

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE CENTRAL DISTRICT OF
ILLINOIS, ROCK ISLAND DIVISION

Jerry A. Reynolds and Steven Loupe v. Schuyler County State's
Attorney and Schuyler County Courthouse, et al.

Reynolds · No. 25-4162 · Decided March 13, 2026

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the Central District of Illinois dismissed a pro se civil rights action brought by Jerry A. Reynolds and Steven Loupe concerning an allegedly unauthorized divorce proceeding. The court denied leave to proceed in forma pauperis, found the claims deficient because the defendants were not proper § 1983 defendants and the claims were time-barred, and concluded that amendment would be futile. The court also denied motions concerning return of personal property, alleged retaliation, and additional time.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the Central District of Illinois, Rock Island Division
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Sara Darrow
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the Central District of Illinois, Rock Island Division
DECIDED	March 13, 2026
DOCKET	25-4162
DISPOSITION	dismissed
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	At merit review of a pro se civil-rights complaint filed by institutionalized civil detainees, the court denied leave to proceed in forma pauperis, denied related motions, and dismissed the complaint under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 12(b)(6) and 28 U.S.C. § 1915A.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	On in forma pauperis and merit review, the court accepted factual allegations as true and liberally construed them in plaintiffs' favor, but required sufficient nonconclusory facts to state a plausible claim for relief. The court dismissed under 28 U.S.C. § 1915A and Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 12(b)(6).

PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	unpublished district court order
PARTIES	Jerry A. Reynolds, Steven Loupe v. Schuyler County State's Attorney, Schuyler County Courthouse, et al.

TOPICS

section 1983 motions to dismiss statute of limitations injunctions civil procedure

PRACTICE AREAS

civil rights constitutional law civil procedure prisoner and detainee litigation

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether plaintiffs' complaint stated a plausible federal claim under 42 U.S.C. § 1983 against the Schuyler County State's Attorney's Office and Schuyler County Courthouse.
2. Whether claims arising from the alleged fraudulent divorce proceedings were barred by prosecutorial immunity.
3. Whether the Schuyler County Courthouse was a suable person under 42 U.S.C. § 1983.
4. Whether plaintiffs' claims were barred by the applicable Illinois statute of limitations.
5. Whether plaintiffs' unrelated motions for return of property, retaliation relief, and additional time should be granted.

HOLDINGS

1. The complaint failed to state a claim because plaintiffs did not allege how the State's Attorney's Office was involved in the allegedly fraudulent divorce proceedings, and any prosecutor acting in a prosecutorial capacity would be absolutely immune from damages liability.
2. The Schuyler County Courthouse was not a person amenable to suit under 42 U.S.C. § 1983.
3. Plaintiffs' claims were time-barred because they waited more than four years to file suit, while Illinois applies a two-year limitations period to § 1983 actions, subject to applicable tolling.
4. Leave to amend was properly denied because any amendment plaintiffs could make would be futile.
5. The motions seeking return of personal property and retaliation relief were denied because the requested matters were unrelated to the claims in the complaint; the motion for additional time was denied as moot after dismissal.

KEY QUOTATIONS

“The Court finds that Plaintiffs fail to state a claim.”

“Any amendment to the Complaint would be futile.”

“The privilege to proceed without posting security for costs and fees is reserved to the many truly impoverished litigants who, within the District Court's sound discretion, would remain without legal remedy if

such privilege were not afforded to them.”

“There must be a relationship between the injury claimed in the motion for injunctive relief and the conduct asserted in the underlying complaint.”

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Plaintiffs were married civil detainees at the Rushville Treatment and Detention Facility. They alleged that another resident filed a petition for dissolution of marriage on their behalf without their knowledge in 2021. The state court granted the petition on July 6, 2021, after a hearing at which Reynolds appeared by Zoom. Plaintiffs later sued the Schuyler County State's Attorney's Office and Schuyler County Courthouse, and filed motions concerning personal property, retaliation, and additional time.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Plaintiffs alleged that another resident filed a state-court petition for dissolution of their marriage without their knowledge and sued the Schuyler County State's Attorney's Office and Schuyler County Courthouse under 42 U.S.C. § 1983. The federal district court screened the complaint, concluded that the claims were barred by immunity, lack of a suable person, and the statute of limitations, and found that amendment would be futile. The court also denied motions concerning return of property, retaliation, and additional time for discovery and related tasks, and directed entry of judgment.

DISPOSITION

dismissed

CASES CITED

- Brewster v. North American Van Lines, Inc., 461 F.2d 649, 651 (7th Cir. 1972)
- Turley v. Rednour, 729 F.3d 645, 649 (7th Cir. 2013)
- Alexander v. United States, 721 F.3d 418, 422 (7th Cir. 2013)
- Archer v. Chisholm, 870 F.3d 603, 612 (7th Cir. 2017)
- Monell v. Department of Social Services of City of New York, 436 U.S. 658 (1978)
- Powell v. Cook County Jail, 814 F. Supp. 757, 758 (N.D. Ill. 1993)
- Turley v. Rednour, 729 F.3d 645, 651 (7th Cir. 2014)
- Liberty v. City of Chicago, 860 F.3d 1017, 1019 (7th Cir. 2017)
- Foodcomm International v. Barry, 328 F.3d 300, 303 (7th Cir. 2003)
- Pacific Radiation Oncology, LLC v. Queen's Medical Center, 810 F.3d 631, 636 (9th Cir. 2015)

OPINION

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT CENTRAL DISTRICT OF ILLINOIS ROCK ISLAND
DIVISION JERRY A. REYNOLDS AND STEVEN) LOUPE,)) Plaintiffs,)) 25-4162 v.))
SCHUYLER COUNTY STATE’S) ATTORNEY AND SCHUYLER COUNTY)

COURTHOUSE, et al.)) Defendants.) MERIT REVIEW ORDER Plaintiffs, proceeding pro se, both civil detainees at the Rushville Treatment and Detention Facility (“TDF” or “Rushville”) are requesting leave to proceed under a reduced payment procedure for indigent plaintiffs who are institutionalized but are not prisoners as defined in 28 U.S.C. Section 1915(h).

The “privilege to proceed without posting security for costs and fees is reserved to the many truly impoverished litigants who, within the District Court’s sound discretion, would remain without legal remedy if such privilege were not afforded to them.” *Brewster v. North Am. Van Lines, Inc.*, 461 F.2d 649, 651 (7th Cir. 1972). A court must dismiss cases proceeding in forma pauperis “at any time” if the action is frivolous, malicious, fails to state a claim, or seeks monetary relief against a defendant who is immune from such relief, even if part of the filing fee has been paid.

28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B). This Court grants leave to proceed in forma pauperis only if the complaint states a federal action. In reviewing the complaint, the Court accepts the factual allegations as true, liberally construing them in the plaintiff’s favor. *Turley v. Rednour*, 729 F.3d 645, 649 (7th Cir. 2013). Conclusory statements and labels are insufficient.

Enough facts must be provided to “state a claim for relief that is plausible on its face.” *Alexander v. U.S.*, 721 F.3d 418, 422 (7th Cir. 2013) (citation omitted). Plaintiffs allege that they are married. They allege that another TDF resident filed in 2021 a petition for dissolution of marriage in state court on their behalf without their knowledge. According to exhibits provided, the state court granted the petition on July 6, 2021, after a hearing in which Plaintiff Reynolds appeared via Zoom.

Plaintiffs sued the Schuyler County State’s Attorney’s Office and Schuyler County Courthouse. Plaintiffs do not allege how the State’s Attorney’s Office was involved in their allegedly fraudulent divorce proceedings. Any prosecutor employed by that office would have absolute immunity for any actions taken in his or her capacity as a prosecutor, and Plaintiffs do not allege that any deprivation they suffered resulted from a county policy.

Archer v. Chisholm, 870 F.3d 603, 612 (7th Cir. 2017); *Monell v. Dep’t of Social Svcs. of City of New York*, 436 U.S. 658 (1978). The Schuyler County Courthouse is not a “person” amenable to suit under 42 U.S.C. § 1983. See *Powell v. Cook County Jail*, 814 F. Supp. 757, 758 (N.D. Ill. 1993) (holding the Cook County Jail was not a person under Section 1983). Plaintiffs’ claims are also time-barred because they waited more than four years to file this lawsuit.

Turley v. Rednour, 729 F.3d 645, 651 (7th Cir. 2014) (“Section 1983 suits in Illinois have a two-year statute of limitations, which is tolled while the prisoner exhausts the administrative grievance process.”) (citation omitted); *Liberty v. City of Chicago*, 860 F.3d 1017, 1019 (7th Cir. 2017).

The Court finds that Plaintiffs fail to state a claim. The Court would ordinarily permit Plaintiffs an opportunity to amend their complaint, but any amendment they could make would be futile. The

Court will dismiss this case. Plaintiffs' Motion to Have All Personal Property Returned (Doc. 11) Plaintiffs seek a court order directing TDF officials to return all personal property.

Because the Court found that Plaintiffs failed to state a claim and issues related to personal property were not raised in this lawsuit, Plaintiffs' motion is denied. *Foodcomm Int'l v Barry*, 328 F.3d 300, 303 (7th Cir. 2003); *Pacific Radiation Oncology, LLC v. Queen's Medical Ctr.*, 810 F.3d 631, 636 (9th Cir. 2015) (“[T]here must be a relationship between the injury claimed in the motion for injunctive relief and the conduct asserted in the underlying complaint.”).

Plaintiffs' Motion for Retaliation (Doc. 12) Plaintiff Loupe alleges that TDF officials retaliated because she reported that another resident had sexually harassed her. These allegations are unrelated to those presented in this case, and the Court lacks authority to grant relief. Plaintiff Loupe's motion is denied. Plaintiffs' Motion (Doc. 14) Plaintiffs seek additional time to conduct discovery and complete other tasks associated with a petition to proceed in forma pauperis.

Pursuant to the ruling above, Plaintiffs' motion is denied as moot. IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED: 1) Plaintiffs' Petition for Leave to Proceed in forma pauperis [10] is DENIED. 2) Plaintiffs' Motions [11][12][14] are DENIED. 3) Plaintiffs' complaint is dismissed for failure to state a claim pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 12(b)(6) and 28 U.S.C. § 1915A. Any amendment to the Complaint would be futile.

This case is therefore terminated. All pending motions are denied as moot. The clerk is directed to enter a judgment pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 58. 4) If Plaintiff wishes to appeal this dismissal, he must file a notice of appeal with this Court within 30 days of the entry of judgment. Fed. R. App. P. 4(a). A motion for leave to appeal in forma pauperis should set forth the issues Plaintiff plans to present on appeal.

See Fed. R. App. P. 24(a)(1)(C). If Plaintiff does choose to appeal, he will be liable for the \$605.00 appellate filing fee irrespective of the outcome of the appeal. Entered this 13th day of March, 2026. s/Sara Darrow SARA DARROW UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE