

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

Geovannie Collazo v. Mindi Nurse, et al.

Collazo · No. 25-1344 · Decided January 16, 2026

SUMMARY

The court conducted a merit review under 28 U.S.C. § 1915A of Geovannie Collazo’s pro se civil rights complaint arising from an alleged inmate attack and denial of medical treatment. The court allowed Eighth Amendment failure-to-protect and deliberate-indifference claims to proceed against several defendants in their individual capacities, dismissed the inmate assailant as a defendant, and directed service.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the Central District of Illinois, Peoria Division
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Sue E. Myerscough
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the Central District of Illinois, Peoria Division
DECIDED	January 16, 2026
DOCKET	25-1344
DISPOSITION	other
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	Merit-review screening of an incarcerated plaintiff's pro se complaint under 28 U.S.C. § 1915A.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	Under 28 U.S.C. § 1915A, the court accepted factual allegations as true and liberally construed them in the plaintiff's favor, while requiring sufficient factual allegations to state a plausible claim for relief.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	unpublished district court merit review order

TOPICS

- prisoners rights
- section 1983
- civil rights
- service of process
- civil procedure

PRACTICE AREAS

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether the complaint stated an Eighth Amendment failure-to-protect claim against Tyese and Williams.
2. Whether the complaint stated Eighth Amendment deliberate-indifference claims concerning a serious medical need against Tyese, Williams, Nurse, Doolin, and Norton.
3. Whether the inmate who allegedly attacked Collazo could be sued under 42 U.S.C. § 1983.

HOLDINGS

1. The complaint stated Eighth Amendment failure-to-protect claims against Tyese and Williams in their individual capacities.
2. The complaint stated Eighth Amendment deliberate-indifference claims concerning a serious medical need against Tyese, Williams, Nurse, Doolin, and Norton in their individual capacities.
3. The complaint did not state a § 1983 claim against the inmate who allegedly assaulted Collazo because § 1983 provides a remedy only against state officials.

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Collazo alleged that Tyese and Williams facilitated an attack by another inmate despite knowing of prior threats and that the attack occurred while he was restrained to a chair during a family video visit. He further alleged that Tyese, Williams, Nurse, Doolin, and Norton denied him medical treatment for injuries resulting from the attack. The court treated these allegations as sufficient to state failure-to-protect and deliberate-indifference claims against the identified prison officials.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Collazo was granted leave to proceed in forma pauperis and submitted a prisoner civil-rights complaint under 42 U.S.C. § 1983. On merit review, the court allowed Eighth Amendment failure-to-protect claims against Tyese and Williams and deliberate-indifference-to-medical-needs claims against Tyese, Williams, Nurse, Doolin, and Norton to proceed in their individual capacities. The court dismissed inmate defendant Hernandez and directed service on the remaining defendants.

DISPOSITION

other

CASES CITED

- Turley v. Rednour, 729 F.3d 645, 649 (7th Cir. 2013)
- Alexander v. U.S., 721 F.3d 418, 422 (7th Cir. 2013)
- Gevas v. McLaughlin, 798 F.3d 475, 480-81 (7th Cir. 2015)
- Petties v. Carter, 836 F.3d 722, 729-30 (7th Cir. 2016) (en banc)

OPINION

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT CENTRAL DISTRICT OF ILLINOIS PEORIA
DIVISION GEOVANNIE COLLAZO,)) Plaintiff,)) v.) 25-1344) MINDI NURSE, et al.))
Defendants.) MERIT REVIEW ORDER Plaintiff, proceeding pro se and presently incarcerated at
Pontiac Correctional Center, was granted leave to proceed in forma pauperis.

The case is now before the Court for a merit review of Plaintiff's claims. The Court must "screen" Plaintiff's complaint, and through such process to identify and dismiss any legally insufficient claim, or the entire action if warranted. 28 U.S.C. § 1915A. A claim is legally insufficient if it "(1) is frivolous, malicious, or fails to state a claim upon which relief may be granted; or (2) seeks monetary relief from a defendant who is immune from such relief." *Id.* 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—the facts alleged must "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). Plaintiff alleges that Defendant Tyese and Williams facilitated an attack from another inmate despite knowing about previous threats this individual had made towards Plaintiff and in retaliation for a previous incident in which Plaintiff says he was forced to defend himself from excessive force.

Plaintiff alleges that the other inmate attacked him while he was restrained to a chair during a video visit with his family. Plaintiff alleges he was the only inmate restrained in that area of the prison. Plaintiff alleges that Defendants Tyese, Williams, Nurse, Doolin, and Norton thereafter denied medical treatment for his injuries. Plaintiff states Eighth Amendment claims for failure to protect against Defendants Tyese and Williams and for deliberate indifference to a serious medical need against Defendants Tyese, Williams, Nurse, Doolin, and Norton in each defendant's individual capacity.

Gevas v. McLaughlin, 798 F.3d 475, 480-81 (7th Cir. 2015); *Petties v. Carter*, 836 F.3d 722, 729-30 (7th Cir. 2016) (en banc). Plaintiff does not state a claim against the inmate who assaulted him. Section 1983 provides a remedy only against state officials.

The Court will therefore dismiss Defendant Hernandez. IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED: 1. Pursuant to its merit review of the Complaint under 28 U.S.C. § 1915A, the court finds that the plaintiff states Eighth Amendment claims for failure to protect against Defendants Tyese and Williams and for deliberate indifference to a serious medical need against Defendants Tyese, Williams, Nurse, Doolin, and Norton in each defendant's individual capacity.

Any additional claims shall not be included in the case, except at the court's discretion on motion by a party for good cause shown or pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 15. 2. This case is now in the process of service.

The plaintiff is advised to wait until counsel has appeared for the defendants before filing any motions, in order to give notice to the defendants and an opportunity to respond to those motions. Motions filed before defendants' counsel has filed an appearance will generally be denied as premature.

The plaintiff need not submit any evidence to the court at this time, unless otherwise directed by the court. 3. The court will attempt service on the defendants by mailing each defendant a waiver of service. The defendants have 60 days from the date the waiver is sent to file an answer. If the defendants have not filed answers or appeared through counsel within 90 days of the entry of this order, the plaintiff may file a motion requesting the status of service.

After the defendants have been served, the court will enter an order setting discovery and dispositive motion deadlines. 4. With respect to a defendant who no longer works at the address provided by the plaintiff, the entity for whom that defendant worked while at that address shall provide to the clerk said defendant's current work address, or, if not known, said defendant's forwarding address.

This information shall be used only for effectuating service. Documentation of forwarding addresses shall be retained only by the clerk and shall not be maintained in the public docket nor disclosed by the clerk. 5.

The defendants shall file an answer within 60 days of the date the waiver is sent by the clerk. A motion to dismiss is not an answer. The answer should include all defenses appropriate under the Federal Rules. The answer and subsequent pleadings shall be to the issues and claims stated in this opinion.

In general, an answer sets forth the defendants' positions. The court does not rule on the merits of those positions unless and until a motion is filed by the defendants. Therefore, no response to the answer is necessary or will be considered. 6. This district uses electronic filing, which means that, after defense counsel has filed an appearance, defense counsel will automatically receive electronic notice of any motion or other paper filed by the plaintiff with the clerk.

The plaintiff does not need to mail to defense counsel copies of motions and other papers that the plaintiff has filed with the clerk. However, this does not apply to discovery requests and responses. Discovery requests and responses are not filed with the clerk.

The plaintiff must mail his discovery requests and responses directly to defendants' counsel. Discovery requests or responses sent to the clerk will be returned unfiled, unless they are attached to and the subject of a motion to compel. Discovery does not begin until defense counsel has filed an appearance and the court has entered a scheduling order, which will explain the discovery process in more detail.

7. Counsel for the defendants is hereby granted leave to depose the plaintiff at his place of confinement. Counsel for the defendants shall arrange the time for the deposition. 8. The plaintiff shall immediately notify the court, in writing, of any change in his mailing address and telephone number.

The plaintiff's failure to notify the court of a change in mailing address or phone number will result in dismissal of this lawsuit, with prejudice. 9. If a defendant fails to sign and return a waiver of service to the clerk within 30 days after the waiver is sent, the court will take appropriate steps to effect formal service through the U.S. Marshals service on that defendant and will require that defendant to pay the full costs of formal service pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 4(d)(2).

10. The clerk is directed to enter the standard qualified protective order pursuant to the Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act. 11. The clerk is directed to terminate Jesus Hernandez as a defendant. 12.

The clerk is directed to attempt service on Defendants Tyese, Williams, Nurse, Doolin, and Norton pursuant to the standard procedures. ENTERED: 1/16/2026 FOR THE COURT: s/Sue E. Myerscough SUE E. MYERSCOUGH UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE