

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF
WISCONSIN

**Ryker Louis Shampo v. Jody Maloney, Jennifer McCommons,
Oconto County, Carol Kopp, Lt. Mary Ruechel, Sgt. David
Rosenfeldt, CO Christopher Melland, Southern Health Partners Inc.,
Chad Angus, and Wisconsin County Mutual Company**

Shampo · No. 25-cv-1742-bbc · Decided January 15, 2026

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the Eastern District of Wisconsin screens Ryker Louis Shampo’s amended 42 U.S.C. § 1983 complaint concerning alleged medical-care and self-harm-related incidents at the Oconto County Jail. The court concludes that the amended complaint violates Federal Rules of Civil Procedure 8, 18, and 20 because it is confusing, includes unsupported legal conclusions, and joins unrelated claims against different defendants. The court grants Shampo one final opportunity to file a compliant second amended complaint by February 18, 2026, and warns that the action will otherwise be dismissed.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the Eastern District of Wisconsin
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Byron B. Conway
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the Eastern District of Wisconsin
DECIDED	January 15, 2026
DOCKET	25-cv-1742-bbc
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	Screening of a prisoner civil-rights plaintiff's amended complaint under 28 U.S.C. § 1915A.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	The court screened the amended prisoner complaint under 28 U.S.C. § 1915A and evaluated whether it satisfied the pleading requirements of Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 8(a)(2) and the joinder requirements of Rules 18 and 20.
PARTIES	Ryker Louis Shampo v. Jody Maloney, Jennifer McCommons, Oconto County, Carol Kopp, Lt. Mary Ruechel, Sgt. David Rosenfeldt, CO Christopher Melland, Southern Health Partners Inc., Chad Angus, Wisconsin County Mutual Company

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether the amended complaint complied with Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 8(a)(2)'s requirement of a short and plain statement showing entitlement to relief.
2. Whether the amended complaint improperly joined unrelated claims against different defendants in violation of Federal Rules of Civil Procedure 18 and 20.
3. Whether the court should permit one final opportunity to file a compliant second amended complaint rather than dismissing the action.

HOLDINGS

1. The amended complaint failed to comply with Rule 8(a)(2) because it was repetitive and confusing, included extensive extraneous detail, and relied on unsupported legal conclusions rather than sufficient factual allegations.
2. The amended complaint improperly joined unrelated claims against different defendants in violation of Rules 18 and 20.
3. Shampo was granted one final opportunity to file a second amended complaint curing the identified pleading and joinder defects.

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Shampo is incarcerated at the Dodge Correctional Institution and previously was confined at the Oconto County Jail. His amended complaint included lengthy, repetitive, and confusing allegations concerning multiple defendants and incidents, including alleged denial of mental-health medications during one period of incarceration and alleged failure by jail staff to respond to threats of self-harm during a later period. He also attached grievances without explaining their relevance and asserted legal conclusions, including negligence allegations against Oconto County, without supporting factual allegations.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Shampo filed a complaint under 42 U.S.C. § 1983 concerning alleged violations during his incarceration at the Oconto County Jail. After screening the original complaint and finding it deficient under the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, the court allowed him to amend. The court found the amended complaint deficient under Rule 8(a)(2) and Rules 18 and 20, granted one final opportunity to file a second amended complaint, and ordered him to use the court's prisoner amended-complaint form.

OPINION

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT EASTERN DISTRICT OF WISCONSIN RYKER LOUIS SHAMPO, Plaintiff, v. Case No. 25-cv-1742-bbc JODY MALONEY, JENNIFER MCCOMMONS, OCONTO COUNTY, CAROL KOPP, LT. MARY RUECHEL, SGT DAVID ROSENFELDT, CO CHRISTOPHER MELLAND, SOUTHERN HEALTH PARTNERS INC., CHAD ANGUS, and WISCONSIN COUNTY MUTUAL COMPANY. Defendants. SCREENING ORDER Plaintiff Ryker Louis Shampo, who is currently confined at the Dodge Correctional

Institution and representing himself, filed a complaint under 42 U.S.C. §1983, alleging that his civil rights were violated while he was incarcerated at the Oconto County Jail.

On December 10, 2025, the Court screened the complaint and after concluding it did not comply with the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, gave Shampo the opportunity to file an amended complaint, which he did on December 22, 2025. It is not clear why, but even though the Court had concluded that the original complaint was deficient, Defendants Jody Maloney, Jennifer McCommons, and Southern Health Partners Inc. filed an answer to the original complaint on January 2, 2026.

The Court will screen the amended complaint, as required by 28 U.S.C. §1915A. SCREENING OF THE AMENDED COMPLAINT To state a claim under the federal notice pleading system, a plaintiff must provide a “short and plain statement of the claim showing that [he] is entitled to relief.” Fed. R. Civ. P. 8(a)(2). A plaintiff should not plead every fact supporting his claims; he only has to “give the defendant fair notice of what the... claim is and the grounds upon which it rests.” Bell Atl.

Corp. v. Twombly, 550 U.S. 544, 555 (2007) (quoting Conley v. Gibson, 355 U.S. 41, 47 (1957)). There is a reason that the rule specifies a “short and plain” statement. “Rule 8(a) requires parties to make their pleadings straightforward, so that judges and adverse parties need not try to fish a gold coin from a bucket of mud.” U.S. ex rel. Garst v. Lockheed-Martin Corp., 328 F.3d 374, 378 (7th Cir.

2003). “[L]ength may make a complaint unintelligible, by scattering and concealing in a morass of irrelevancies the few allegations that matter.” Kadamovas v. Stevens, 706 F.3d 843, 844 (7th Cir. 2013) (quoting U.S. ex rel. Garst, 328 F.3d 374, 378 (7th Cir. 2003)). “District judges are busy, and therefore have a right to dismiss a complaint that is so long that it imposes an undue burden on the judge, to the prejudice of other litigants seeking the judge’s attention.” Id. THE COURT’S ANALYSIS The plaintiff’s amended complaint violates Rule 8(a)(2) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure.

It begins with “a short plain statement of the claim showing that the pleader is entitled to relief,” as the rule requires, but then adds sixteen pages of handwritten “details” that set forth a person-by-person (some Defendants, some non-Defendants) catalogue of alleged wrongs as well as additional details of each incident that are not included in the body of the amended complaint.

Shampo also attaches copies of the grievances he filed while at the jail without explanation of why he is attaching them. Taken as a whole, the amended complaint is repetitive and confusing, making it difficult to understand who did what, when and what happened as a result.

Moreover, the amended complaint is replete with legal conclusions that are unsupported by factual allegations. For example, Shampo asserts that Oconto County “took part in negligent hiring,

supervision, training. Negligence gross negligence, wanton negligence, failure to provide.” Shampo does not, however, include any factual allegations from which the Court can reasonably conclude that Oconto County is liable for the alleged misconduct. “The pleading standard Rule 8 announces does not require ‘detailed factual allegations,’ but it demands more than an unadorned, the-defendant-unlawfully-harmed-me accusation.” *Ashcroft v. Iqbal*, 556 U.S. 662, 678 (2009) (quoting *Bell Atl.*

Corp. v. Twombly, 550 U.S. 544, 555 (2007)). “The tenet that a court must accept as true all of the allegations contained in a complaint is inapplicable to legal conclusions. Threadbare recitals of the elements of a cause of action, supported by mere conclusory statements, do not suffice.” *Id.* A complaint must contain sufficient factual matter, accepted as true, to “state a claim to relief that is plausible on its face.” *Twombly*, 550 U.S. at 570.

Simply accusing Oconto County of negligence will be insufficient to state a claim. Shampo also joins unrelated claims against different defendants in the same pleading. He alleges that when he was incarcerated for several months beginning in May 2025, medical staff refused to allow the delivery of medications to treat various mental health conditions, which resulted in a mental health crisis.

He then alleges that during a different period of incarceration beginning in September 2025, jail staff ignored his threats of self-harm, after which he seriously injured himself. As the Court explained in the original screening order, “[u]nrelated claims against different defendants belong in different suits.” *George v. Smith*, 507 F.3d 605, 607 (7th Cir. 2007).

Claims about medical staff denying medication and claims that arose months later about jail staff ignoring threats of self-harm, cannot be pursued in the same case. In short, the Court finds that the amended complaint fails to comply with Rule 8(a)(2) and Rules 18 and 20.

The Court will give Shampo one final opportunity to prepare a complaint that complies with the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, as explained to him in the Court’s orders. The Court will again provide Shampo with an amended complaint form. Shampo must use the form. See Civil L. R. 9(b). If he needs additional space, he may attach no more than five additional pages, but Shampo should take care to state his allegations only once in a straightforward, chronological story.

He does not need to identify the claims he believes he states; that is the Court’s job. See 28 U.S.C. §1915A (“the court shall identify cognizable claims”). All Shampo must do is tell the Court what happened, who was involved, and how it impacted him. Shampo is again reminded that, at the pleading stage, he need only provide notice to the Defendants of why he is suing them.

He should not try to prove his claims at this stage. The parties will later have an opportunity to provide evidence to prove their claims at the summary judgment stage. The second amended

complaint will take the place of the prior complaints, so it must be complete in itself without reference to the prior complaints. See *Duda v. Bd. of Educ. of Franklin Park Pub.*

Sch. Dist. No. 84, 133 F.3d 1054, 1056 (7th Cir. 1998). If a second amended complaint is received, it will become the operative complaint in this action, and the Court will screen it in accordance with 28 U.S.C. § 1915A. Defendants named in the second amended complaint should not respond to the second amended complaint until after the Court enters a screening order identify the cognizable claims.

IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED that on or before February 18, 2026, Shampo may file a second amended complaint curing the defects described in this decision. If he chooses not to file a second amended complaint, the Court will dismiss this action based on the amended complaint's failure to comply with the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure. IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that the Clerk's Office mail Shampo a blank prisoner amended complaint form.

Shampo must use the form. Dated at Green Bay, Wisconsin this 15th day of January, 2026. s/
Byron B. Conway BYRON B. CONWAY United States District Judge