

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF
ILLINOIS

Ray Riley v. Anthony Wills, Tonya Kenner, and Joe Loera

Riley · No. 24-cv-02624-SMY · Decided May 13, 2026

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the Southern District of Illinois conducted preliminary screening of Ray Riley’s Second Amended Complaint under 28 U.S.C. § 1915A. The court allowed an Eighth Amendment failure-to-protect claim to proceed against Joe Loera in his individual capacity, while dismissing without prejudice the claims concerning prison conditions and disciplinary proceedings and terminating the other named defendants.

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	May 13, 2026
DOCKET	24-cv-02624-SMY
DISPOSITION	other
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	Preliminary screening of a prisoner’s Second Amended Complaint under 28 U.S.C. § 1915A in a civil-rights action brought under 42 U.S.C. § 1983.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	Under 28 U.S.C. § 1915A, the court must dismiss any portion of a prisoner complaint that is frivolous, malicious, fails to state a claim, or seeks monetary relief from an immune defendant. For failure-to-state-a-claim purposes, the court applied the pleading standard under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 8(a)(2) and Bell Atlantic Corp. v. Twombly.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	nonprecedential district-court memorandum and order
PARTIES	Ray Riley v. Anthony Wills, Tonya Kenner, Joe Loera

TOPICS

- section 1983
- prisoners rights
- cruel and unusual punishment
- procedural due process
- civil procedure

PRACTICE AREAS

civil rights

prisoner litigation

constitutional law

civil procedure

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether Riley stated an Eighth Amendment failure-to-protect claim against Officer Loera.
2. Whether Riley stated an Eighth Amendment conditions-of-confinement claim against the defendants.
3. Whether Riley stated a Fourteenth Amendment due-process claim based on 14 days of disciplinary segregation.
4. Whether claims against individuals not named as defendants in the caption, and against Anthony Wills, who was not alleged to have committed misconduct, could proceed.

HOLDINGS

1. Riley stated a viable Eighth Amendment failure-to-protect claim against Officer Loera because he alleged that he identified a specific and impending threat, Loera disregarded the warnings, and the assault occurred moments later.
2. Riley failed to state a conditions-of-confinement claim because the alleged responsible officers were unidentified and were not named as defendants in the Second Amended Complaint.
3. Riley failed to state a Fourteenth Amendment due-process claim based on 14 days in segregation because he did not allege a protected liberty interest or identify the process he was denied.
4. Claims against individuals not identified as defendants in the caption were dismissed without prejudice, and Anthony Wills was dismissed because the complaint alleged no wrongdoing by him.

KEY QUOTATIONS

“The Eighth Amendment imposes a duty on prison officials to take reasonable steps to protect inmates from violence at the hands of other inmates.”

“Plaintiff’s punishment with 14 days in segregation does not rise to the level of an “atypical” or “significant” hardship, as described.”

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Riley, an Illinois prisoner, alleged that while being escorted at Menard Correctional Center on May 31, 2024, he twice warned Officer Joe Loera that another inmate planned to attack him, but Loera disregarded the warnings. Shortly afterward, the inmate threw urine and feces on Riley while Riley was handcuffed. Riley also alleged that he was placed in a filthy, poorly ventilated cell and later received 14 days in segregation after a disciplinary proceeding concerning the incident.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Riley filed a Second Amended Complaint alleging that prison officials failed to protect him from an inmate assault, subjected him to unconstitutional conditions of confinement, and deprived him of due process through disciplinary punishment. On preliminary review, the court allowed the failure-to-protect claim against Joe Loera

to proceed, while dismissing the remaining claims and defendants without prejudice. The court directed service of the complaint on Loera and terminated Wills and Kenner as parties.

DISPOSITION

other

CASES CITED

- Bell Atlantic Corp. v. Twombly, 550 U.S. 544, 570 (2007)
- Myles v. United States, 416 F.3d 551, 551-52 (7th Cir. 2005)
- Collins v. Kibort, 143 F.3d 331, 334 (7th Cir. 1998)
- Farmer v. Brennan, 511 U.S. 825, 832-33, 837 (1994)
- Pinkston v. Madry, 440 F.3d 879, 889 (7th Cir. 2006)
- Pope v. Shafer, 86 F.3d 90, 92 (7th Cir. 1996)
- Knight v. Wiseman, 590 F.3d 458, 463 (7th Cir. 2010)
- Lisle v. Welborn, 933 F.3d 705, 720 (7th Cir. 2019)
- Ealy v. Watson, 109 F.4th 958, 964 (7th Cir. 2024)
- Croom v. Schoenbeck, 2025 WL 957898, at *1 (7th Cir. Mar. 31, 2025)
- Sandin v. Conner, 515 U.S. 472, 484 (1995)