

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF
ILLINOIS, EASTERN DIVISION

Divonte Hall v. City of Chicago, et al.

No. 25 CV 935 (N.D. Ill. Jan. 13 2026) · No. No. 25 CV 935 · Decided January 13, 2026

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the Northern District of Illinois ruled on defendants’ motion to dismiss claims arising from Divonte Hall’s arrest, pretrial detention, and prosecution. The court dismissed the false-arrest claim with prejudice by agreement but allowed the unlawful pretrial detention, malicious prosecution, and indemnification claims to proceed. The court held that a grand-jury indictment did not establish probable cause as a matter of law where the plaintiff plausibly alleged that defendants used false or incomplete information.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the Northern District of Illinois, Eastern Division
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Jeffrey I. Cummings
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the Northern District of Illinois, Eastern Division
DECIDED	January 13, 2026
DOCKET	No. 25 CV 935
DISPOSITION	other
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	Defendants moved under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 12(b)(6) to dismiss claims arising from an allegedly false arrest, unlawful pretrial detention, malicious prosecution, and municipal indemnification.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	On a Rule 12(b)(6) motion, the court accepts well-pleaded factual allegations as true, draws reasonable inferences for the nonmoving party, and asks whether the complaint states a plausible claim for relief.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	nonprecedential district court order

TOPICS

- motions to dismiss
- section 1983
- police misconduct
- civil rights
- government liability

PRACTICE AREAS

Civil procedure

Civil rights

Constitutional law

Municipal law

Criminal procedure

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether Hall's false-arrest claim should remain in the action.
2. Whether a grand-jury indictment conclusively established probable cause and required dismissal of Hall's unlawful-pretrial-detention and malicious-prosecution claims at the pleading stage.
3. Whether Hall plausibly alleged that the officers' allegedly false reports and statements rebutted the presumption of probable cause arising from the indictment.
4. Whether Hall's indemnification claim against the City could proceed when the underlying substantive claims survived dismissal.

HOLDINGS

1. The false-arrest claim was dismissed with prejudice by agreement of the parties.
2. A grand-jury indictment does not establish probable cause as a matter of law at the pleading stage when the plaintiff plausibly alleges that the indictment and subsequent proceedings were based on false or incomplete information.
3. Hall plausibly stated an unlawful-pretrial-detention claim, and the claim could proceed despite the grand-jury indictment.
4. Hall plausibly stated a malicious-prosecution claim against the defendants, including the officers, because he alleged post-arrest conduct that could have influenced the prosecution and indictment.
5. The City's indemnification claim could proceed because the court declined to dismiss the underlying unlawful-detention and malicious-prosecution claims.

KEY QUOTATIONS

“In sum: the Court rejects defendants’ assertion that an indictment establishes probable cause as a matter of law where—as here—a plaintiff has plausibly alleged that his arrest and legal proceedings were based on false information.” (Analysis, III)

“For the reasons stated above, the Court grants defendants’ motion to dismiss (Dckt. #9) only with respect to plaintiff’s false arrest claim, which is dismissed with prejudice by agreement of the parties. The motion to dismiss is otherwise denied and plaintiff’s remaining claims (unlawful pretrial detention, malicious prosecution, and indemnification) may proceed.” (Conclusion)

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Hall alleged that Chicago police officers arrested him for firearm possession on October 28, 2022, despite not seeing him possess a firearm, witnessing him commit a crime, or receiving a dispatch indicating criminal activity at the arrest location. He alleged that the officers generated false and incomplete reports and statements that led to his incarceration for more than fourteen months. A grand jury indictment issued on December 2, 2022, and Hall was found not guilty of all counts on December 14, 2023.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Hall filed a § 1983 action against three Chicago police officers and the City of Chicago. Defendants moved to dismiss, arguing principally that a grand-jury indictment established probable cause. The court dismissed the false-arrest claim with prejudice by agreement, denied dismissal of the unlawful-pretrial-detention, malicious-prosecution, and indemnification claims, lifted the discovery stay, and directed defendants to answer or otherwise plead.

DISPOSITION

other

CASES CITED

- Bell Atl. Corp. v. Twombly, 550 U.S. 544, 570 (2007)
- Ashcroft v. Iqbal, 556 U.S. 662, 678, 679 (2009)
- Yeftich v. Navistar, Inc., 722 F.3d 911, 915 (7th Cir. 2013)
- Thompson v. Clark, 596 U.S. 36, 42-43, 49 & n.2 (2022)
- Manuel v. City of Joliet, Ill., 580 U.S. 357, 366 (2017)
- Cairel v. Alderden, 821 F.3d 823, 834 (7th Cir. 2016)
- Sang Ken Kim v. City of Chicago, 858 N.E.2d 569, 574 (Ill. App. Ct. 2006)
- Mustafa v. City of Chicago, 442 F.3d 544, 547 (7th Cir. 2006)
- Logan v. Caterpillar, Inc., 246 F.3d 912, 926 (7th Cir. 2001)
- Gower v. Vercler, 377 F.3d 661, 668 (7th Cir. 2004)
- Washington v. City of Chicago, 98 F.4th 860, 869 (7th Cir. 2024)
- Whitlock v. Brown, 596 F.3d 406, 410 (7th Cir. 2010)
- Franks v. Delaware, 438 U.S. 154, 164-65 (1978)
- Economan v. Luttrull, Nos. 24-3165, 24-32246 & 25-1020, 2026 WL 82958, at *6 (7th Cir. Jan. 12, 2026)
- Whirl v. City of Harvey, No. 25cv307, 2025 WL 1826384, at *3 (N.D. Ill. July 2, 2025)
- Engel v. Buchan, 791 F. Supp. 2d 604, 611 (N.D. Ill. 2011)
- Snodderly v. R.U.F.F. Drug Enforcement Task Force, 239 F.3d 892, 902 (7th Cir. 2001)
- Gen. Elec. Capital Corp. v. Lease Resol. Corp., 128 F.3d 1074, 1080-81 (7th Cir. 1997)