

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF
WISCONSIN

**Matthew X. Winters v. Corporal Jarvela, et al.; Matthew X. Winters
v. J. O’Hanlon; Matthew X. Winters v. Corporal Willstead and
Corporal Dobbs; Matthew X. Winters v. Vita Core Medical Staff and
Nicole Do; Matthew X. Winters v. CPL. MacDonald, et al.**

Winters · No. 25-CV-1135-JPS-JPS; 25-CV-1136-JPS-JPS; 25-CV-1629-JPS-JPS; 25-CV-1741-JPS-JPS; 25-
CV-1755-JPS-JPS · Decided December 9, 2025

SUMMARY

The Eastern District of Wisconsin imposes a filing restriction on inmate Matthew X. Winters after determining that he had filed or attempted to file more than twenty civil rights claims across multiple cases within a short period. The order limits Winters to two open cases before the court at a time, excludes habeas corpus petitions concerning his criminal convictions, and requires him to identify which two of five pending cases he wishes to pursue. The remaining cases are to be administratively closed subject to possible reopening, and Winters may seek modification or rescission of the restriction after three years.

OPINION

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT EASTERN DISTRICT OF WISCONSIN MATTHEW X. WINTERS, Plaintiff, Case No. 25-CV-1135-JPS-JPS v. CORPORAL JARVELA, CORPORAL ORDER RARIE, SERGEANT GRAY, CORRECTIONAL OFFICER BEDFORD, CORRECTIONAL OFFICER AYALA, CORPORAL MACDONALD, CAPTAIN BERANIS, CORRECTIONAL OFFICER LOESCH, SERGEANT REINERSMAN, and KATHLEEN SUMMERS, Defendants. MATTHEW X. WINTERS, Plaintiff, Case No. 25-CV-1136-JPS-JPS v. ORDER J. O’HANLON, Defendant.

MATTHEW X. WINTERS, Plaintiff, Case No. 25-CV-1629-JPS-JPS v. CORPORAL WILLSTEAD and ORDER CORPORAL DOBBS, Defendants. MATTHEW X. WINTERS, Plaintiff, Case No. 25-CV-1741-JPS-JPS v. VITA CORE MEDICAL STAFF and ORDER NICOLE DO, Defendants. MATTHEW X. WINTERS, Plaintiff, Case No. 25-CV-1755-JPS-JPS v. CPL. MACDONALD, C.O. ORDER LIVINGSTON, CPL. JARVELA, SGT. BERNHARDT, C.O.

WILKS, C.O. GRIFFIFTH, C.O. POOLE, C.O. TROTTER, SGT. PARKER, LT. MIKUTIS, C. VALLADARES, K. CERMINARA, BRITTANY ERBY, and C.O. HARRIS, Defendants. Plaintiff

Matthew X. Winters (“Plaintiff”), an inmate at Kenosha County Detention Center (“KCDC”), has filed five cases within several months. All of Plaintiff’s cases are § 1983 civil rights cases and are generally about his care at KCDC.

Specifically, Plaintiff has filed the following cases: Date Filed Case Number Disposition
08/01/2025 25-CV-1135 Screened 08/01/2025 25-CV-1136 Screened 10/23/2025 25-CV-1629 Pre-screening
11/06/2025 25-CV-1741 Pre-screening 11/07/2025 25-CV-1755 Pre-screening In Case No. 25-CV-1135, Plaintiff recently filed an amended complaint, which included ten different complaints as attachments.

Case No. 25-CV-1135, ECF No. 15. Plaintiff states he wants to “amend and sever into separate lawsuits.” *Id.* at 1. In Case No. 25-CV-1755, Plaintiff’s complaint attached eleven different complaints. Case No. 25-CV-1755, ECF No. 1-1. Including these attached complaints, it appears that Plaintiff is attempting to bring over twenty different cases.

The right of access to federal courts is not absolute. *In re Chapman*, 328 F.3d 903, 905 (7th Cir. 2003) (citing *United States ex rel. Verdone v. Circuit Court for Taylor Cnty.*, 73 F.3d 669, 674 (7th Cir. 1995)). Individuals are “only entitled to meaningful access to the courts.” *Id.* (citing *Lewis v. Casey*, 518 U.S. 343, 351 (1996)). “Every paper filed... no matter how repetitious or frivolous, requires some portion of the institution’s limited resources.

A part of the Court’s responsibility is to see that these resources are allocated in a way that promotes the interests of justice.” *In re McDonald*, 489 U.S. 180, 184 (1989). A federal court’s inherent powers include “the ability to fashion an appropriate sanction for conduct which abuses the judicial process.” *Chambers v. NASCO, Inc.*, 501 U.S. 32, 44–45 (1991).

The All Writs Act, 28 U.S.C. § 1651(a), gives district courts the “inherent power to enter pre-filing orders against vexatious litigants.” *Orlando Residence Ltd. v. GP Credit Co., LLC*, 609 F. Supp. 2d 813, 816–17 (E.D. Wis. 2009) (citing *Molski v. Evergreen Dynasty Corp.*, 500 F.3d 1047, 1057 (9th Cir. 2007)). “A filing restriction must, however, be narrowly tailored to the type of abuse, and must not bar the courthouse door absolutely.” *Chapman v. Exec.*

Comm., 324 Fed. App’x 500, 502 (7th Cir. 2009) (citations omitted). “Courts have consistently approved filing bars that permit litigants access if they cease their abusive filing practices,” but have “rejected as overbroad filing bars in perpetuity.” *Id.* (citations omitted); *Smith v. United States Cong.*, No. 19-CV-1001-PP, 2019 WL 6037487, at *9 (E.D. Wis. Nov.

14, 2019). Under the circumstances presented by Plaintiff having filed what amounts to be over twenty different complaints in a short time span, the Court finds it appropriate to impose a filing bar limiting Plaintiff to proceeding with only two cases before this branch of the Court at any one time, with the exception that the bar will not apply to habeas corpus petitions relating to his criminal convictions.

Accordingly, the Court will order Plaintiff to file a letter with the Court within thirty days of this Order indicating which two of his five open cases before this Court (25-CV-1135, 25-CV-1136, 25-CV-1629, 25-CV-1741, 25-CV-1755) he would like to proceed.

The remaining cases will then be administratively closed subject to a motion to reopen after such time as the number of Plaintiff's pending cases falls below two. Plaintiff may move to modify or rescind this bar no earlier than three years after the date of this Order. See Smith, 2019 WL 6037487, at *11.

Accordingly, ORDERED that Plaintiff Matthew X. Winters is BARRED from having more than two open cases before this branch of the Court, with the exception that the bar will not apply to habeas corpus petitions relating to his criminal convictions; the Clerk of Court shall return UNFILED any new cases submitted by or on behalf of Plaintiff in violation of this Order; Plaintiff may move to modify or rescind this bar no earlier than three years after the date of this Order; and IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that, consistent with the terms of this Order, Plaintiff must file a letter with the Court on or before January 9, 2026 indicating which two of his five open cases before this Court (25-CV-1135, 25-CV-1136, 25-CV-1629, 25-CV-1741, 25-CV-1755) he would like to proceed.

Dated at Milwaukee, Wisconsin, this 9th day of December, 2025. \ BRE) J.P. Stathh ueller U.S
Distfict Judge Page 50f5