah Brown

TOPICS

[motion for reconsideration](#)

[injunctions](#)

[prisoners rights](#)

[section 1983](#)

[civil procedure](#)

PRACTICE AREAS

[civil procedure](#)

[civil rights](#)

[prisoner litigation](#)

[constitutional law](#)

[injunctive relief](#)

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether Peters established grounds under Rule 59(e) or Rule 60(b) to reconsider the denial of his request for temporary or preliminary injunctive relief.
2. Whether Peters's requested injunction was properly tailored to the claims pleaded in his complaint.
3. Whether Peters demonstrated a likelihood of success on the merits and irreparable harm sufficient to justify injunctive relief.

HOLDINGS

1. A motion to alter or amend judgment under Rule 59(e) may be granted only when the movant demonstrates a mistake of law or fact or presents newly discovered evidence that could not previously have been discovered.
2. Rule 60(b) relief is an extraordinary remedy available only in exceptional circumstances and may not be used merely to rehash old arguments or present arguments that should have been raised earlier.
3. A request for a preliminary injunction must be tailored to the claims in the complaint and may not extend to unrelated medical conditions or claims not pleaded in the action.
4. A prisoner seeking preliminary injunctive relief must provide evidence supporting a likelihood of success on the merits and irreparable harm; generalized allegations and hypothetical or historical

medical problems are insufficient.

KEY QUOTATIONS

“A request for a preliminary injunction must be “tailored to the claims” in the Complaint.” (Discussion)

“‘[M]anifest error’ is not demonstrated by the disappointment of the losing party. It is the wholesale disregard, misapplication, or failure to recognize controlling precedent.” (Discussion)

“Rule 60(b) relief is “an extraordinary remedy and is granted only in exceptional circumstances.””
(Discussion)

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Peters, an Illinois inmate, alleged that he received constitutionally inadequate dental care at Menard Correctional Center in October 2023 and was later issued a disciplinary ticket and placed in segregation. After he transferred to Lawrence Correctional Center, he sought injunctive relief concerning what he characterized as systemic policies affecting dental, medical, mental-health, and other care throughout Illinois Department of Corrections facilities. He provided no evidence establishing the current condition of his dental, medical, or mental-health care at Lawrence, and his complaint primarily concerned the earlier Menard dental-care incidents.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Peters filed a § 1983 complaint concerning alleged unconstitutional dental care and related disciplinary and segregation incidents at Menard Correctional Center, together with an in forma pauperis motion and motions for temporary restraining order and preliminary injunction. The court denied injunctive relief because he failed to show a likelihood of success on the merits, irreparable harm, or evidence concerning his current care after transfer to Lawrence Correctional Center. Peters then filed objections, a motion to stay, and a request to proceed under Rule 59(e); the court treated the reconsideration request under the applicable Rule 59(e) or Rule 60(b) standards and denied all motions.

DISPOSITION

other

CASES CITED

- *Obrieht v. Raemisch*, 517 F.3d 489, 493
- *Borrero v. City of Chicago*, 456 F.3d 698, 701-02
- *Hope v. United States*, 43 F.3d 1140, 1143
- *United States v. Deutsch*, 981 F.2d 299, 301
- *Cincinnati Life Ins. Co. v. Beyrer*, 722 F.3d 939, 954
- *Blue v. Hartford Life & Acc. Ins. Co.*, 698 F.3d 587, 589
- *Oto v. Metropolitan Life Insurance Co.*, 224 F.3d 601, 606
- *McCormick v. City of Chicago*, 230 F.3d 319, 327

- Dickerson v. Board of Education of Ford Heights, Ill., 32 F.3d 1114, 1116
- Russell v. Delco Remy Division of General Motors Corp., 51 F.3d 746, 749
- Rutledge v. United States, 230 F.3d 1041, 1052
- Tatum v. Hunter, Case No. 23-2253, 2024 WL 3177132, at *1 (7th Cir. Apr. 2, 2024)

Retrieved from lawtools.ai · <https://lawtools.ai/cases/federal/united-states-district-court-for-the-southern-district-of-il/2026/scott-peters-v-j-b-pritzker-latoya-hughes-anthony-wills-fjaiixi0>