

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF
WISCONSIN

Ontario D. Fondren v. Christopher Stevens, James Kent, Tonia Doris
Rozmarynoski, and Dominic Strack

Fondren · No. 25-CV-1942 · Decided March 27, 2026

SUMMARY

In this screening order, the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Wisconsin permits Ontario D. Fondren to proceed on Eighth Amendment excessive-force claims against Captain Tonia Doris Rozmarynoski and Officer Dominic Strack. The court drops the unrelated due-process claim concerning protective confinement and terminates Warden Christopher Stevens and Security Director James Kent as defendants.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the Eastern District of Wisconsin
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Byron B. Conway
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the Eastern District of Wisconsin
DECIDED	March 27, 2026
DOCKET	25-CV-1942
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	Prisoner civil-rights action under 42 U.S.C. § 1983 screened under 28 U.S.C. § 1915A after the plaintiff filed an amended complaint.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	The court screened the prisoner complaint under 28 U.S.C. § 1915A and evaluated whether it complied with the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure and stated plausible claims for relief under the Rule 8 pleading standard.
PARTIES	Ontario D. Fondren v. Christopher Stevens, James Kent, Tonia Doris Rozmarynoski, Dominic Strack

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

- Whether the amended complaint plausibly stated an Eighth Amendment excessive-force claim against Captain Tonia Doris Rozmarynoski and Officer Dominic Strack.
- Whether Fondren's due-process claim concerning his placement in protective confinement was properly joined with the excessive-force claims.

3. Whether Warden Christopher Stevens and Security Director James Kent should remain defendants when the amended complaint did not state claims against them related to the May 2025 incident.

HOLDINGS

1. The allegations plausibly stated an Eighth Amendment excessive-force claim against Captain Rozmarynoski and Officer Strack, so the claim may proceed.

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Fondren, an incarcerated Wisconsin prisoner, was placed in protective confinement in restrictive housing for 277 consecutive days after being removed from observation status and interviewed regarding protective placement. He alleged that in May 2025, while restrained in a hearing room after learning of his brother's death, Rozmarynoski, Strack, and another officer forcibly removed his smock, bent his fingers and wrist, grabbed his neck and face, bent him backward, and applied a spit mask despite his allegedly nonthreatening and nondisruptive behavior. Fondren alleged continuing tingling and numbness in his left hand and arm from the incident.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

The court previously dismissed the original complaint for violating Federal Rules of Civil Procedure 18 and 20 but allowed Fondren to file an amended complaint containing only related claims and defendants. On screening the amended complaint, the court allowed an Eighth Amendment excessive-force claim to proceed against Rozmarynoski and Strack, dropped the unrelated due-process claim concerning protective confinement under Rule 21, and terminated Stevens and Kent as defendants.