

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF CONNECTICUT

McClendon v. Pearson, et al.

McClendon v. Pearson, No. 3:25-cv-1760 (SRU) (D. Conn. Feb. 13, 2026) · No. No. 3:25-cv-1760 (SRU) ·
Decided February 13, 2026

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the District of Connecticut conducts an initial review of pro se inmate Seville McClendon's 42 U.S.C. § 1983 action against parole officials and correctional staff. The court permits an Eighth Amendment excessive force claim against Special Parole Officer Pearson to proceed, dismisses all other claims, terminates the remaining defendants, and sets service, discovery, and motion deadlines.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the District of Connecticut
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Stefan R. Underhill
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the District of Connecticut
DECIDED	February 13, 2026
DOCKET	No. 3:25-cv-1760 (SRU)
DISPOSITION	other
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	Initial screening of a pro se prisoner civil-rights complaint under 28 U.S.C. § 1915A.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	Under 28 U.S.C. § 1915A, the court must dismiss a prisoner complaint that is frivolous, malicious, fails to state a claim, or seeks monetary relief from an immune defendant. Pro se pleadings are construed liberally, but the complaint must contain sufficient facts to provide fair notice and state a plausible claim for relief.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	Unpublished district court initial review order; precedential status not stated in the opinion.
PARTIES	Seville McClendon v. Special Parole Officer Pearson, Correctional Officer Santiago, Hartford Correctional Center Warden Long, Hartford Correctional Center Deputy Warden, Hartford Correctional Center First Shift Commander, Connecticut Board of Pardons and Parole, Jennifer M. Zaccagnini

TOPICS

prisoners rights

section 1983

civil rights

procedural due process

cruel and unusual punishment

PRACTICE AREAS

Civil rights

Prisoner litigation

Constitutional law

Federal civil procedure

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether McClendon's claims concerning the alleged forced signing and later breach of a special-parole agreement and incarceration for a special-parole violation stated a viable procedural-due-process claim under § 1983.
2. Whether the special-parole-related claims were barred by the applicable statute of limitations or by Heck v. Humphrey.
3. Whether Pearson's alleged verbal sexual harassment and leering while McClendon was undressed stated an Eighth Amendment claim.
4. Whether Pearson's alleged throwing of objects into McClendon's cell, causing a bleeding leg injury, stated an Eighth Amendment excessive-force claim.
5. Whether the alleged failure to provide medical assistance stated an Eighth Amendment deliberate-indifference claim and whether the requested damages and injunctive relief were available.

HOLDINGS

1. McClendon's claims concerning the forced signing of the special-parole agreement and the alleged breach of that agreement were dismissed as barred by the statute of limitations. Any claim challenging incarceration based on the special-parole revocation was dismissed under Heck v. Humphrey because McClendon did not allege that the revocation sentence had been reversed or otherwise invalidated.
2. The allegation that Pearson looked at McClendon with lustful eyes while McClendon was undressed did not state an Eighth Amendment claim because it was an isolated incident of verbal or visual harassment without sufficiently egregious conduct or physical contact.
3. McClendon's allegation that Pearson threw objects into his cell, cutting his leg and causing bleeding, was sufficient at the initial-review stage to state an Eighth Amendment excessive-force claim.
4. The alleged failure to provide treatment for the leg cut and later anxiety or panic attack did not state an Eighth Amendment deliberate-indifference claim because the alleged conditions were not sufficiently serious.
5. Official-capacity damages were barred by the Eleventh Amendment; damages could proceed only against a defendant personally involved in the alleged violation; and the request for an apology and other injunctive relief against Hartford Correctional Center officials was dismissed as unavailable or moot after McClendon's transfer.

KEY QUOTATIONS

“Therefore, McClendon’s Eighth Amendment excessive force claim may proceed.” (III.C)

“All other claims are dismissed.” (IV)

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

McClendon alleged that, while he was undressed in his cell at Hartford Correctional Center, Special Parole Officer Pearson refused to leave and threw items into the cell, cutting McClendon's leg and causing it to bleed. McClendon also alleged that correctional staff failed to obtain medical assistance after the incident and that Officer Santiago refused to call medical staff during a later anxiety or panic attack. He further challenged the imposition and enforcement of special parole, sought damages and injunctive relief, and was transferred from Hartford Correctional Center to another facility after reporting the incident.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

McClendon filed a § 1983 complaint against Connecticut parole officials and Hartford Correctional Center personnel. On initial review, the court dismissed all claims except an Eighth Amendment excessive-force claim against Special Parole Officer Pearson, terminated the remaining defendants, and ordered service and further case management.

DISPOSITION

other

CASES CITED

- Mangiafico v. Blumenthal, 471 F.3d 391, 398 (2d Cir. 2006)
- Kelley v. Quiros, 2023 WL 1818545, at *2 n.1 (D. Conn. Feb. 8, 2023)
- Blango v. Ludovico, 2024 WL 988164, at *2 (D. Conn. Mar. 7, 2024)
- Shakur v. Selsky, 391 F.3d 106, 112 (2d Cir. 2004)
- Sykes v. Bank of America, 723 F.3d 399, 403 (2d Cir. 2013)
- Triestman v. Federal Bureau of Prisons, 470 F.3d 471, 474 (2d Cir. 2006)
- Bell Atlantic Corp. v. Twombly, 550 U.S. 544, 555-56, 570 (2007)
- Ashcroft v. Iqbal, 556 U.S. 662, 678 (2009)
- Walentas v. Lipper, 862 F.2d 414, 418 (2d Cir. 1988)
- Johnson v. Rowe, 2025 WL 1786083, at *5 (D. Conn. June 27, 2025)
- Morrow v. Department of Correction, 2018 WL 5817003, at *1 (D. Conn. Nov. 6, 2018)
- Connelly v. Komm, 2021 WL 5359738, at *3 (D. Conn. Nov. 16, 2021)
- Heck v. Humphrey, 512 U.S. 477, 486-87 (1994)
- Lee v. Donnaruma, 63 F. App'x 39, 41 (2d Cir. 2003)
- Boddie v. Schnieder, 105 F.3d 857, 860-61 (2d Cir. 1997)
- Holland v. City of New York, 197 F. Supp. 3d 529, 547 (S.D.N.Y. 2016)

- Jones v. Harris, 665 F. Supp. 2d 384, 396 (S.D.N.Y. 2009)
- Shabazz v. Sharr, 2020 WL 646171, at *3 (D. Conn. Feb. 11, 2020)
- Hudson v. McMillian, 503 U.S. 1, 5, 7-10 (1992)
- Crawford v. Cuomo, 796 F.3d 252, 256 (2d Cir. 2015)
- Wilkins v. Gaddy, 559 U.S. 34, 38 (2010)
- Whitley v. Albers, 475 U.S. 312, 321 (1986)
- Estelle v. Gamble, 429 U.S. 97, 104-05 (1976)
- Spavone v. New York State Department of Correctional Services, 719 F.3d 127, 138 (2d Cir. 2013)
- Chance v. Armstrong, 143 F.3d 698, 702-03 (2d Cir. 1998)
- Farmer v. Brennan, 511 U.S. 825, 835, 839-40 (1994)
- Morehouse v. Vasquez, 2020 WL 1049943, at *18 (S.D.N.Y. Mar. 4, 2020)
- Gonzalez v. Hannah, 2020 WL 3256869, at *6 (D. Conn. June 16, 2020)
- Young v. Choinski, 15 F. Supp. 3d 172, 183 (D. Conn. 2014)
- Brown v. Head Kitchen Dietician, 2025 WL 1371788, at *3 (E.D.N.Y. May 12, 2025)
- Kentucky v. Graham, 473 U.S. 159, 167 (1985)
- Wright v. Smith, 21 F.3d 496, 501 (2d Cir. 1994)
- Moffitt v. Town of Brookfield, 950 F.2d 880, 886 (2d Cir. 1991)
- Rivera v. Viger, 2021 WL 3269095, at *3 (D. Conn. July 30, 2021)
- Provost v. City of Newburgh, 262 F.3d 146, 155 (2d Cir. 2001)
- Tangreti v. Bachmann, 983 F.3d 609, 620 (2d Cir. 2020)
- Prins v. Coughlin, 76 F.3d 504, 506 (2d Cir. 1996)
- Salahuddin v. Goord, 467 F.3d 263, 272 (2d Cir. 2006)