

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF
ILLINOIS

**Shawn Randall v. C/O Robert Gearhart, Lt. Dallas, Sgt. Woodley,
Jacob Guetersloh, Kevin Reichert, Sandy Walker, Anthony Wills,
Anthony B. Jones, Angela Locke, C/O Chandler, C/O Heins, C/O
Baker, C/O Choate, C/O Farrar, C/O Bent, Ms. Salger, Ms. Phillips,
C/O Falaster, C/O McClanahan**

Randall · No. 25-cv-1130-RJD · Decided January 14, 2026

SUMMARY

The court conducts preliminary screening of Shawn Randall’s amended 42 U.S.C. § 1983 complaint concerning prison disciplinary proceedings, segregation conditions, and mental-health care. The court dismisses the due process and retaliation-related claims without prejudice, allows an Eighth Amendment yard-access claim to proceed against Anthony Wills and McClanahan, and allows a deliberate-indifference-to-mental-health-needs claim to proceed against Salger and Phillips. All other claims and defendants are dismissed without prejudice.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the Southern District of Illinois
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Reona J. Daly
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the Southern District of Illinois
DECIDED	January 14, 2026
DOCKET	25-cv-1130-RJD
DISPOSITION	other
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	Preliminary screening of a prisoner’s amended complaint under 28 U.S.C. § 1915A.
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 damages from an immune defendant. The court applied the Rule 12(b)(6)-type plausibility standard, accepting well-pleaded allegations as true and assessing whether the complaint stated a plausible claim for relief.

PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	nonprecedential district court memorandum and order
PARTIES	Shawn Randall v. C/O Robert Gearhart, Lt. Dallas, Sgt. Woodley, Jacob Guetersloh, Kevin Reichert, Sandy Walker, Anthony Wills, Anthony B. Jones, Angela Locke, C/O Chandler, C/O Heins, C/O Baker, C/O Choate, C/O Farrar, C/O Bent, Ms. Salger, Ms. Phillips, C/O Falaster, C/O McClanahan

TOPICS

[section 1983](#)
[prisoners rights](#)
[procedural due process](#)
[cruel and unusual punishment](#)
[first amendment](#)

PRACTICE AREAS

[civil rights](#)
[prisoner civil rights](#)
[constitutional law](#)
[civil procedure](#)

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether Randall stated a Fourteenth Amendment due process claim based on being charged a second time after being found not guilty on the first disciplinary ticket.
2. Whether Randall stated a due process claim based on allegedly inadequate notice of the charges and disciplinary evidence.
3. Whether Randall stated an Eighth Amendment conditions-of-confinement claim based on denial of yard or recreation while in segregation.
4. Whether Randall stated an Eighth Amendment deliberate-indifference claim based on alleged denial of mental-health care.
5. Whether Randall stated a First Amendment retaliation claim based on issuance of the second disciplinary ticket.
6. Whether Randall stated a First Amendment claim based on placement on mail-scan status.

HOLDINGS

1. Randall failed to state a due process claim merely because he was charged again for the same infraction after being found not guilty on the first ticket, because double-jeopardy principles do not apply in the prison-disciplinary context.
2. An inmate is entitled to due process only when the challenged deprivation imposes an atypical and significant hardship, and where segregation is imposed without loss of good-time credit, informal due process requires notice of the reasons for segregation and an opportunity to present the inmate's views in writing or at a hearing.
3. Randall plausibly stated an Eighth Amendment deliberate-indifference claim against Anthony Wills and McClanahan based on alleged denial of yard access while in segregation, but failed to state a claim against the correctional officers whose alleged involvement was described only in general and conclusory terms.

4. Randall stated an Eighth Amendment claim against Salger and Phillips by alleging that he had mental-health needs and that they ignored his repeated requests for mental-health care.
5. Randall failed to state a retaliation claim because he did not identify protected First Amendment activity that motivated Gearhart’s issuance of the second disciplinary ticket.
6. Randall failed to state a First Amendment claim based on placement on mail-scan status because prison mail restrictions may be imposed when reasonably related to legitimate penological interests, and he did not allege that he was prohibited from accessing his mail.

KEY QUOTATIONS

“an acquittal in an earlier prison disciplinary hearing is no bar to a subsequent hearing to consider the very same charge” (Count 1)

“Informal due process requires only that an inmate is provided (1) notice of the reasons for his placement in segregation, and (2) an opportunity to present his views in a written statement of hearing.” (Count 1)

“the legitimate governmental interest in the order and security of penal institutions justifies the imposition of certain restraints on inmate correspondence.” (Preliminary Dismissals)

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Randall, an Illinois prisoner, received two disciplinary tickets concerning drugs or drug paraphernalia allegedly found during a cell shakedown. He was found not guilty on the first ticket, but was charged again for the same alleged infraction, later found guilty, and placed in segregation for six months. While segregated, he alleged that officials denied him yard or recreation access and that mental-health personnel ignored his requests for care; he also challenged retaliation and placement on mail-scan status.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Randall filed an action under 42 U.S.C. § 1983 alleging constitutional violations arising from prison disciplinary proceedings, segregation conditions, mail restrictions, and alleged denial of mental-health care. The original complaint was dismissed without prejudice for failure to state a claim, and Randall was granted leave to amend. On screening the amended complaint, the court dismissed Count 1 and several other claims without prejudice, allowed Count 2 to proceed against Anthony Wills and McClanahan, and allowed Count 3 to proceed against Salger and Phillips; service was ordered on the surviving defendants.

DISPOSITION

other

CASES CITED

- Hawkins v. Mitchell, 756 F.3d 983, 996 (7th Cir. 2014)
- Rowe v. Shake, 196 F.3d 778, 782 (7th Cir. 1999)
- Procunier v. Martinez, 416 U.S. 396, 412-13 (1974)

- Turner v. Safley, 482 U.S. 78, 89 (1987)
- Sandin v. Conner, 515 U.S. 472, 484 (1995)
- Kervin v. Barnes, 787 F.3d 833, 836-37 (7th Cir. 2015)
- Meeks v. McBride, 81 F.3d 717, 722 (7th Cir. 1996)
- Sain v. Wood, 512 F.3d 886, 894 (7th Cir. 2008)
- Giles v. Godinez, 914 F.3d 1040, 1049 (7th Cir. 2019)
- Ealy Watson, 109 F.4th 958, 965-66 (7th Cir. 2024)
- Bell Atlantic Corp. v. Twombly, 550 U.S. 544, 570 (2007)

Retrieved from lawtools.ai · <https://lawtools.ai/cases/state/united-states-district-court-for-the-southern-district-of-illinois-united-states-district-court-for/2026/shawn-randall-v-c-o-robert-gearhart-lt-dallas-sgt-woodley-oinsudjf>