

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF  
WISCONSIN

Isadoris Green v. Nicholas Alexander

Green v. Alexander · No. 25-cv-203-jdp · Decided December 17, 2025

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the Western District of Wisconsin screened Isadoris Green’s pro se complaint alleging that a Douglas County sheriff struck him with a squad car because of his race and false charges. The court dismissed the complaint for failure to state a claim, identified insufficient factual allegations and potential statute-of-limitations concerns, and granted Green until January 17, 2026, to file an amended complaint.

CASE DETAILS

|                       |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                              |
|-----------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| COURT                 | United States District Court for the Western District of Wisconsin                                                                                                                                                                                                           |
| WRITING FOR THE COURT | James D. Peterson                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                            |
| JURISDICTION          | United States District Court for the Western District of Wisconsin                                                                                                                                                                                                           |
| DECIDED               | December 17, 2025                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                            |
| DOCKET                | 25-cv-203-jdp                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                |
| DISPOSITION           | dismissed                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                    |
| PROCEDURAL POSTURE    | Screening of a pro se civil-rights complaint under 28 U.S.C. §§ 1915(e)(2) and 1915A.                                                                                                                                                                                        |
| STANDARD OF REVIEW    | On screening under 28 U.S.C. §§ 1915(e)(2) and 1915A, the court accepts a pro se plaintiff’s allegations as true and liberally construes the complaint, but requires sufficient factual allegations to provide fair notice of the claim and plausible grounds supporting it. |
| PRECEDENTIAL VALUE    | nonprecedential                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                              |
| PARTIES               | Isadoris Green v. Nicholas Alexander                                                                                                                                                                                                                                         |

TOPICS

- section 1983
- police misconduct
- pleadings
- civil procedure
- statute of limitations

PRACTICE AREAS

## QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether Green's complaint stated a plausible Fourth Amendment excessive-force claim against the sole named defendant.
2. Whether the complaint was subject to dismissal at screening because it failed to identify the actors and conduct underlying the alleged constitutional violation.
3. Whether the apparent expiration of the statute of limitations warranted dismissal or required Green to address the delay in an amended complaint.

## HOLDINGS

1. The complaint failed to state a plausible Fourth Amendment excessive-force claim because its allegations were too sparse and inconsistent to identify who did what, and it did not identify any action by Alexander, the sole named defendant.
2. Dismissal was warranted under 28 U.S.C. §§ 1915(e)(2) and 1915A because the complaint failed to state a claim upon which relief could be granted.
3. The court noted that claims based on the 2016 events appeared untimely, but permitted Green to amend and required him to explain why he waited more than nine years to file suit.

## KEY QUOTATIONS

*“The allegations in Green’s complaint are so sparse and inconsistent that I cannot understand who did what to violate Green’s rights.”*

*“Although the statute of limitations is generally an affirmative defense to be raised by defendants, the court would not allow an obviously untimely case to proceed.”*

*“Green’s amended complaint must name as a defendant anyone from whom he seeks any remedy, and he must explain what each defendant did to violate his rights.”*

## FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Green alleged that in May 2016 a Douglas County sheriff struck him with a squad car because of his race and because of false charges brought against him. He named only Nicholas Alexander, whom he identified as a member of the Douglas County Sheriff’s Department, while also referring to the Superior Wisconsin Police Department and Lake Superior Task Force. The complaint did not identify what Alexander or the other entities allegedly did, and publicly available information indicated that Alexander was not the Douglas County sheriff in 2016.

## PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Green filed a complaint alleging that a Douglas County sheriff struck him with a squad car in May 2016 because of his race and allegedly false charges. The court screened the complaint, dismissed it for failure to state a claim, and granted Green leave to file an amended complaint by January 17, 2026.

## DISPOSITION

dismissed

## CASES CITED

- Arnett v. Webster, 658 F.3d 742, 751 (7th Cir. 2011)
- Ollison v. Gossett, 136 F.4th 729, 737 (7th Cir. 2025)
- Bell Atl. Corp. v. Twombly, 550 U.S. 544, 555–56 (2007)
- Graham v. Connor, 490 U.S. 386, 394 (1989)
- Plumhoff v. Rickard, 572 U.S. 765, 774 (2014)

## OPINION

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF WISCONSIN ISADORIS GREEN, Plaintiff, OPINION and ORDER v. 25-cv-203-jdp NICHOLAS ALEXANDER, Defendant. Plaintiff Isadoris Green, proceeding without counsel, alleges that, in May 2016, the Douglas County sheriff struck him with a squad car because of Green’s race and because of false charges brought against him.

See Dkt. 1, at 2. Green names as a defendant only Nicholas Alexander, whom Green identifies as a member of the Douglas County Sheriff’s Department. Green also identifies the Superior Wisconsin Police Department and Lake Superior Task Force as entities that violated his rights. See *id.* Green’s complaint is before the court for screening under 28 U.S.C. §§ 1915(e)(2) and 1915A, which require the court to dismiss any claim that is legally frivolous or malicious, fails to state a claim upon which relief may be granted, or asks for money damages from a defendant who by law cannot be sued for money damages.

When screening the complaint of a plaintiff without counsel, I accept the allegations as true and read the complaint liberally. *Arnett v. Webster*, 658 F.3d 742, 751 (7th Cir. 2011). But Green must allege enough facts to give defendant’s fair notice of his claim and the plausible grounds upon which it rests. See *Ollison v. Gossett*, 136 F.4th 729, 737 (7th Cir.

2025); *Bell Atl. Corp. v. Twombly*, 550 U.S. 544, 555–56 (2007). It isn’t clear whether Green was in custody when the sheriff struck him with a squad car. So I will assume that he was a free citizen, meaning that his Fourth Amendment rights are at issue. See *Graham v. Connor*, 490 U.S. 386, 394 (1989). A law enforcement officer violates the Fourth Amendment when he uses an objectively unreasonable amount of force against an individual.

See *Plumhoff v. Rickard*, 572 U.S. 765, 774 (2014). Getting hit by a car obviously involves force, but it would violate Green’s rights only if it was done intentionally. The allegations in Green’s complaint are so sparse and inconsistent that I cannot understand who did what to violate Green’s

rights. Based on publicly available information, the court knows that Alexander was not the Douglas County sheriff in 2016.

Green doesn't name the sheriff as a defendant. And Green doesn't identify any action by Alexander, the sole named defendant. Green does not identify any acts by the Superior Wisconsin Police Department or the Lake Superior Task Force. Generally, Green would have to identify the individual law enforcement officers who violated his rights and explain how they did so.

Green's complaint has another problem: he alleges that the events took place in 2016, which would mean that the statute of limitations for any claim based on those events would have expired years ago. Although the statute of limitations is generally an affirmative defense to be raised by defendants, the court would not allow an obviously untimely case to proceed.

I will allow Green to file an amended complaint that attempts to fix these problems. Green's amended complaint must name as a defendant anyone from whom he seeks any remedy, and he must explain what each defendant did to violate his rights. He has to provide enough background to give a plausible account of the violation of his rights. He should also address why he waited more than nine years to file this suit.

ORDER IT IS ORDERED that: 1. Plaintiff Isadoris Green's complaint, Dkt. 1, is DISMISSED for failure to state a claim upon which relief may be granted. 2. Green may have until January 17, 2026, to submit an amended complaint that fixes the problems identified in this order. 3. Green must file his amended complaint on the court's non-prisoner complaint form, which the court will send him with this order.

4. The amended complaint will act as a complete substitute for the complaint. This case will proceed on only the allegations made and claims presented in the amended complaint, and against only the defendants specifically named in the amended complaint's caption. 5. If Green fails to comply with this order, I may dismiss this case. 6. Green must inform the court of any new address.

If he fails to do this and defendant or the court cannot locate him, this case may be dismissed. 7. The clerk is directed to send Green copies of this order and the court's non-prisoner complaint form. Entered December 17, 2025. BY THE COURT: /s/

\_\_\_\_\_  
JAMES D. PETERSON District Judge