

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF CONNECTICUT

Darryl Crenshaw v. Officer Ross, Officer Iliades, Officer John Doe,
and Captain Blackstock

25-CV-479 (SFR) · No. 25-CV-479 (SFR); 3:25-cv-00479 · Decided December 8, 2025

SUMMARY

This Initial Review Order evaluates a pro se incarcerated plaintiff’s 42 U.S.C. § 1983 claims against Connecticut Department of Correction officers arising from alleged excessive force, an unreasonable strip search, threats, retaliation, and property destruction. The court permits several individual-capacity claims to proceed, including Eighth Amendment, Fourth Amendment, and First Amendment retaliation claims, as well as state-law assault and battery claims against one defendant. The court dismisses the remaining claims, including official-capacity claims and the Fourteenth Amendment property-deprivation claim, without prejudice.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the District of Connecticut
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Sarah F. Russell
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the District of Connecticut
DECIDED	December 8, 2025
DOCKET	25-CV-479 (SFR); 3:25-cv-00479
DISPOSITION	other
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	Initial review of a prisoner civil-rights complaint under the Prison Litigation Reform Act, 28 U.S.C. § 1915A.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	Under 28 U.S.C. § 1915A, the court accepted well-pleaded factual allegations as true, drew reasonable inferences in the plaintiff’s favor, and dismissed claims that were frivolous, malicious, failed to state a plausible claim, or sought monetary relief from an immune defendant. The court applied the plausibility standard from Ashcroft v. Iqbal and Bell Atlantic Corp. v. Twombly, while construing the pro se complaint liberally.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	unpublished
PARTIES	Darryl Crenshaw v. Officer Ross, Officer Iliades, Officer John Doe, Captain Blackstock

TOPICS

section 1983

prisoners rights

first amendment

due process

civil rights

PRACTICE AREAS

civil rights

prisoner civil rights

constitutional law

civil procedure

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether the complaint plausibly alleged Eighth Amendment excessive-force or failure-to-intervene claims against Doe and Iliades.
2. Whether the complaint plausibly alleged an Eighth Amendment deliberate-indifference-to-health-and-safety claim against Ross based on threats and threatening physical conduct.
3. Whether the alleged strip search plausibly violated the Fourth Amendment rights of bodily privacy.
4. Whether the complaint plausibly alleged First Amendment retaliation claims based on segregation placement, use of force, strip search, disciplinary charges, and property destruction.
5. Whether the alleged property destruction stated a Fourteenth Amendment due-process claim despite available state post-deprivation remedies.
6. Whether official-capacity claims for declaratory or monetary relief were barred or otherwise unavailable.

HOLDINGS

1. The complaint plausibly alleged that Doe and Iliades used excessive force, or failed to intervene to prevent excessive force, during Crenshaw's escort to segregation and cell placement, and those individual-capacity claims could proceed for damages.
2. The complaint plausibly alleged an individual-capacity Eighth Amendment claim against Ross based on threatening physical conduct and extreme fear of bodily harm, notwithstanding that verbal threats alone generally do not constitute a constitutional violation.
3. The complaint plausibly alleged an unreasonable strip search in violation of the Fourth Amendment against Blackstock, Iliades, and Doe.
4. The complaint plausibly alleged retaliation claims against Blackstock for segregation placement and directing the strip search, against Iliades for aggressive treatment and property destruction in retaliation for a prior grievance, and against Ross for issuing a disciplinary report; the retaliation claims against Doe and claims against Iliades based solely on Crenshaw's contemporaneous stated intent to complain were dismissed.
5. The alleged destruction of Crenshaw's property did not state a plausible Fourteenth Amendment due-process claim because Connecticut provides adequate administrative and post-deprivation remedies.
6. The official-capacity claims were dismissed without prejudice because the alleged violations were past events, no ongoing constitutional violation was alleged, declaratory relief was unnecessary, and monetary relief was barred by the Eleventh Amendment.

KEY QUOTATIONS

“A claim has facial plausibility when the plaintiff pleads factual content that allows the Court to draw the reasonable inference that the defendant is liable for the misconduct alleged.” (§ II)

“To satisfy the causation element, a plaintiff must allege but-for causation.” (§ III.D)

“All other claims, including official capacity claims, are DISMISSED without prejudice.” (§ IV)

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

While incarcerated at Cheshire Correctional Institution, Crenshaw had a hostile verbal exchange with Officer Ross concerning a cell search, during which Ross allegedly threatened and attempted to assault him. Crenshaw alleged that Captain Blackstock placed him in segregation after he expressed an intent to file grievances, a federal lawsuit, and a police report; Officers Doe and Iliades then handcuffed and forcibly escorted him, forced his head into a cell-wall protrusion, and conducted a forceful strip search. Crenshaw further alleged that Ross issued a disciplinary report in retaliation and that Iliades destroyed his property in retaliation for a prior grievance.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Crenshaw filed a pro se action under 42 U.S.C. § 1983 and state common law seeking damages and declaratory relief against four Connecticut Department of Correction officers. The court screened the complaint under § 1915A, permitted several individual-capacity federal and state claims to proceed to service, and dismissed the remaining claims, including official-capacity claims and the Fourteenth Amendment property-deprivation claim, without prejudice.

DISPOSITION

other

CASES CITED

- *Giraldo v. Kessler*, 694 F.3d 161, 164 (2d Cir. 2012)
- *Ashcroft v. Iqbal*, 556 U.S. 662, 678 (2009)
- *Bell Atlantic Corp. v. Twombly*, 550 U.S. 544, 570 (2007)
- *Faber v. Metro Life Ins. Co.*, 648 F.3d 98, 104 (2d Cir. 2011)
- *Matheson v. Deutsche Bank National Trust Co.*, 706 F. App'x 24, 26 (2d Cir. 2017)
- *Triestman v. Federal Bureau of Prisons*, 470 F.3d 471, 474-75 (2d Cir. 2006) (per curiam)
- *Blyden v. Mancusi*, 186 F.3d 252, 264 (2d Cir. 1999)
- *Wright v. Smith*, 21 F.3d 496, 501 (2d Cir. 1994)
- *Tangreti v. Bachman*, 983 F.3d 609, 620 (2d Cir. 2020)
- *Sims v. Artuz*, 230 F.3d 14, 21 (2d Cir. 2000)
- *Abreu v. Bascue*, No. 9:18-CV-0186 (MAD/ATB), 2018 WL 11466956, at *13 (N.D.N.Y. May 1, 2018)
- *Delano v. Rendle*, No. 9:13-CV-00070 (NAM/TWD), 2016 WL 4146476, at *11 (N.D.N.Y. July 12, 2016)

- Delgado v. Bezio, No. 09-CIV-6899 (LTS), 2011 WL 1842294, at *7 (S.D.N.Y. May 9, 2011)
- Sanchez v. Bell, No. 3:22-CV-1087 (SVN), 2023 WL 363045, at *3 (D. Conn. Jan. 23, 2023)
- Davis v. Rinaldi, No. 3:19-CV-504 (CSH), 2019 WL 7879729, at *11 (D. Conn. Oct. 31, 2019)
- Farmer v. Brennan, 511 U.S. 825, 837 (1994)
- Spavone v. New York State Department of Correctional Services, 719 F.3d 127, 138 (2d Cir. 2013)
- Hilton v. Wright, 673 F.3d 120, 127 (2d Cir. 2012) (per curiam)
- Purcell v. Coughlin, 790 F.2d 263, 265 (2d Cir. 1986) (per curiam)
- Cole v. Fischer, 379 F. App'x 40, 43 (2d Cir. 2010)
- Willey v. Kirkpatrick, 801 F.3d 51, 70 (2d Cir. 2015)
- Green v. City of New York Department of Correction, No. 06-CIV-4978 (LTS) (KNF), 2008 WL 2485402, at *6 (S.D.N.Y. June 19, 2008)
- Hudson v. Palmer, 468 U.S. 517, 526 (1984)
- Covino v. Patrisi, 967 F.2d 73, 78 (2d Cir. 1992)
- Bell v. Wolfish, 441 U.S. 520, 558-59 (1979)
- Harris v. Miller, 818 F.3d 49, 58 (2d Cir. 2016)
- Jean-Laurent v. Wilkerson, 438 F. Supp. 2d 318, 323 (S.D.N.Y. 2006), aff'd, 461 F. App'x 18 (2d Cir. 2012)
- Bacon v. Phelps, 961 F.3d 533, 542-43 (2d Cir. 2020)
- Benway v. Aldi, No. 3:19-CV-208 (VAB), 2020 WL 4433561, at *4 (D. Conn. 2020)
- Wrobel v. County of Erie, 692 F.3d 22, 31 (2d Cir. 2012)
- Dawes v. Walker, 239 F.3d 489, 491 (2d Cir. 2001)
- Gill v. Pidlypchak, 389 F.3d 379, 381 (2d Cir. 2004)
- Nieves v. Bartlett, 587 U.S. 391, 399 (2019)
- Hartman v. Moore, 547 U.S. 250, 260 (2006)
- Handsome, Inc. v. Town of Monroe, No. 23-711, 2024 WL 2747142, at *5 (2d Cir. May 29, 2024)
- Blue v. Koren, 72 F.3d 1075, 1084 (2d Cir. 1995)
- A.S. v. City School District of Albany, 585 F. Supp. 3d 246, 269-70 (N.D.N.Y. 2022)
- Ramos v. Malloy, No. 3:18-CV-615 (VAB), 2018 WL 1936144, at *3 (D. Conn. Apr. 24, 2018)
- Edwards v. Erfe, 588 F. App'x 79, 80 (2d Cir. 2015)
- Conquistador v. Hannah, No. 3:19-CV-1293 (KAD), 2019 WL 4346346, at *4 (D. Conn. Sept. 12, 2019)
- Verizon Maryland, Inc. v. Public Service Commission of Maryland, 535 U.S. 635, 645 (2002)
- Puerto Rico Aqueduct and Sewer Authority v. Metcalf & Eddy, Inc., 506 U.S. 139, 146 (1993)
- Kentucky v. Graham, 473 U.S. 159, 169 (1985)