

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF MARYLAND

William Ferandes v. Warden Weber et al.

Ferandes · No. BAH-24-2011 · Decided March 24, 2026

SUMMARY

This memorandum opinion addresses motions to dismiss and motions for summary judgment in William Ferandes’s 42 U.S.C. § 1983 action alleging constitutionally inadequate medical care while incarcerated in Maryland. The court evaluates claims concerning delayed treatment for a dislocated finger and related medical care under the Eighth Amendment’s deliberate-indifference standard. The opinion states that YesCare’s motion will be denied and that the other pending defendants’ motions will be granted.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the District of Maryland
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Brendan A. Hurson
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the District of Maryland
DECIDED	March 24, 2026
DOCKET	BAH-24-2011
DISPOSITION	other
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	Prisoner civil-rights action under 42 U.S.C. § 1983 alleging constitutionally inadequate medical care in violation of the Eighth Amendment. Defendants filed motions to dismiss under Rule 12(b)(6) and motions to dismiss or, alternatively, for summary judgment under Rules 12(d) and 56.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	For Rule 12(b)(6) motions, the court accepted well-pleaded factual allegations as true and drew reasonable inferences in the plaintiff's favor, liberally construing the pro se pleading. For motions converted to summary judgment under Rule 12(d), the court granted relief only when there was no genuine dispute of material fact and the movant was entitled to judgment as a matter of law, viewing the evidence in the light most favorable to the nonmovant.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	unpublished district-court memorandum opinion; persuasive authority only

PARTIES

William Ferandes v. Warden Weber, Assistant Warden Butler, Maryland Division of Correction, Janette Clark, NP, Tammy Buser, RN, Cynthia O. Taferi, RN, Labib H. Syed, MD, Evans Budu, RN, Sandra Shank, RN, Kimberly Fazenbaker, RN, Queen Ehigiator, RN, Elizabeth Talley, RN, YesCare Corp., Centurion of Maryland, LLC

TOPICS

section 1983 prisoners rights cruel and unusual punishment summary judgment motions to dismiss

PRACTICE AREAS

civil rights prisoner medical care constitutional torts civil procedure government immunity

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether Ferandes stated an Eighth Amendment deliberate-indifference claim against individual nurses, a nurse practitioner, a radiologist, prison officials, and the Maryland Division of Correction.
2. Whether the undisputed evidence entitled individual medical defendants and Centurion of Maryland, LLC to summary judgment.
3. Whether YesCare was entitled to summary judgment on Ferandes's claim that a policy or custom caused constitutionally inadequate medical care.
4. Whether the State Defendants were immune from suit in their official capacities under the Eleventh Amendment and whether the Maryland Division of Correction was a person subject to suit under 42 U.S.C. § 1983.
5. Whether the claims against the unserved defendants were sufficient to state an Eighth Amendment medical-care claim.

HOLDINGS

1. An incarcerated plaintiff asserting inadequate medical care must show an objectively serious medical need and that prison officials subjectively knew of and disregarded a substantial risk of harm by failing to provide or ensure necessary care.
2. The claims against these individual medical defendants failed because the record showed, at most, isolated errors, disagreements over treatment, or delays outside the defendants' personal control, rather than deliberate indifference.
3. YesCare was not entitled to summary judgment because disputed evidence could support a finding that a policy or custom, or the absence of a reliable scheduling system, caused repeated delays in necessary medical care. Centurion was entitled to summary judgment because it did not become the medical contractor until after the events alleged.
4. The Maryland Division of Correction and Warden Weber and Assistant Warden Butler in their official capacities were immune from damages claims in federal court under the Eleventh Amendment, and the Division of Correction was not a person subject to suit under § 1983.

5. The claims against Weber and Butler in their individual capacities, and against the unserved defendants Taferi, Budu, and Syed, failed because the complaint did not establish their subjective knowledge and deliberate indifference to a serious medical need.

KEY QUOTATIONS

“Deliberate indifference to a serious medical need requires proof that, objectively, the prisoner plaintiff was suffering from a serious medical need and that, subjectively, the prison staff were aware of the need for medical attention but failed to either provide it or ensure it was available” (at 12)

“Viewed in the light most favorable to Ferandes, and considering both the repeated failures to schedule care he needed together with the apparent lack of a consistent and reliable scheduling system, it remains factually unsettled whether YesCare engaged in a policy or custom of failing to ensure patients, like Ferandes, received necessary care or were met with deliberate indifference to their serious medical conditions.” (at 26)

“The amended complaint is dismissed as to the remaining unserved defendants for failure to state a claim.” (at 30)

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Ferandes, an incarcerated person, injured his finger in June 2022 and received initial treatment, an x-ray, and buddy taping, but experienced delays in follow-up care. The injury remained dislocated and painful until he obtained orthopedic treatment and surgery in August 2023, followed by additional physical therapy. He alleged that individual medical providers, prison officials, and private health-care contractors were deliberately indifferent to his serious medical needs and that YesCare maintained a custom or policy of delaying or denying care.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Ferandes filed the action on July 10, 2024, and later filed an amended complaint naming prison officials, medical providers, and private prison-health-care companies. The court considered the pending motions without a hearing. It granted the motions of all defendants except YesCare, whose motion for summary judgment was denied because a factual dispute remained concerning whether a policy or custom caused repeated failures to schedule necessary medical care.

DISPOSITION

other

CASES CITED

- Secretary of State for Defence v. Trimble Navigation Ltd., 484 F.3d 700, 705 (4th Cir. 2007)
- E. I. du Pont de Nemours & Co. v. Kolon Industries, Inc., 637 F.3d 435, 440 (4th Cir. 2011)
- Erickson v. Pardus, 551 U.S. 89, 94 (2007)
- Anderson v. Liberty Lobby, Inc., 477 U.S. 242, 247-48 (1986)
- Bouchat v. Baltimore Ravens Football Club, Inc., 346 F.3d 514, 522, 526 (4th Cir. 2003)

- *Dennis v. Columbia Colleton Medical Center, Inc.*, 290 F.3d 639, 645 (4th Cir. 2002)
- *Laughlin v. Metropolitan Washington Airports Authority*, 149 F.3d 253, 260-61 (4th Cir. 1998)
- *Kensington Volunteer Fire Department, Inc. v. Montgomery County*, 788 F. Supp. 2d 431, 436-37 (D. Md. 2012), *aff'd*, 684 F.3d 462 (4th Cir. 2012)
- *Farabee v. Gardella*, 131 F.4th 185, 196 (4th Cir. 2025)
- *Estelle v. Gamble*, 429 U.S. 97, 105-06 (1976)
- *Anderson v. Kingsley*, 877 F.3d 539, 543, 545 (4th Cir. 2017)
- *Farmer v. Brennan*, 511 U.S. 825, 834-37, 839-40, 842, 844, 846 (1994)
- *Heyer v. United States Bureau of Prisons*, 849 F.3d 202, 209-10 (4th Cir. 2017)
- *King v. Rubenstein*, 825 F.3d 206, 218 (4th Cir. 2016)
- *Iko v. Shreve*, 535 F.3d 225, 241 (4th Cir. 2008)
- *Hudson v. McMillian*, 503 U.S. 1, 9 (1992)
- *Jackson v. Lightsey*, 775 F.3d 170, 178 (4th Cir. 2014)
- *Scinto v. Stansberry*, 841 F.3d 219, 226, 228 (4th Cir. 2016)
- *United States v. Clawson*, 650 F.3d 530, 538 (4th Cir. 2011)
- *Bowring v. Godwin*, 551 F.2d 44, 47-48 (4th Cir. 1977)
- *Sharpe v. South Carolina Department of Corrections*, 621 F. App'x 732, 733-34 (4th Cir. 2015) (*per curiam*)
- *Formica v. Aylor*, 739 F. App'x 745, 755 (4th Cir. 2018)
- *Monell v. Department of Social Services of City of New York*, 436 U.S. 658, 690-94 (1978)
- *Board of County Commissioners of Bryan County v. Brown*, 520 U.S. 397, 403 (1997)
- *West v. Atkins*, 487 U.S. 42, 48-49 (1988)
- *Polk County v. Dodson*, 454 U.S. 312, 320 (1981)
- *Love-Lane v. Martin*, 355 F.3d 766, 782 (4th Cir. 2004)
- *Will v. Michigan Department of State Police*, 491 U.S. 58, 71 (1989)
- *Pennhurst State School & Hospital v. Halderman*, 465 U.S. 89, 100 (1984)
- *Chukwurah v. Corizon Health Care*, Civ. No. PX-22-212, 2023 WL 4268556, at *6 (D. Md. June 29, 2023), *aff'd*, No. 23-6716, 2024 WL 1405885 (4th Cir. Apr. 2, 2024)
- *Sorricks v. Manning*, Civ. No. TDC-16-0709, 2017 WL 3668755, at *9 (D. Md. Aug. 22, 2017), *aff'd*, 717 F. App'x 300 (4th Cir. 2018)
- *Moone v. Herrick*, No. 7:21CV00472, 2022 WL 4594027, at *12 n.13 (W.D. Va. Sept. 29, 2022), *aff'd*, No. 22-7244, 2023 WL 3144549 (4th Cir. Apr. 28, 2023)