

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE CENTRAL DISTRICT OF
ILLINOIS, ROCK ISLAND DIVISION

Everardo Salinas v. Christine Brannon, et al.

Salinas v. Brannon · No. 4:22-cv-04019-JEH · Decided January 21, 2026

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the Central District of Illinois denied Everardo Salinas’s motion for reconsideration of an order granting summary judgment to prison officials. The court held that the plaintiff had not shown a manifest error of law, newly discovered evidence, or a genuine dispute of material fact concerning his medical-care claims under the Eighth Amendment. The court concluded that the alleged delays and treatment decisions did not support a finding of deliberate indifference.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the Central District of Illinois, Rock Island Division
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Jonathan E. Hawley
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the Central District of Illinois
DECIDED	January 21, 2026
DOCKET	4:22-cv-04019-JEH
DISPOSITION	other
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	Plaintiff moved under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 59(e) for reconsideration of an order granting defendants' motion for summary judgment in his prisoner civil-rights action.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	Under Rule 59(e), reconsideration is appropriate only to correct a manifest error of law or fact or to consider newly discovered evidence. A Rule 59(e) motion may not present evidence or arguments that could have been presented before judgment.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	unpublished
PARTIES	Everardo Salinas v. Christine Brannon, Pulse, Selkirk, Kramer, et al.

TOPICS

- motion for reconsideration
- summary judgment
- prisoners rights
- section 1983
- cruel and unusual punishment

PRACTICE AREAS

civil procedure

prisoner civil rights

constitutional law

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether plaintiff established a manifest error of law or newly discovered evidence warranting reconsideration under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 59(e).
2. Whether the evidence created a genuine dispute of material fact that defendants acted with deliberate indifference to plaintiff's serious medical need in violation of the Eighth Amendment.
3. Whether any delay in providing crutches or pain medication caused actionable harm attributable to the defendants.

HOLDINGS

1. The motion for reconsideration was properly denied because plaintiff did not identify a manifest error of law or fact, newly discovered evidence, or a qualifying basis to alter the summary-judgment judgment.
2. The record did not permit a reasonable inference that defendants acted with deliberate indifference to plaintiff's serious medical need, and plaintiff failed to identify a genuine dispute of material fact requiring trial.
3. The alleged delay in receiving crutches or pain medication did not support liability because plaintiff failed to show that defendants knowingly caused the delay or that the delay caused medically corroborated detrimental harm.

KEY QUOTATIONS

"Motions for reconsideration serve a limited function: to correct manifest errors of law or fact or to present newly discovered evidence." (1)

"A treatment decision permits an inference that the medical provider acted with deliberate indifference only when the decision constitutes "such a substantial departure from accepted professional judgment, practice, or standards, as to demonstrate that the person responsible actually did not base the decision on such a judgment."" (3)

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Plaintiff injured his foot in the prison yard on July 30, 2021. Defendants examined him, contacted the prison physician, provided an ACE bandage and ibuprofen, and arranged an x-ray; hospital x-rays on August 1 revealed fractures to three metatarsal bones, after which plaintiff received Tramadol, a walking boot, crutches, and a specialist referral. Plaintiff disputed whether he received crutches on July 30, when the nurses contacted the physician, and whether defendant Kramer threatened to discontinue his medication, but the specialist later concluded that the fractures had healed without issue.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

On March 19, 2025, the previously presiding district judge granted defendants' motion for summary judgment after concluding that plaintiff had not timely responded. Plaintiff moved for reconsideration, asserting that he had timely submitted a response but that prison e-filing problems prevented its receipt. The court later found the response timely, directed the Clerk to docket it, allowed defendants to file a reply, and then denied reconsideration after reviewing the merits.

DISPOSITION

other

CASES CITED

- Obriecht v. Raemisch, 517 F.3d 489, 494 (7th Cir. 2008)
- U.S. v. Resnick, 594 F.3d 562, 568 (7th Cir. 2010)
- Caisse Nationale de Credit Agricole v. CBI Industries, Inc., 90 F.3d 1264, 1269 (7th Cir. 1996)
- Estelle v. Gamble, 429 U.S. 97, 104-05 (1976)
- Petties v. Carter, 836 F.3d 722, 729-30 (7th Cir. 2016) (en banc)
- McDonald v. Hardy, 821 F.3d 882, 888 (7th Cir. 2016)
- Farmer v. Brennan, 511 U.S. 825, 837, 842 (1994)
- Sain v. Wood, 512 F.3d 886, 894-95 (7th Cir. 2008)
- Berry v. Peterman, 604 F.3d 435, 443 (7th Cir. 2010)
- Reck v. Wexford Health Sources, 27 F.4th 473, 485-86 (7th Cir. 2022)
- Williams v. Liefer, 491 F.3d 710, 715 (7th Cir. 2007)
- Vance v. Peters, 97 F.3d 987, 991 (7th Cir. 1996)