

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE CENTRAL DISTRICT OF
ILLINOIS, SPRINGFIELD DIVISION

Marcus Craig v. Brittany Greene, et al.

Craig · No. 3:23-cv-3343-DJQ · Decided January 5, 2026

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the Central District of Illinois granted Defendants’ motion for summary judgment in Marcus Craig’s 42 U.S.C. § 1983 action alleging deliberate indifference to a serious medical need. The court held that the record did not support a reasonable inference that the defendants were personally responsible for a constitutional deprivation or acted with deliberate indifference. The court also declined to consider an ADA claim raised for the first time in the summary-judgment response and directed entry of judgment for Defendants.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the Central District of Illinois, Springfield Division
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Douglas J. Quivey
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the Central District of Illinois, Springfield Division
DECIDED	January 5, 2026
DOCKET	3:23-cv-3343-DJQ
DISPOSITION	other
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	Plaintiff brought a 42 U.S.C. § 1983 action alleging that prison officials were deliberately indifferent to his serious medical need arising from significant hearing loss. Defendants moved for summary judgment.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	Summary judgment is appropriate when there is no genuine dispute as to any material fact and the movant is entitled to judgment as a matter of law. Facts and reasonable inferences are construed in favor of the nonmoving party.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	unpublished district court opinion; precedential status unknown
PARTIES	Marcus Craig v. Brittany Greene, Ashcraft, Kestner, et al.

TOPICS

prisoners rights

summary judgment

section 1983

civil rights

constitutional law

PRACTICE AREAS

civil rights

prisoner litigation

constitutional law

civil procedure

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether defendants were deliberately indifferent under the Eighth Amendment to Craig's serious medical need.
2. Whether Craig could raise an ADA claim for the first time in his response to defendants' summary-judgment motion.
3. Whether the evidence created a genuine dispute of material fact concerning defendants' personal involvement in any constitutional deprivation.

HOLDINGS

1. Craig could not add or pursue an ADA claim through his summary-judgment response because the screened complaint stated only an Eighth Amendment claim, defendants lacked fair notice of the proposed claim, and Craig had not sought reconsideration or leave to amend.
2. Defendants were entitled to summary judgment because no reasonable juror could find that they were deliberately indifferent to Craig's serious medical need or that they caused or participated in a constitutional deprivation.
3. Summary judgment was appropriate because the record presented no genuine dispute of material fact and defendants were entitled to judgment as a matter of law.

KEY QUOTATIONS

“The Court finds that no reasonable juror could conclude that Defendants violated Plaintiff’s Eighth Amendment rights.” (Analysis, section III)

“Public officials do not have a free-floating obligation to put things to rights, disregarding rules (such as time limits) along the way. Bureaucracies divide tasks; no prisoner is entitled to insist that one employee do another’s job.” (Analysis, section III)

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Craig was incarcerated at Western Illinois Correctional Center and had severe hearing loss, including deafness in his left ear and substantial hearing loss in his right ear. He arrived with one broken hearing aid and submitted healthcare requests, grievances, and correspondence concerning hearing accommodations and medical devices. Prison officials provided communication plans, vibrating or pager watches, headphones, and access to medical providers, but Craig did not receive hearing aids before his transfer. The record did not establish that the named defendants caused or participated in any delay in obtaining hearing aids or otherwise acted with deliberate indifference.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

The court previously determined during screening under 28 U.S.C. § 1915A that the amended complaint stated only an Eighth Amendment claim and did not state an ADA claim. Plaintiff attempted to raise an ADA claim in his summary-judgment response, but the court denied the request because defendants lacked fair notice and plaintiff had not sought leave to amend. The court granted defendants' motion for summary judgment on the Eighth Amendment claim, directed entry of judgment for defendants, and terminated the case.

DISPOSITION

other

CASES CITED

- Ollison v. Gossett, 136 F.4th 729, 739 (7th Cir. 2025)
- Estelle v. Gamble, 429 U.S. 97, 104-05 (1976)
- Petties v. Carter, 836 F.3d 722, 729-30 (7th Cir. 2016) (en banc)
- McDonald v. Hardy, 821 F.3d 882, 888 (7th Cir. 2016)
- Farmer v. Brennan, 511 U.S. 825, 837, 842 (1994)
- Ashcroft v. Iqbal, 556 U.S. 662, 676 (2009)
- Burks v. Raemisch, 555 F.3d 592, 594-95 (7th Cir. 2009)
- Vance v. Peters, 97 F.3d 987, 991, 993 (7th Cir. 1996)
- Perez v. Fenoglio, 792 F.3d 768, 781-82 (7th Cir. 2015)
- Berry v. Peterman, 604 F.3d 435, 440 (7th Cir. 2010)
- Hayes v. Snyder, 546 F.3d 516, 527 (7th Cir. 2008)
- Greeno v. Daley, 414 F.3d 645, 656 (7th Cir. 2005)
- Williams v. Liefer, 491 F.3d 710, 714-15 (7th Cir. 2007)
- Celotex Corp. v. Catrett, 477 U.S. 317, 323 (1986)
- Matsushita Elec. Indus. Co. v. Zenith Radio Corp., 475 U.S. 574, 586 (1986)
- Anderson v. Liberty Lobby, Inc., 477 U.S. 242, 248 (1986)
- Ogden v. Atterholt, 606 F.3d 355, 358 (7th Cir. 2010)
- Celske v. Edwards, 164 F.3d 396, 398 (7th Cir. 1999)
- Walker v. O'Brien, 216 F.3d 626, 632 (7th Cir. 2000)