

LEXSEE 404 U.S. 519,AT 521

**HAINES v. KERNER ET AL.**

**No. 70-5025**

**SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES**

***404 U.S. 519; 92 S. Ct. 594; 30 L. Ed. 2d 652; 1972 U.S. LEXIS 99; 16 Fed. R. Serv. 2d (Callaghan) 1***

**December 6, 1971, Argued**

**January 13, 1972, Decided**

**PRIOR HISTORY:**

CERTIORARI TO THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE SEVENTH CIRCUIT.

**DISPOSITION:**

*427 F.2d 71*, reversed and remanded.

**CASE SUMMARY**

**PROCEDURAL POSTURE:** Petitioner inmate sought review of a decision by the United States Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit, which affirmed dismissal of his action under *42 U.S.C.S. § 1983* and *28 U.S.C.S. § 1343(3)* against respondents, state officers and prison officials.

**OVERVIEW:** The inmate sought to recover damages for claimed injuries and deprivation of rights while he was incarcerated under a previous judgment. The inmate's pro se complaint was premised on the alleged action of prison officials placing him in solitary confinement after he had struck another inmate on the head with a shovel. The complaint included general allegations of physical injuries suffered while the inmate was in disciplinary confinement and denial of due process in the steps leading to that confinement. The district court dismissed the complaint for failure to state a claim upon which relief could be granted, suggesting that only under exceptional circumstances could courts inquire into the internal operations of state penitentiaries and concluding that the inmate had failed to show a deprivation of federally protected rights. The inmate contended that the district court erred in dismissing his complaint without allowing him to present evidence on his claims. The court held that the inmate's allegations were sufficient to require that he be provided the opportunity to offer supporting evidence.

**OUTCOME:** The district court's judgment was reversed and remanded.

**CORE TERMS:** pro se, prison, inmate, disciplinary, deprivation, confinement, physical injuries

**SUMMARY:**

An Illinois State Penitentiary inmate sued state officials pro se in the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Illinois, seeking damages for a deprivation of his civil rights and alleging (1) a denial of due process in the steps leading to his solitary confinement and (2) physical injuries suffered while in solitary confinement. The District Court dismissed the complaint for failure to state a claim upon which relief could be granted, and the United States Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit affirmed (*427 F2d 71*).

On certiorari, the United States Supreme Court reversed. In a per curiam opinion, expressing the unanimous views of the court, it was held that since it did not appear beyond doubt that the inmate could prove no set of facts in support of his claim which would entitle him to relief, he was entitled to an opportunity to offer proof.

Powell and Rehnquist, JJ., did not participate.

**LEXIS HEADNOTES - Classified to U.S. Digest Lawyers' Edition:**

**[\*\*\*HN1]**

PLEADING § 130  
pro se complaint --

Headnote: [1]

The United States Supreme Court holds allegations of a pro se complaint to less stringent standards than formal pleadings drafted by lawyers.

**[\*\*\*HN2]**

PLEADING § 130  
failure to state a claim --

Headnote: [2]

A complaint should not be dismissed for failure to state a claim unless it appears beyond doubt that the plaintiff can prove no set of facts in support of his claim which would entitle him to relief.

**[\*\*\*HN3]**

CIVIL RIGHTS § 10

PLEADING § 179  
solitary confinement --

Headnote: [3]

In a suit under 42 USC 1983, which gives a right of action for the deprivation of civil rights under color of state law, a state penitentiary inmate is entitled to an opportunity to offer proof under his pro se allegations that he was denied due process in the steps leading to his solitary confinement and that in solitary confinement he was forced to sleep on the floor of a cell with only blankets, which aggravated a pre-existing foot injury and a circulatory ailment.

**SYLLABUS:**

Prisoner's *pro se* complaint seeking to recover damages for claimed physical injuries and deprivation of rights in imposing disciplinary confinement should not have been dismissed without affording him the opportunity to present evidence on his claims.

**COUNSEL:**

Stanley A. Bass, by appointment of the *Court*, 401 U.S. 1008, argued the cause for petitioner. With him on the briefs were Jack Greenberg, James M. Nabrit III, William B. Turner, Alice Daniel, and Max Stern.

Warren K. Smoot, Assistant Attorney General of Illinois, argued the cause for respondents pro hac vice. With him on the brief were William J. Scott, Attorney General, Joel M. Flaum, First Assistant Attorney General, and James B. Zagel, Morton E. Friedman, and Jayne A. Carr, Assistant Attorneys General.

Briefs of amici curiae were filed by Charles H. Baron for Boston College Center for Corrections and the Law, and by Julian Tepper and Marshall J. Hartman for the National Law Office of the National Legal Aid and Defender Assn.

**OPINIONBY:**

PER CURIAM

**OPINION:**

**[\*519]** Petitioner, an inmate at the Illinois State Penitentiary, Menard, Illinois, commenced this action against the Governor of Illinois and other state officers and prison officials under the Civil Rights Act of 1871, 17 Stat. 13, 42 U. S. C. § 1983, and 28 U. S. C. § 1343 (3), seeking to recover damages for claimed injuries and deprivation of rights while incarcerated under a judgment not challenged here. **[\*520]** Petitioner's *pro se* complaint was premised on alleged action of prison officials placing him in solitary confinement as a disciplinary measure after he had struck another inmate on the head with a shovel following a verbal altercation. The assault by petitioner on another inmate is not denied. Petitioner's *pro se* complaint included general allegations of physical injuries suffered while in disciplinary confinement and denial of due process in the steps leading to that confinement. The claimed physical suffering was aggravation of a pre-existing foot injury and a circulatory ailment caused by forcing him to sleep on the floor of his cell with only blankets.

The District Court granted respondents' motion under Rule 12 (b)(6) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure to dismiss the complaint for failure to state a claim upon which relief could be granted, suggesting that only under exceptional circumstances should courts inquire into the internal operations of state penitentiaries and concluding that petitioner had failed to show a deprivation of federally protected rights. The Court of Appeals affirmed, emphasizing that prison officials are vested with "wide discretion" in disciplinary matters. We granted certiorari and appointed [\*\*\*654] counsel to represent petitioner. The only issue now before us is petitioner's contention that the District Court erred in dismissing his *pro se* complaint without allowing him to present evidence on his claims.

[\*\*\*HR1] [\*\*\*HR2] Whatever may be the limits on the scope of inquiry of courts into the internal administration of prisons, allegations such as those asserted by petitioner, [\*\*596] however inartfully pleaded, are sufficient to call for the opportunity to offer supporting evidence. We cannot say with assurance that under the allegations of the *pro se* complaint, which we hold to less stringent standards than formal pleadings drafted by lawyers, it appears [\*521] "beyond doubt that the plaintiff can prove no set of facts in support of his claim which would entitle him to relief." *Conley v. Gibson*, 355 U.S. 41, 45-46 (1957). See *Dioguardi v. Durning*, 139 F.2d 774 (CA2 1944).

[\*\*\*HR3] Accordingly, although we intimate no view whatever on the merits of petitioner's allegations, we conclude that he is entitled to an opportunity to offer proof. The judgment is reversed and the case is remanded for further proceedings consistent herewith.

*Reversed and remanded.*

MR. JUSTICE POWELL and MR. JUSTICE REHNQUIST took no part in the consideration or decision of this case.