

NONPRECEDENTIAL DISPOSITION

To be cited only in accordance with FED. R. APP. P. 32.1

United States Court of Appeals

For the Seventh Circuit

Chicago, Illinois 60604

Submitted May 27, 2025*

Decided May 28, 2025

Before

DIANE S. SYKES, *Chief Judge*

FRANK H. EASTERBROOK, *Circuit Judge*

JOHN Z. LEE, *Circuit Judge*

No. 24-2194

CHAD CUTLER,
Plaintiff-Appellant,

v.

ANTHONY WILLIS,
Defendant-Appellee.

Appeal from the United States District
Court for the Southern District of
Illinois.

No. 3:23-cv-03127-GCS

Gilbert C. Sison,
Magistrate Judge.

ORDER

Chad Cutler, an Illinois prisoner, appeals the denial of his request for a preliminary injunction. While this appeal was pending, Cutler was transferred to another prison, and so we dismiss the appeal as moot.

* We have agreed to decide the case without oral argument because the briefs and record adequately present the facts and legal arguments, and oral argument would not significantly aid the court. FED. R. APP. P. 34(a)(2)(C).

In September 2023, Cutler sued the warden of Menard Correctional Center for injunctive relief and money damages, alleging a violation of his rights under the Eighth Amendment. *See* 42 U.S.C. § 1983. In his complaint, Cutler said that he experiences “catatonic episodes” — periods during which he slips into a “trancelike” state and becomes paralyzed — and that the warden deliberately ignored his numerous requests for medical care to address the episodes.

The following month, Cutler moved for a preliminary injunction to compel the warden to place him in a single-occupancy cell until a full medical evaluation was completed. A magistrate judge, acting with the parties’ consent, *see* 28 U.S.C. § 636(c), held a hearing and denied the motion. The judge determined that Cutler did not show that he was likely to succeed on the merits (because the prison was addressing his medical concern), that the remedies at law were inadequate, or that irreparable harm would result if the injunction were denied.

Cutler twice moved for reconsideration, but the judge denied both motions because Cutler did not identify any reason to disturb the ruling.

Cutler appeals the interlocutory order denying his motion for a preliminary injunction. *See* 28 U.S.C. § 1292(a)(1). But seven months after filing his opening brief, he was transferred from Menard to Western Illinois Correctional Center.¹ Cutler’s transfer to a different institution moots his claim for injunctive relief, which pertains only to the specific conditions at Menard. *See Calhoun v. DeTella*, 319 F.3d 936, 939 (7th Cir. 2003); *see also Lehn v. Holmes*, 364 F.3d 862, 871–72 (7th Cir. 2004).

DISMISSED

¹ *See* Illinois Department of Corrections, Individual in Custody Search, <https://idoc.illinois.gov/offender/inmatesearch.html> (search for “Chad Cutler” last performed May 15, 2025).