

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF
ILLINOIS

Sean Rose v. Denise Light, Monica Sheets, Anthony D. Wills, Kendra
Siep, and Frank Lawrence

Rose v. Light · No. 23-cv-01027-SMY · Decided March 25, 2026

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the Southern District of Illinois granted Sean Rose leave to file a Fifth Amended Complaint in his 42 U.S.C. § 1983 action alleging Eighth Amendment sexual abuse and failure-to-protect claims arising from conduct at Menard Correctional Center. The court screened the amended complaint and allowed five Eighth Amendment claims to proceed against the named defendants. The court also directed service on Monica Sheets, dismissed related motions without prejudice or as moot, and denied motions to intervene.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the Southern District of Illinois
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Staci M. Yandle
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the Southern District of Illinois
DECIDED	March 25, 2026
DOCKET	23-cv-01027-SMY
DISPOSITION	other
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	Plaintiff moved for leave to file a Fifth Amended Complaint in a prisoner civil-rights action. The court granted leave, screened the amended pleading, allowed five Eighth Amendment claims to proceed, dismissed or denied several related motions, and issued service and responsive-pleading instructions.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	Under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 15(a)(2), leave to amend is granted when justice so requires. The court also screened the amended complaint under 28 U.S.C. § 1915A and applied the plausibility standard for failure to state a claim.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	Unknown; district-court memorandum and order
PARTIES	Sean Rose v. Denise Light, Monica Sheets, Anthony D. Wills, Kendra Siep, Frank Lawrence

TOPICS

motion to amend pleadings intervention prisoners rights civil rights

PRACTICE AREAS

civil procedure prisoner civil rights constitutional law

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether Plaintiff should be granted leave under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 15(a)(2) to file a Fifth Amended Complaint.
2. Whether the Fifth Amended Complaint stated claims that survived screening under 28 U.S.C. § 1915A.
3. Whether the pending motion for summary judgment and related motions should be dismissed or otherwise addressed because the Fifth Amended Complaint superseded prior pleadings.
4. Whether Justin Dalcollo satisfied the requirements for intervention under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 24.

HOLDINGS

1. Leave to file the Fifth Amended Complaint was warranted because Plaintiff did not cause undue delay and Defendants would suffer no undue prejudice from the amendment.
2. Counts 1 through 5 of the Fifth Amended Complaint stated Eighth Amendment claims sufficient to survive screening under 28 U.S.C. § 1915A.
3. Because the Fifth Amended Complaint superseded and replaced all prior versions, the pending exhaustion-related summary-judgment motion and associated responses and replies were dismissed without prejudice to refiling with reference to the new complaint.
4. Justin Dalcollo was not entitled to intervene because he did not establish the requirements for intervention as of right or permissive intervention and his motion was untimely.

KEY QUOTATIONS

“Pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 15(a)(2), the Court grants leave to amend when justice so requires.”

“Because the Fifth Amended Complaint supersedes and replaces all prior versions”

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Sean Rose, an Illinois Department of Corrections inmate, alleged that Officers Denise Light and Monica Sheets repeatedly sexually assaulted, abused, and harassed him while he was housed in the Medium Security Unit at Menard Correctional Center. He alleged that prison administrators transferred the officers to that unit while they were under investigation for sexual misconduct, maintained a policy that did not restrict their inmate contact, and failed to protect inmates despite knowledge of the risk. The Fifth Amended Complaint asserted Eighth

Amendment claims against Light and Sheets for the assaults and against Anthony Wills, Kendra Siep, and Frank Lawrence for failure to protect Rose.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

The Second Amended Complaint survived screening under 28 U.S.C. § 1915A as to three claims, while five other claims and seven defendants were dismissed without prejudice. Defendants filed a summary-judgment motion concerning exhaustion, and Plaintiff later obtained appointed counsel. Counsel promptly moved for leave to file a Fifth Amended Complaint, which Defendants opposed based on undue delay and prejudice. The court granted amendment, screened the Fifth Amended Complaint, dismissed unrelated inadequately pleaded claims without prejudice, and addressed the pending motions and service issues.

DISPOSITION

other

CASES CITED

- Bell Atlantic Corp. v. Twombly, 550 U.S. 544, 570 (2007)