

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF
WISCONSIN

Corey M. Campana v. Joan Koval, Amanda Schwensen, Danielle
Pollock, Heather Egan, Officer Burg, and John/Jane Does

Campana · No. 24-cv-730-wmc · Decided December 10, 2025

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the Western District of Wisconsin dismissed Corey Campana’s second amended civil-rights complaint without prejudice under 28 U.S.C. § 1915A(b). The court held that the alleged disciplinary actions, restrictions on hygiene items and writing materials, and brief cell confinement did not establish procedural due process, access-to-courts, or First Amendment retaliation claims. Campana was given 30 days to file another amended complaint addressing the identified defects.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the Western District of Wisconsin
WRITING FOR THE COURT	William M. Conley
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the Western District of Wisconsin
DECIDED	December 10, 2025
DOCKET	24-cv-730-wmc
DISPOSITION	dismissed
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	Screening of a pro se pretrial detainee's second amended complaint under 28 U.S.C. § 1915A.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	The court screened the complaint under 28 U.S.C. § 1915A and accepted the factual allegations as true, dismissing if the pleading failed to state a claim upon which relief may be granted.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	nonprecedential district court opinion
PARTIES	Corey M. Campana v. Joan Koval, Amanda Schwensen, Danielle Pollock, Heather Egan, Officer Burg, John/Jane Does

TOPICS

- prisoners rights
- section 1983
- procedural due process
- first amendment
- civil procedure

PRACTICE AREAS

civil rights litigation

prisoner litigation

constitutional law

federal civil procedure

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether the alleged disciplinary actions, brief cell confinement, deprivation of a pencil, and denial of shaving and fingernail-clipping privileges stated a procedural due process claim.
2. Whether the alleged deprivation of writing materials and vague reference to upcoming trial and motions deadlines stated an access-to-the-courts claim.
3. Whether the alleged false conduct reports, three-day cell confinement, and deprivation of a pencil constituted First Amendment retaliation.
4. Whether the complaint stated any claim warranting relief under 28 U.S.C. § 1915A.

HOLDINGS

1. The alleged false conduct reports and punishments did not state a procedural due process claim because the plaintiff failed to allege a cognizable property or liberty interest implicated by the challenged deprivations.
2. The complaint failed to state an access-to-the-courts claim because the plaintiff did not allege a specific actual injury resulting from the deprivation of writing materials.
3. The complaint failed to state a First Amendment retaliation claim because the alleged actions were not sufficiently serious to deter a person of ordinary firmness from continuing protected activity.

KEY QUOTATIONS

“A false disciplinary action does not by itself state a procedural due process claim.”

“Second, prisoners have a right to “meaningful” access to the courts, which includes the right to have “basic scribe materials,” such as paper and writing utensils.”

“Absent a viable claim, plaintiff’s complaint must be dismissed under 28 U.S.C. § 1915A(b).”

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Campana was a pretrial detainee at the Trempealeau County Jail in 2024. He alleged that jail officials denied him shaving and fingernail-clipping privileges, issued false conduct reports, confined him to his cell for three days, took away a pencil, and denied grievances in retaliation for his grievances and threatened litigation. He also alleged that these actions violated procedural due process, the First Amendment, and his Sixth Amendment right of access to the courts.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

The court previously dismissed Campana's amended complaint because it failed to provide sufficient factual detail and improperly joined unrelated claims and defendants under Federal Rules of Civil Procedure 8 and 20. The court allowed him to amend and identify which related claims he wished to pursue. Campana submitted a

second amended complaint focusing on alleged retaliation and due-process violations involving Koval, Schwensen, Pollock, and Egan. The court dismissed the second amended complaint without prejudice for failure to state a claim and granted 30 days to amend again.

DISPOSITION

dismissed

CASES CITED

- Ramirez v. Wisconsin, Dane Cnty., No. 20-cv-1027-wmc, 2023 WL 3309827, at *6 (W.D. Wis. Mar. 13, 2023)
- Khan v. Blanscreend, 630 F.3d 519, 527 (7th Cir. 2010)
- Ealy v. Watson, 109 F.4th 958, 964 (7th Cir. 2024)
- Smith v. Akpore, 689 F. App'x 458, 460 (7th Cir. 2017)
- Cordova v. Frank, No. 05-cv-487, 2005 WL 2206791, at *6 (W.D. Wis. Sept. 12, 2005)
- Lee v. Washington, No. 97-cv-4710, 1999 WL 759609, at *6 (N.D. Ill. Aug. 31, 1999)
- Sandin v. Conner, 515 U.S. 472, 486 (1995)
- Gentry v. Duckworth, 65 F.3d 555, 558 (7th Cir. 1995)
- Christopher v. Harbury, 536 U.S. 403, 414-15 (2002)
- Lewis v. Casey, 518 U.S. 343, 349, 353-55 (1996)
- DeBauche v. Wisconsin Dep't of Corr., No. 17-cv-454-wmc, 2021 WL 2860983, at *3 (W.D. Wis. July 8, 2021)
- Owens v. Evans, 878 F.3d 559, 565 (7th Cir. 2017)
- Marshall v. Knight, 445 F.3d 965, 969-70 (7th Cir. 2006)
- Bridges v. Gilbert, 557 F.3d 541, 546 (7th Cir. 2009)
- Maus v. Boughton, No. 22-CV-141-JDP, 2022 WL 1288445, at *3 (W.D. Wis. Apr. 29, 2022)
- Felton v. City of Chicago, 827 F.3d 632, 636 (7th Cir. 2016)