

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF
ILLINOIS

Joshua M. Mohring v. Latoya Hughes, Wexford Health Sources, Inc.,
Christine Vinyard, Dr. Caldwell, Dr. Percy Meyers, Warden Daniel
Monti, John Doe, Jane Doe, Dr. Arora, Jana Rueter, and Dr. Khan

Mohring · No. 25-cv-1859-NJR · Decided December 10, 2025

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the Southern District of Illinois conducted preliminary screening under 28 U.S.C. § 1915A of Joshua M. Mohring’s amended § 1983 complaint concerning medical care and the denial of disability-related housing permits. The court dismissed the claim against Warden Daniel Monti without prejudice but allowed claims concerning deliberate indifference, ADA violations, and allegedly unconstitutional policies to proceed against specified defendants. The court also directed service and discovery procedures for identifying unknown nurses.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the Southern District of Illinois
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Nancy J. Rosenstengel, Chief District Judge
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the Southern District of Illinois
DECIDED	December 10, 2025
DOCKET	25-cv-1859-NJR
DISPOSITION	other
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	Prisoner civil-rights action under 42 U.S.C. § 1983 and the Americans with Disabilities Act. The court conducted preliminary screening of the amended complaint under 28 U.S.C. § 1915A.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	Preliminary screening under 28 U.S.C. § 1915A; allegations are assessed under the plausibility standard for failure to state a claim.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	unpublished

TOPICS

- section 1983
- prisoners rights
- ada / disability
- civil rights
- civil procedure

PRACTICE AREAS

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether the amended complaint stated an Eighth Amendment deliberate-indifference claim against the intake nurses and Christine Vinyard for refusing to honor Mohring's ADA permits.
2. Whether the amended complaint stated an ADA claim against IDOC officials for refusing to honor Mohring's valid permits.
3. Whether the amended complaint stated an Eighth Amendment claim against Wexford based on alleged policies or practices causing delayed medical care and refusal to honor ADA permits.
4. Whether the amended complaint stated deliberate-indifference claims against the treating medical providers for allegedly delaying or denying care after Mohring's fall.
5. Whether Mohring stated an individual-capacity claim against Warden Daniel Monti based only on conclusory allegations that he allowed an unconstitutional policy to develop.

HOLDINGS

1. The amended complaint failed to state a claim against Warden Daniel Monti in his individual capacity because it alleged no facts showing that he knew of, facilitated, approved, condoned, or deliberately ignored the challenged conduct, and its allegation that he allowed the policy to develop was conclusory.
2. The amended complaint stated a viable Eighth Amendment deliberate-indifference claim against John Doe Nurse #1, Jane Doe Nurse #1, and Christine Vinyard.
3. The amended complaint stated a viable ADA claim based on refusal to honor Mohring's valid permits, but the claim could proceed only against Latoya Hughes in her official capacity, not against individual IDOC employees.
4. The amended complaint stated a viable Eighth Amendment claim against Wexford Health Sources, Inc. based on alleged policies or practices that caused delayed medical care and refusal to honor ADA permits after transfer.
5. The amended complaint stated viable Eighth Amendment deliberate-indifference claims against Dr. Caldwell, Dr. Percy Meyers, Dr. Khan, Dr. Arora, and Nurse Jana Rueter for allegedly denying or delaying appropriate treatment after Mohring's fall.

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Mohring, an Illinois prisoner with a spinal-cord injury and prior right-knee injuries, had repeatedly received low-bunk and low-gallery ADA permits. After transferring to Centralia Correctional Center, intake nurses allegedly refused to honor his prior permit pursuant to a facility practice, and he was assigned to an upper bunk. Following a seizure and fall from that bunk, he alleged continuing shoulder and knee injuries, delayed testing and treatment, and refusal or delay in providing accommodations, medication, physical therapy, and specialist care. He also alleged that Wexford maintained policies or practices involving delayed hiring of doctors and refusal to honor permits transferred from other prisons.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Mohring initially filed a complaint alleging deliberate indifference to medical needs and ADA violations, then moved for leave to file an amended complaint. The court granted or considered the amended pleading and screened it under § 1915A, dismissing the claim against Warden Daniel Monti in his individual capacity without prejudice while allowing four designated counts to proceed against specified defendants. Monti remained in the case in his official capacity solely to respond to discovery intended to identify unknown nurses.

DISPOSITION

other

CASES CITED

- Gill v. City of Milwaukee, 850 F.3d 335, 344 (7th Cir. 2017)
- Bell Atlantic Corp. v. Twombly, 550 U.S. 544, 570 (2007)
- Daniel v. Cook County, 833 F.3d 728, 737 (7th Cir. 2016)
- Lacy v. Cook County, Illinois, 897 F.3d 847, 853 (7th Cir. 2018)
- Jaros v. Illinois Department of Corrections, 684 F.3d 667, 670 & n.2 (7th Cir. 2012)
- Iskander v. Village of Forest Park, 690 F.2d 126, 128 (7th Cir. 1982)
- McCormick v. City of Chicago, 230 F.3d 319, 324 (7th Cir. 2000)