

Robert L. Farb
School of Government
November 4 and 7, 2016

Fourth Circuit Court of Appeals

(Note: You may access the court's opinion by clicking on the case name)

Court Rules That Jail Officials Violated Pretrial Detainee's Due Process Rights When They Failed to Provide Hearing in Connection With His Placements in Disciplinary Segregation

[Dilworth v. Adams](#), ___ F.3d ___, 2016 WL 6575076 (4th Cir. Nov. 7, 2016). The plaintiff was a pretrial detainee in a North Carolina detention facility. While awaiting trial, he spent a total of 85 days in disciplinary segregation as punishment for two disciplinary infractions, one arising from an altercation with another inmate and one from an altercation with detention officers. He was not afforded a hearing in connection with either of his placements in disciplinary segregation.

The plaintiff sued various detention facility officials in a North Carolina federal district court alleging that the imposition of disciplinary segregation without a hearing violated his procedural due process rights. The federal district court granted summary judgment to the defendants, reasoning that due process requirements were satisfied by the plaintiff's opportunity to file a written appeal after he was placed in disciplinary segregation.

The fourth circuit reversed the district court and ruled that as a pretrial detainee, the plaintiff was entitled to a hearing before he was punished. The court noted, however, that officials are not barred from taking immediate action, without a prior hearing, in response to altercations. For example, taking preventative actions to segregate a detainee after a fight or disruption.

Court Makes Several Rulings on Summary Judgment Involving Federal Prisoner's Civil Lawsuit Against Doctor and Federal Prison Officials for Damages Involving Alleged Indifference to His Medical or Dietary Needs

[Scinto v. Stansberry](#), ___ F.3d ___, 2016 WL 6543368 (4th Cir. Nov. 4, 2016). The plaintiff, who had been a federal prisoner, sued a doctor who had treated him in prison and various prison officials in which he alleged that they had been deliberately indifferent under the Eighth Amendment to his medical or dietary needs. The federal district court granted summary judgment to all defendants. The fourth circuit reversed the grants of summary judgment involving the doctor and one prison official concerning medical needs, which included (1) the alleged failure to provide insulin, and (2) the alleged failure to provide aid when he was vomiting blood and incontinent during a lockdown. It also ruled that neither the doctor nor the prison official were not entitled to qualified immunity. It affirmed the grant of summary judgment for another prison official involving the alleged failure to provide a special diabetic diet.