

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE CENTRAL DISTRICT OF
ILLINOIS

Sean Rose v. Jenkins, et al.

Rose v. Jenkins · No. 3:26-cv-03013 · Decided May 29, 2026

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the Central District of Illinois conducted a merit review under 28 U.S.C. § 1915A of Sean Rose’s pro se § 1983 complaint. The court allowed Eighth Amendment claims for deliberate indifference to a serious medical need and verbal harassment or humiliation, and a First Amendment retaliation claim against Defendant Jenkins in her individual capacity, while dismissing the warden as a defendant and directing service on Jenkins.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the Central District of Illinois
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Sara Darrow
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the Central District of Illinois, Springfield Division
DECIDED	May 29, 2026
DOCKET	3:26-cv-03013
DISPOSITION	other
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	Merit review of a pro se incarcerated plaintiff’s complaint under 28 U.S.C. § 1915A before service of process.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	Under 28 U.S.C. § 1915A, the court accepts factual allegations as true and liberally construes them in the plaintiff’s favor, but dismisses claims that are frivolous, malicious, fail to state a claim, or seek monetary relief from an immune defendant. The complaint must allege facts sufficient to state a claim that is plausible on its face.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	Nonprecedential district-court merit review order
PARTIES	Sean Rose v. Jenkins, et al.

TOPICS

- prisoners rights
- section 1983
- civil rights
- first amendment
- cruel and unusual punishment

PRACTICE AREAS

Prisoner civil rights

Constitutional law

Civil procedure

Medical care in correctional facilities

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether Rose's allegations stated an Eighth Amendment claim for deliberate indifference to a serious medical need against Jenkins.
2. Whether Rose's allegations of verbal harassment and humiliation stated an Eighth Amendment claim against Jenkins.
3. Whether Rose's allegations that Jenkins retaliated against him for filing grievances and complaining about medical treatment stated a First Amendment retaliation claim.
4. Whether Rose stated a claim against the warden based solely on the warden's supervisory position.

HOLDINGS

1. Rose stated an Eighth Amendment claim for deliberate indifference to a serious medical need against Jenkins in her individual capacity.
2. Rose stated an Eighth Amendment claim against Jenkins based on the alleged verbal harassment and humiliation.
3. Rose stated a First Amendment retaliation claim against Jenkins in her individual capacity based on allegations that Jenkins acted because Rose filed grievances and complained about inadequate medical treatment.
4. Rose failed to state a claim against the warden because he made no allegations against the warden and could not impose liability merely because the warden was in charge.

KEY QUOTATIONS

“Plaintiff states an Eighth Amendment claim for deliberate indifference to a serious medical need, an Eighth Amendment claim based on the alleged verbal harassment and humiliation, and a First Amendment retaliation claim against Defendant Jenkins in her individual capacity.”

“Plaintiff does not make any allegations against Defendant Warden, and he cannot prevail against this defendant just because he may have been in charge.”

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Rose, who was incarcerated at Western Illinois Correctional Center, alleged that Jenkins refused to provide treatment for a suspected sexually transmitted disease that he believed he contracted after being sexually abused by a guard at another prison. He further alleged that Jenkins loudly questioned him about his symptoms in front of officials and inmates, called him a derogatory name, and encouraged him to kill himself. Rose connected some of Jenkins's conduct to his grievances and complaints about the lack of medical treatment under the Prison Rape Elimination Act.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Sean Rose filed a 42 U.S.C. § 1983 action alleging denial of medical treatment, verbal harassment and humiliation, and retaliation by prison personnel. The court screened the complaint under 28 U.S.C. § 1915A, allowed specified claims against Defendant Jenkins to proceed in her individual capacity, dismissed the claims against the warden for failure to allege personal involvement, terminated the warden as a defendant, and directed service on Jenkins.

DISPOSITION

other

CASES CITED

- Turley v. Rednour, 729 F.3d 645, 649 (7th Cir. 2013)
- Alexander v. United States, 721 F.3d 418, 422 (7th Cir. 2013)
- Ashcroft v. Iqbal, 556 U.S. 662, 676 (2009)

OPINION

Rose

PER CURIAM.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

CENTRAL DISTRICT OF ILLINOIS

SPRINGFIELD DIVISION

SEAN ROSE,)

) Plaintiff,)) v.) 26-3013) JENKINS, et al.)) Defendants.)

MERIT REVIEW ORDER

Plaintiff, proceeding pro se and presently incarcerated at Western Illinois Correctional Center, filed the present lawsuit pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983. The case is now before the Court for a merit review of Plaintiff’s claims. The Court must “screen” Plaintiff’s complaint, and through such process to identify and dismiss any legally insufficient claim, or the entire action if warranted. 28 U.S.C. § 1915A. A claim is legally insufficient if it “(1) is frivolous, malicious, or fails to state a claim upon which relief may be granted; or (2) seeks monetary relief from a defendant who is immune from such relief.” *Id.* The Court accepts the factual allegations as true, liberally construing them in the plaintiff’s favor. *Turley v. Rednour*, 729 F.3d 645, 649 (7th Cir. 2013). Conclusory statements and labels are insufficient—the facts alleged must “state a claim for relief that is plausible on its face.” *Alexander v. U.S.*, 721 F.3d 418, 422 (7th Cir. 2013) (citation omitted). Plaintiff alleges that Defendant Jenkins refused to provide treatment for a suspected sexually transmitted disease he contracted from a guard at another prison who had sexually abused him. He alleges that Defendant Jenkins questioned him loudly about his symptoms in front of other officials and several inmates, called him a “bitch,” and encouraged him to kill himself in part because Plaintiff had written grievances and complained about the lack of medical treatment via

the Prison Rape Elimination Act. Plaintiff states an Eighth Amendment claim for deliberate indifference to a serious medical need, an Eighth Amendment claim based on the alleged verbal harassment and humiliation, and a First Amendment retaliation claim against Defendant Jenkins in her individual capacity. Plaintiff does not make any allegations against Defendant Warden, and he cannot prevail against this defendant just because he may have been in charge. *Ashcroft v. Iqbal*, 556 U.S. 662, 676 (2009). The Court finds that Plaintiff does not state a claim against the warden. IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED:

1. Pursuant to its merit review of the Complaint under 28 U.S.C. § 1915A, the court finds that the plaintiff states an Eighth Amendment claim for deliberate indifference to a serious medical need, an Eighth Amendment claim based on the alleged verbal harassment and humiliation, and a First Amendment retaliation claim against Defendant Jenkins in her individual capacity. Any additional claims shall not be included in the case, except at the court's discretion on motion by a party for good cause shown or pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 15.
2. This case is now in the process of service. The plaintiff is advised to wait until counsel has appeared for the defendants before filing any motions, in order to give notice to the defendants and an opportunity to respond to those motions. Motions filed before defendants' counsel has filed an appearance will generally be denied as premature. The plaintiff need not submit any evidence to the court at this time, unless otherwise directed by the court.
3. The court will attempt service on the defendants by mailing each defendant a waiver of service. The defendants have 60 days from the date the waiver is sent to file an answer. If the defendants have not filed answers or appeared through counsel within 90 days of the entry of this order, the plaintiff may file a motion requesting the status of service. After the defendants have been served, the court will enter an order setting discovery and dispositive motion deadlines.
4. With respect to a defendant who no longer works at the address provided by the plaintiff, the entity for whom that defendant worked while at that address shall provide to the clerk said defendant's current work address, or, if not known, said defendant's forwarding address. This information shall be used only for effectuating service. Documentation of forwarding addresses shall be retained only by the clerk and shall not be maintained in the public docket nor disclosed by the clerk.
5. The defendants shall file an answer within 60 days of the date the waiver is sent by the clerk. A motion to dismiss is not an answer. The answer should include all defenses appropriate under the Federal Rules. The answer and subsequent pleadings shall be to the issues and claims stated in this opinion. In general, an answer sets forth the defendants' positions. The court does not rule on the merits of those positions unless and until a motion is filed by the defendants. Therefore, no response to the answer is necessary or will be considered.
6. This district uses electronic filing, which means that, after defense counsel has filed an appearance, defense counsel will automatically receive electronic notice of any motion or other paper filed by the plaintiff with the clerk. The plaintiff does not need to mail to defense

counsel copies of motions and other papers that the plaintiff has filed with the clerk. However, this does not apply to discovery requests and responses. Discovery requests and responses are not filed with the clerk. The plaintiff must mail his discovery requests and responses directly to defendants' counsel. Discovery requests or responses sent to the clerk will be returned unfiled, unless they are attached to and the subject of a motion to compel. Discovery does not begin until defense counsel has filed an appearance and the court has entered a scheduling order, which will explain the discovery process in more detail.

7. Counsel for the defendants is hereby granted leave to depose the plaintiff at his place of confinement. Counsel for the defendants shall arrange the time for the deposition.

8. The plaintiff shall immediately notify the court, in writing, of any change in his mailing address and telephone number. The plaintiff's failure to notify the court of a change in mailing address or phone number will result in dismissal of this lawsuit, with prejudice.

9. If a defendant fails to sign and return a waiver of service to the clerk within 30 days after the waiver is sent, the court will take appropriate steps to effect formal service through the U.S. Marshals service on that defendant and will require that defendant to pay the full costs of formal service pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 4(d)(2).

10. The clerk is directed to enter the standard qualified protective order pursuant to the Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act.

11. The clerk is directed to terminate Western Correctional Center warden as a defendant.

12. The clerk is directed to attempt service on Jenkins pursuant to the standard procedures. Entered this 29th day of May, 2026. s/Sara Darrow

SARA DARROW

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE