

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PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	unpublished district court merit review order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)

