

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF WISCONSIN

---

CHRISTOPHER GOODVINE,

Plaintiff,

v.

OPINION and ORDER

Case No. 16-cv-703-wmc

J. LITSCHER, C. JESS, J. SCHWOCHERT,  
M. SAUNDERS, K. KALLAS, S. ECKSTEIN,  
S. SCHUELER, J. KIND, MS. FRANCOIS,  
J. LUTSEY, DR. ANKARLO, DR. STEVEN  
SCHMIDT, DR. CHING, DR. FORBES,  
DR. SCHWARTZ-OSCAR, CAPT. M.  
SCHULTZ, CAPT. VANLANEN,  
DR. AHEN, JANE/JOHN DOE NURSES 1-4,  
SGT. BONIN, SGT. KEILER-HERT,  
SGT. MEJIA, ST. VINCENT'S HOSPITAL and  
JANE/JOHN DOES 5-8,

Defendants.

---

*Pro se* plaintiff Christopher Goodvine contends that prison staff at the Green Bay Correctional Institution (“GBCI”) violated his rights under the Eighth Amendment, as well as state law by failing to protect him from harming himself and subjecting him to harsh conditions of confinement. Because Goodvine is incarcerated, his complaint must be screened under 28 U.S.C. § 1915A. After reviewing the complaint, the court concludes that Goodvine may proceed with claims under the Eighth Amendment and state law. As discussed below, the court will also require the state defendants to respond formally to Goodvine’s most recent motion for emergency injunctive relief arising out of a newly alleged “no officer contact” restriction, including (1) an explanation as to the nature of this restriction; (2) a report, affidavit or declaration from a psychiatrist that this restriction is consistent with Goodvine’s treatment needs; (3) the steps being taken to insure Goodvine is being adequately monitored for medical

or psychological needs; and (4) Goodvine's ability to (a) request medical or psychological care, or (b) prepare and file legal documents.

That being said, there is a threshold question whether this district is the most appropriate venue. In June 2016, Goodvine filed a case with claims and defendants substantially similar to those in this case. (*Goodvine v. Eckstein, et al.*, 16-cv-416-wmc.) Because GBCI is located in the Eastern District of Wisconsin, however, this court granted defendants' motion to transfer the case to that district. On September 7, 2016, that case was dismissed for Goodvine's failure to pay the filing fee. (*Goodvine v. Eckstein, et al.*, 16-cv-940-cnc, dkt. #20.)

Goodvine filed another case in the Eastern District on July 8, 2016, again challenging conditions and policies at GBCI and prison staff's alleged failure to protect him from harming himself. (*Goodvine v. Eckstein, et al.*, 16-cv-890-pp.) That case was screened in September 2016, and Goodvine was permitted to proceed on several claims. Additionally, the court held a hearing and issued an order granting in part and denying in part Goodvine's motion for a preliminary injunction, in which he challenged several of the same policies that he raises in the present case. (Dkt. #31, in 16-cv-890-pp.) The court also ordered mediation and recruited counsel for the limited purpose of mediating that case, although the mediation was ultimately canceled by order of the court and recruited counsel was released from her duty to represent Goodvine further. (Dkt. 68, in 16-cv-890-pp.) Indeed, that case remains pending.

Goodvine filed the present case on October 24, 2016, which appears to overlap substantially his pending Eastern District case, both factually and legally. Given that his claims also concern policies and incidents that occurred at GBCI and at a hospital in Green Bay, it is not clear why he has chosen to file in this district. Nonetheless, because venue does not appear to be improper in this district, the court will not transfer the case *sua sponte*. However, the

court will require the parties to address whether this case should be transferred and consolidated with the pending case in the Eastern District.

## ALLEGATIONS OF FACT<sup>1</sup>

### A. The Parties

At times relevant to his complaint, plaintiff Christopher Goodvine was confined at the Green Bay Correctional Institution (“GBCI”). He was transferred there in mid-March 2016. Goodvine has a long history of serious mental illness that causes him to engage in acts of self-harm. His suicidal and self-harming attempts often increase when he is incarcerated, particularly when he is held in segregation.

Most of the named defendants are employed at GBCI: S. Schueler is the deputy warden; S. Eckstien is the warden; J. Kind is the security director; Francois is the segregation unit manager; J. Lutsey is the health services manager; Dr. Ankarlo is the former psychological services director; Dr. Steven Schmidt is the current psychological services directors; Dr. Ching, Dr. Forbes and Dr. Schwartz-Oscar are psychologists; Captains M. Schultz and VanLanen are security supervisors; Dr. Ahen is a physician; Jane and John Does 1-4 and are nurses and/or nurse practitioners; and Bonin, Keiler-Hert and Mejia are correctional sergeants. Other state defendants include J. Litscher, Secretary of the Wisconsin Department of Corrections (“DOC”); C. Jess, the deputy secretary of DOC; J. Schwochert, an administrator with Division of Adult Institutions (“DAI”); Mike Saunders, the assistance security chief of DAI; and Kevin Kallas, the psychology chief of DOC and reviewing authority for mental-health related

---

<sup>1</sup> In addressing any pro se litigant’s complaint, the court must read the allegations generously. *Haines v. Kerner*, 404 U.S. 519, 521 (1972). For purposes of this order, the court assumes the facts above based on the allegations in Goodvine’s complaint.

grievances. Additionally, Goodvine seeks to sue St. Vincents Hospital and Jane/John Does 5-8, employees of St. Vincent's.

## **B. Policies and Practices Relating to Mentally Ill Inmates Housed at GBCI**

Goodvine alleges that GBCI and the DOC generally have several flawed policies and practices relating to severely mentally ill inmates housed at GBCI. In particular, he alleges that the following practices have worsened his mental illness, failed to protect him from harming himself and/or deprived him of needed mental health treatment:

- When prisoners are admitted to GBCI, they are not screened for mental health issues or given any global treatment plan to address serious mental illness or self-harming behaviors. Instead, GBCI allegedly discourages treatment plans and places inmates, like Goodvine, on “behavior plans,” which Goodvine says are essentially a promise from the prisoner not to harm himself.
- GBCI does not adequately control access to medications, even when it knows a prisoner is seriously mentally ill or prone to self-harm. Goodvine alleges that, despite staff knowing about his extensive history of self-harming behavior, no steps were taken to restrict his access to medications. On August 10, 2016, he overdosed on Tylenol.
- GBCI does not offer dialectical behavior therapy, a treatment that Goodvine had been participating in prior to his incarceration. Instead, GBCI offers “coping skills” training, which Goodvine alleges has not been beneficial to him.
- PSU psychologists, including Goodvine’s current psychologist, Dr. Ching, frequently make visits at the cell-front, rather than out of the cell, which Goodvine finds to be unhelpful.
- GBCI’s psychological services unit is understaffed, and the prison generally lacks the resources to provide adequate mental health care for prisoners with serious mental illnesses, like Goodvine, who need daily monitoring, medication assistance, intensive therapy and counseling and a therapeutic environment.
- The security staff at GBCI are not qualified to help prisoners, like Goodvine, who may engage in self-harming behavior for days on end; instead, Goodvine alleges that security staff are only qualified to respond when there is a need for emergency treatment.
- Because GBCI lacks resources to provide adequate mental health care, prison staff frequently resorts to placing suicidal or self-harming prisoners on observation status, where the prisoner’s access to property and other contact is severely limited. Goodvine

alleges that observation status is ineffective in addressing his underlying mental health care needs.

- The security staff responsible for monitoring prisoners on observation status are not qualified to do so and frequently neglect their duties. According to Goodvine, he frequently manages to continue harming himself while on observation status.
- Even when prisoners harm themselves on observation, they are not always given the emergency care they need. Goodvine alleges that he was denied emergency care by John/Jane Doe Nurses or Nurse Practitioners on at least two occasions after seriously harming himself while on observation status.
- GBCI uses 8-point restraints to restrain prisoners who are suicidal or self-harming. Goodvine alleges that the restraints are unnecessarily painful and humiliating, and that Warden Eckstein and Captain Schultz have admitted that the restraints are supposed to be “painful” and “unforgettable.” On two occasions, Captain VanLanen, Dr. Forbes and Dr. Schwartz-Oscar placed Goodvine in 8-point restraints despite knowing he had razor blades in his mouth. The razors cut his tongue and he choked.
- GBCI, and DOC generally, fail to transfer prisoners who need daily monitoring and care to Wisconsin Resource Center, which Goodvine believes is the only state facility that can provide the mental health care he needs.

### **C. Goodvine’s “No Officer Contact” Restriction**

Goodvine has been placed in an “isolation tank” with a “no officer contact” restriction. Goodvine alleges that Warden Eckstein and Security Director Kind admitted that the restrictions were imposed in retaliation for his filing a lawsuit against GBCI staff in the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Wisconsin and, in particular, for his submitting an affidavit by an GBCI employee in support of his claims. The effect of the restriction is that Goodvine is in a cell with no intercom to call staff in case of an emergency, and staff has been instructed not to speak with Goodvine. Instead, he is to communicate only with the unit sergeant when he needs assistance, but that sergeant is incredibly busy. Because of his cell placement, staff cannot hear him yelling for help in emergency situations. Goodvine generally sees the sergeant only three times a day, when the sergeant delivers his meals.

On at least two occasions in August 2016, Goodvine attempted to call guards for help and, when no one responded, he seriously hurt himself. He was hospitalized on both occasions.

#### **D. St. Vincent's Hospital**

After Goodvine overdosed on August 10, 2016, he was transported to the intensive care unit at St. Vincent's Hospital in Green Bay, Wisconsin, for treatment. Goodvine told hospital staff that he was suicidal and would attempt suicide again if given the opportunity. On August 11, he again told a nurse he was thinking of harming himself. A short time later, Goodvine lacerated his wrist. A nurse later noticed the profuse bleeding and contacted a physician who performed surgery to close the wound.

#### **E. September 2016 Incident**

On September 9, 2016, Goodvine reported to Sergeant Verheyen that he was going to "slice his throat" and cut himself in a few days. Sergeant Verheyen emailed Warden Eckstein, Deputy Warden Schueler, Security Director Kind, Unit Director Francois, Captain Schultz, PSU Director Dr. Ankarlo and Dr. Ching about Goodvine's statements. Goodvine alleges that, instead of helping him, Francois and Schultz reprimanded Verheyen for "documenting" Goodvine's threats.

On September 12, 2016, Goodvine cut his throat. He was placed on observation, where he should have been monitored by Captain Schultz. Goodvine alleges, however, that Schultz watched him cut himself for nearly an hour without intervening. Sergeants Keiler-Hertz and Mejia repeatedly told Schultz that Goodvine was hurting himself, but Schultz responded that he did not care. Keiler-Hertz and Mejia took no further action to help Goodvine.

## OPINION

The allegations in Goodvine's complaint can be grouped into four categories: (1) GBCI and DOC policies and practices fail to provide adequate mental health treatment for seriously mentally ill inmates and fail to protect them from harming themselves; (2) on several, specific occasions, various individual defendants failed to provide Goodvine with adequate treatment for his mental illnesses, subjected him to harsh conditions of confinement, or failed to respond appropriately to his threats or acts of self-harm; (3) individual defendants retaliated against Goodvine for filing a lawsuit challenging conditions at GBCI; and/or (4) St. Vincent's hospital staff failed to protect Goodvine from harming himself. Goodvine asserts claims for this alleged misconduct under the Eighth Amendment, First Amendment and state law.

As a preliminary matter, there is a question whether including all of these claims in a single lawsuit violates Rule 20 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure. Rule 20 prohibits a plaintiff from asserting unrelated claims against different defendants or sets of defendants in the same lawsuit. Multiple defendants may not be joined in a single action unless (1) the plaintiff asserts at least one claim for relief against each defendant that arises out of the same transaction or occurrence or series of transactions or occurrences; and (2) questions of law or fact are common to all. *George v. Smith*, 507 F.3d 605, 607 (7th Cir. 2007).

Goodvine's complaint includes multiple claims about different events, policies and incidents that occurred over a span of several months. On the other hand, although Goodvine includes allegations regarding specific instances in which he suffered harm, the primary focus of his complaint is the allegedly flawed policies and practices that *allowed* or *caused* those specific instances of harm to occur with one exception discussed below. Moreover, unlike in many prisoner lawsuits in which a plaintiff attempts to connect unrelated events through allegations

of conspiracy or unlawful policies, Goodvine’s pleadings contain a detailed and plausible explanation of how GBCI’s policies and practices caused, or at least contributed to, specific instances of harm. Under these circumstances, the court concludes that Rule 20 does not bar Goodvine from proceeding with his numerous claims within this lawsuit. Therefore, the court addresses each category of Goodvine’s claims below.

**I. Flawed Policies and Practices that Deny Access to Mental Health Treatment and Fail to Adequately Protect Prisoners from Self-Harm**

The Eighth Amendment imposes a duty on prison officials to provide “humane conditions of confinement” and to insure that “reasonable measures” are taken to guarantee inmate safety and prevent harm. *Farmer v. Brennan*, 511 U.S. 825, 834-35 (1994). Goodvine’s Eighth Amendment claims concerning the alleged flawed policies at GBCI are based on theories that defendants (1) fail to protect prisoners generally, and Goodvine in particular, from serious harm, and (2) fail to provide adequate mental health care to those with serious mental illnesses and self-harming tendencies.

An inmate may prevail on a claim under the Eighth Amendment by showing that the defendant acted with “deliberate indifference” to a “substantial risk of serious harm” to his health or safety. *Id.* at 836. Significant self-harm constitutes “serious harm.” *See Minix v. Canarecci*, 597 F.3d 824, 831 (7th Cir. 2010). Deliberate indifference to a risk of self-harm is present when an official is subjectively “aware of the significant likelihood that an inmate may imminently” harm himself, yet “fail[s] to take reasonable steps to prevent the inmate from performing the act.” *Pittman ex rel. Hamilton v. County of Madison, Ill.*, 746 F.3d 766, 775-76 (7th Cir. 2014) (citations omitted). *See also Rice ex rel. Rice v. Correctional Medical Services*, 675



F.3d 650, 665 (7th Cir. 2012) (“[P]rison officials have an obligation to intervene when they know a prisoner suffers from self-destructive tendencies.”).

The Eighth Amendment also gives prisoners the right to receive adequate medical care, *Estelle v. Gamble*, 429 U.S. 97 (1976), which includes a right to appropriate mental health treatment. *See Rice ex. Rel. Rice v. Correctional Medical Servs.*, 675 F.3d 650, 665 (7th Cir. 2012). To establish deliberate indifference under the Eighth Amendment on a denial of medical care claim, the plaintiff must demonstrate that: (1) he had a serious medical need; (2) defendants knew that plaintiff needed medical treatment; and (3) defendants consciously failed to take reasonable measures to provide the necessary treatment. *Forbes v. Edgar*, 112 F.3d 262, 266 (7th Cir. 1997).

Goodvine alleges that several of the defendants should be liable for implementing or enforcing deficient policies and practices relating to those GBCI inmates suffering from a severe mental illness. Specifically, he alleges that the following defendants are aware that GBCI’s current policies and practices (as already described in Part B of this opinion) fail to provide adequate mental health treatment and fail to protect him and other inmates with self-harming tendencies: Warden Eckstein; Deputy Warden Schueler; Security Director Kind; Unit Director Francois; HSU Manager Lutsey; PSU Directors Dr. Ankarlo and Dr. Schmidt; Dr. Ching; Captains Schultz and VanLanen; Secretary Litscher; Deputy Secretary Jess; Administrator Schwochert; Assistance Security Chief Saunders; and Chief of Psychology Kallas. Goodvine further alleges that these defendants had the ability to make or recommend needed changes to policies to provide more effective treatment to plaintiff and others, but failed to do so. At this stage, these allegations are sufficient to state Eighth Amendment claims against each of these defendants.

## **II. Specific Incidents of Injury**

In addition to Goodvine's allegations and claims challenging security and mental health treatment policies, Goodvine includes allegations regarding several, specific instances when prison staff allegedly failed to respond adequately to a serious risk that he would harm himself or failed to provide him with necessary medical or psychological attention. Goodvine's allegations are sufficient to state a claim for deliberate indifference, under the standard set forth above, against the following defendants:

- Dr. Forbes, Dr. Schwartz-Oscar, Captain VanLanen, Warden Eckstein, Deputy Warden Schueler, Security Director Kind and HSU Manager Lutsey for their alleged decision on two occasions to place Goodvine in 8-point restraints despite knowing that he had razors in his mouth;
- Warden Eckstein, Deputy Warden Schueler, Security Director Kind, Captain Schultz, and Unit Director Francois for allegedly instituting the "no officer contact" rule that resulted in Goodvine suffering serious injury on August 13 and 16, 2016;
- John/Jane Does Nurses or Nurse Practicioners 1-4 for allegedly failing to provide emergency medical treatment on two occasions in which Goodvine lacerated his arms; and
- Warden Eckstein, Deputy Warden Schueler, Security Director Kind, Captain Schultz, Unit Director Francois, Dr. Ankarlo, Dr. Ching and Sergeants Keiler-Hertz and Mejia for allegedly failing to protect Goodvine from harm on September 12, 2016.

## **III. Supplemental State Law Claims and State Defendants.**

Goodvine also seeks leave to proceed on Wisconsin negligence claims based on the above allegations. The exercise of supplemental jurisdiction is appropriate when the state law claims are "so related" to the federal claims that "they form part of the same case or controversy." 28 U.S.C. § 1367(a). In other words, where a district court has original jurisdiction over a civil action, such as a § 1983 claim, it also has supplemental jurisdiction

over related state law claims under 28 U.S.C. § 1367(a), so long as the state claims “derive from a common nucleus of operative fact” with the original federal claims. *Wisconsin v. Ho-Chunk Nation*, 512 F.3d 921, 936 (7th Cir. 2008).

Here, Goodvine’s negligence claims generally stem from the same common nucleus of operative facts underlying his claims that defendants violated his rights under the Eighth Amendment. Wisconsin negligence claims include the following four elements: (1) a breach of (2) a duty owed (3) causing (4) harm to the plaintiff. *Paul v. Skemp*, 2001 WI 42, ¶ 17, 242 Wis. 2d 507, 625 N.W.2d 860. With the exception of events involving actions by staff at St. Vincent’s and certain of its nurses. Goodvine’s allegations are sufficient to state a claim under this standard. Therefore, the court will allow him to proceed on state-law claims against Warden Eckstein, Deputy Warden Schueler, Security Director Kind, Unit Director Francois, HSU Manager Lutsey, PSU Directors Dr. Ankarlo and Dr. Schmidt, Dr. Ching, Captains Schultz and VanLanen, Secretary Litscher, Deputy Secretary Jess, Administrator Schwochert, Assistance Security Chief Saunders, Chief of Psychology Kallas, Dr. Forbes, Dr. Schwartz-Oscar, John/Jane Does Nurses or Nurse Practicioners 1-4, and Sergeants Keiler-Hertz and Mejia, based on the same allegations that support his Eighth Amendment claims.

In addition to his negligence claims against state defendants, Goodvine seeks to proceed against St. Vincent’s Hospital and Jane/John Does 5-8, employees of St. Vincent’s, based on his allegations that they failed to protect him from harming himself while he was a patient there on August 10 and 11, 2016. While Goodvine’s allegations are sufficient to state negligence claims against these defendants, *see Snyder v. Injured Patients and Families Compensation Fund*, 2009 WI App 86, ¶ 20, 320 Wis. 2d 259, 768 N.W.2d 271, they do not overlap his Eighth Amendment claims against the state defendants. Moreover, these

defendants are factually distinct in a number of important respects, not least of which is that they are functioning under another institutions policies and procedures. Accordingly, for reasons under both Rule 20 and considerations of the discretionary exercise of supplemental jurisdiction, the court will dismiss the claims against St. Vincent's and its employees. Therefore, Goodvine may not proceed with negligence claims against these defendants.

#### **IV. Retaliation**

Goodvine also contends that Warden Eckstein and Security Director Kind placed him in isolation and instituted a “no officer contact” restriction in retaliation for his filing a lawsuit against GBCI staff. To state a claim for retaliation, a plaintiff must: (1) identify a constitutionally protected activity in which he was engaged; (2) identify one or more retaliatory actions taken by defendant that would likely deter a person of “ordinary firmness” from engaging in the protected activity in the future; and (3) allege sufficient facts that would make it plausible to infer that plaintiff's protected activity was a motivating factor in defendant's decision to take retaliatory action. *Bridges v. Gilbert*, 557 F.3d 541, 555-56 (7th Cir. 2009) (citing *Woodruff v. Mason*, 542 F.3d 545, 551 (7th Cir. 2008)).

Even more specifically, prison officials may not retaliate against a prisoner for filing lawsuits against those officials. *See, e.g., Higgs v. Carver*, 286 F.3d 437, 439 (7th Cir. 2002); *Babcock v. White*, 102 F.3d 267, 276 (7th Cir. 1996). Since this is essentially what Goodvine alleges happened, the court will allow him to proceed with his retaliation claim against Eckstein and Kind.

## **V. Remaining Defendants**

Goodvine's complaint also names Dr. Ahen and Sergeant Bonin as defendants, but fails to include any allegations against them that would support a claim for relief. Accordingly, those defendants will also be dismissed.

## **VII. Motions for Emergency Relief**

In addition to his complaint, Goodvine has filed two motions for emergency injunctive relief. In his first motion, filed on March 23, 2017, Goodvine alleged that he had recently been transferred to Dodge Correctional Institution ("DCI") and placed in harsh conditions of confinement that were detrimental to his mental health. (Dkt. #4.) Because Goodvine has since been transferred back to GBCI, however, that request for emergency relief appears to be moot and will be denied.

In his second motion, filed on June 27, 2017, Goodvine asked the court to immediately screen his complaint and schedule a preliminary injunction hearing because: (1) he is extremely suicidal and has been placed in a segregation cell with a "no officer contact" restriction, apparently meaning that officers are not permitted to speak to or interact with him; (2) his cell has no emergency call button and officers cannot hear him yelling for help, which resulted in him seriously harming himself on June 22, 2017; (3) he is at imminent risk of suicide; and (4) he has been denied permission to contact the court, though a concerned officer helped him file this motion. (Dkt. #7.)

In light of the severity of Goodvine's claims, on June 27, 2017, Magistrate Judge Crocker ordered the Attorney General's office to alert DOC officials of the situation. (Dkt. #8.) On June 28, 2017, the Attorney General's office responded that it had contacted GBCI

administration, who had reported that “they are taking all actions that they have deemed appropriate to ensure Mr. Goodvine’s safety.” (Dkt. #9.) The letter provides no further explanation of what “actions” have been taken; nor does it address the specific concerns raised in Goodvine’s motion.

Because Goodvine’s allegations are extremely concerning, the court will direct the state defendants to respond to the specific allegations in his motion and will schedule a telephone conference to discuss Goodvine’s current status. At the conference, the court will also discuss with the parties whether this case should be transferred to the Eastern District.

## ORDER

IT IS ORDERED that:

- (1) Plaintiff Christopher Goodvine is GRANTED leave to proceed on the following claims:
  - a) Eighth Amendment and state negligence claims, as identified in the above opinion, against Warden Eckstein, Deputy Warden Schueler, Security Director Kind, Unit Director Francois, HSU Manager Lutsey, PSU Directors Dr. Ankarlo and Dr. Schmidt, Dr. Ching, Captains Schultz and VanLanen, Secretary Litscher, Deputy Secretary Jess, Administrator Schwochert, Assistance Security Chief Saunders, Chief of Psychology Kallas, Dr. Forbes, Dr. Schwartz-Oscar, John/Jane Does Nurses or Nurse Practicioners 1-4, and Sergeants Keiler-Hertz and Mejia; and
  - b) First Amendment retaliation claims against Warden Eckstein and Security Director Kind.
- (2) Plaintiff is DENIED leave to proceed on all other claims and defendants Dr. Ahen, Sergeant Bonin and against St. Vincent’s Hospital and Jane/John Does 5-8 are DISMISSED from this case without prejudice.
- (3) Plaintiff’s motion for emergency relief (dkt. #4) is DENIED as moot.
- (4) Pursuant to an informal service agreement between the Wisconsin Department of Justice and this court, copies of plaintiff’s complaint and this order are being sent today to the Attorney General for service on the state defendants. Under

the agreement, the Department of Justice will have 40 days from the date of the Notice of Electronic Filing in this order to answer or otherwise plead to plaintiff's complaint if it accepts service for the defendants.

- (5) The state defendants are directed to file a response to plaintiff's motion for a preliminary injunction (dkt. #7), by July 17, 2017. A telephone conference will be held on July 21, 2017, at 1:30 p.m. to discuss, among other things: the status of plaintiff's placement at GBCI; whether an evidentiary hearing is needed to resolve plaintiff's motion for a preliminary injunction; and whether this case should be transferred to the Eastern District of Wisconsin. Defendants' counsel shall be responsible for initiating that call.
- (6) For the time being, plaintiff must send the defendants a copy of every paper or document he files with the court. Once plaintiff has learned what lawyer will be representing the defendants, he should serve the lawyer directly rather than the defendants. The court will disregard any documents submitted by plaintiff unless plaintiff shows on the court's copy that he has sent a copy to the defendants or to defendants' attorney.
- (7) Plaintiff should keep a copy of all documents for his own files. If plaintiff does not have access to a photocopy machine, he may send out identical handwritten or typed copies of his documents.
- (8) If plaintiff is transferred or released while this case is pending, it is his obligation to inform the court of his new address. If he fails to do this and defendants or the court are unable to locate him, his case may be dismissed for failure to prosecute.

Entered this 5th day of July, 2017.

BY THE COURT:

/s/

WILLIAM M. CONLEY  
District Judge