

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

Michael Weis v. S. Angel, et al.

No. 3:26-cv-03177-JEH (C.D. Ill. June 15, 2026) · No. 3:26-cv-03177-JEH · Decided June 15, 2026

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the Central District of Illinois conducted a merit review under 28 U.S.C. § 1915A of Michael Weis’s § 1983 complaint alleging deliberate indifference to serious medical needs. The court allowed Eighth Amendment claims to proceed against M. West, Megan Battles, Lindsay Boehm, and Berkman Gordon, while dismissing claims against S. Angel, Arvinder Arora, and K. McMann without prejudice. The court denied Weis’s motion for a preliminary injunction seeking an MRI and a bottom-bunk permit.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the Central District of Illinois, Springfield Division
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Jonathan E. Hawley
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the Central District of Illinois, Springfield Division
DECIDED	June 15, 2026
DOCKET	3:26-cv-03177-JEH
DISPOSITION	other
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	Pro se prisoner civil-rights action under 42 U.S.C. § 1983 subjected to mandatory screening under 28 U.S.C. § 1915A, together with a motion for preliminary injunction.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	Under 28 U.S.C. § 1915A, the court accepted well-pleaded factual allegations as true and liberally construed them in the plaintiff's favor, while disregarding conclusory statements and determining whether the complaint stated a plausible claim. The court applied the Rule 12(b)(6) failure-to-state-a-claim standard. For preliminary injunctive relief, the plaintiff had to show a likelihood of success on the merits, no adequate remedy at law, and irreparable harm, after which the court would balance relative harms.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	Nonprecedential district-court order

PARTIES

Michael Weis v. S. Angel, M. West, Megan Battles, K. McMann,
Lindsay Boehm, Arvinder Arora, Berkman Gordon

TOPICS

section 1983 prisoners rights injunctions health law civil procedure

PRACTICE AREAS

prisoner civil rights constitutional law health law civil procedure injunctive relief

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether Weis stated an Eighth Amendment deliberate-indifference claim against Boehm, West, Battles, and Gordon.
2. Whether Weis stated an Eighth Amendment deliberate-indifference claim against Angel, Arora, and McMann.
3. Whether Weis was entitled to a preliminary injunction requiring prison medical staff to arrange an MRI and issue a bottom-bunk permit.

HOLDINGS

1. The complaint sufficiently stated a deliberate-indifference claim against Boehm based on her alleged handling of Weis's back pain, refusal to refer him for an MRI, and refusal to issue a bottom-bunk permit.
2. The complaint sufficiently stated a deliberate-indifference claim against West based on her alleged direction that Weis return a soft cast despite knowledge of the outside orthopedist's recommendation concerning the cast.
3. The complaint sufficiently stated a deliberate-indifference claim against Battles based on her alleged failure to schedule follow-up appointments with the outside provider after being instructed to do so.
4. The complaint sufficiently stated a deliberate-indifference claim against Gordon based on his alleged failure to provide adequate care for Weis's continuing back pain during the April 30, 2026 visit.
5. The complaint failed to state deliberate-indifference claims against Angel, Arora, and McMann, and those defendants were dismissed without prejudice under Rule 12(b)(6) and § 1915A.
6. Weis was not entitled to a preliminary injunction because he failed to show a reasonable likelihood of success on the merits.

KEY QUOTATIONS

“The official must know of and disregard an excessive risk to the inmate’s health; “the official must both be aware of facts from which the inference could be drawn that a substantial risk of serious harm exists, and he must also draw the inference.”” (Section III)

“A preliminary injunction is “an extraordinary and drastic remedy, one that should not be granted unless the movant, by a clear showing, carries the burden of persuasion.”” (Section IV)

“The purpose of a temporary restraining order and ultimately a preliminary injunction is to preserve the status quo pending a final hearing on the merits.” (Section IV)

“At best, Plaintiff’s allegations permit a reasonable inference that he disagrees with the course of treatment Defendants have offered, that Defendants chose a course of treatment different from that previously provided, or that he desired alternative treatment, none of which are sufficient to show a constitutional violation.”
(Section IV)

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Weis, incarcerated at Graham Correctional Center, alleged that he experienced persistent lower-back pain, numbness, difficulty moving between his bunk and standing positions, and two falls from his bunk. He claimed that prison medical personnel repeatedly treated him with medication, x-rays, and physical therapy while declining or delaying an MRI and a bottom-bunk permit. After a fall caused a hand fracture, he alleged that a nurse directed him to return a soft cast and that medical staff failed to arrange recommended follow-up care. He sought damages and injunctive relief requiring an MRI and bottom-bunk permit.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Weis filed a complaint alleging that medical personnel at Graham Correctional Center were deliberately indifferent to serious back and hand injuries in violation of the Eighth Amendment. He also moved for a preliminary injunction requiring an MRI and a bottom-bunk permit. On merit review, the court allowed Eighth Amendment claims to proceed against M. West, Megan Battles, Lindsay Boehm, and Berkman Gordon, dismissed claims against S. Angel, Arvinder Arora, and K. McMann without prejudice, and denied the motion for preliminary injunction.

DISPOSITION

other

CASES CITED

- Turley v. Rednour, 729 F.3d 645, 649-51 (7th Cir. 2013)
- Alexander v. United States, 721 F.3d 418, 422 (7th Cir. 2013)
- Wilson v. Ryker, 451 F. App'x 588, 589 (7th Cir. 2011)
- Ashcroft v. Iqbal, 556 U.S. 662, 678 (2009)
- Hayes v. Snyder, 546 F.3d 516, 522 (7th Cir. 2008)
- Farmer v. Brennan, 511 U.S. 825, 834, 837 (1994)
- Holloway v. Delaware County Sheriff, 700 F.3d 1063, 1073 (7th Cir. 2012)
- Lockett v. Bonson, 937 F.3d 1016, 1023 (7th Cir. 2019)
- Snipes v. DeTella, 95 F.3d 586, 591-92 (7th Cir. 1996)
- Pyles v. Fahim, 771 F.3d 403, 409, 411-12 (7th Cir. 2014)
- Sain v. Wood, 512 F.3d 886, 894-95 (7th Cir. 2008)

- *Petties v. Carter*, 836 F.3d 722, 729-30 (7th Cir. 2016), as amended (Aug. 25, 2016)
- *Mazurek v. Armstrong*, 520 U.S. 968, 972 (1997)
- *Winter v. Natural Resources Defense Council, Inc.*, 555 U.S. 7, 24 (2008)
- *Foodcomm International v. Barry*, 328 F.3d 300, 303 (7th Cir. 2003)
- *Incredible Technologies, Inc. v. Virtual Technologies, Inc.*, 400 F.3d 1007, 1011 (7th Cir. 2005)
- *Westefer v. Neal*, 682 F.3d 679, 683 (7th Cir. 2012)
- *American Hospital Association v. Harris*, 625 F.2d 1328, 1330 (7th Cir. 1980)
- *Graham v. Medical Mutual of Ohio*, 130 F.3d 293, 295 (7th Cir. 1997)
- *Jordan v. Wolke*, 593 F.2d 772, 774 (7th Cir. 1979)
- *Estelle v. Gamble*, 429 U.S. 97, 104-05 (1976)
- *Harper v. Santos*, 847 F.3d 923, 928 (7th Cir. 2017)

Retrieved from lawtools.ai · <https://lawtools.ai/cases/state/united-states-district-court-for-the-central-district-of-illinois-springfield-division-united-states/2026/michael-weis-v-s-angel-et-al-morh1j40>