26-6030

PROVIDED TO CHARLOTTE CORRECTIONAL INSTITUTION ON 8-19-26 FOR MAILING BY [illegible] S.J.

ORIGINAL

FILED
AUG 19 2026
OFFICE OF THE CLERK
SUPREME COURT, U.S.

IN THE

SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

No.

SHAQUON R. JOHNSON,

Petitioner,

— against —

M. COLLINS, et al.,

Respondents.

PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI TO THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE ELEVENTH CIRCUIT

RECEIVED
SEP - 1 2026
OFFICE OF THE CLERK
SUPREME COURT, U.S.

[signature] #C07844
Shaquon Johnson-DC#C07844
Charlotte Correctional Inst.
33123 Oil Well Road
Punta Gorda, Florida 33955

QUESTION PRESENTED

1. Whether the respondents A. Acevedo, M. Collins, C. Wiess, M. Hall, E. Gilliom, and M. C. Hughes caused Petitioner to suffer from unnecessary and wanton infliction of pain.

2. Whether the respondents A. Acevedo, M. Collins, C. Wiess, M. Hall, E. Gilliom, and M. C. Hughes showed deliberate indifferences to Petitioner's serious medical needs.

~ PARTIES ~

1. The Petitioner is Shaquon R. Johnson, a prisoner currently at Charlotte Correctional Institution.

2. The Respondents are A. Acevedo, the MD, C. Weiss, the HSP, E. Gilliam, the Admin. Asst., M. C. Hughes, the HSA, M. Collins, the ARNP, and M. Hall, the LISC.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1. Questions Presented - page. 3

2. Parties - page. 4

3. Table of Authorities - page. 5

4. Decisions Below - page. 6

5. Jurisdiction - page. 6

6. Constitutional and Statutory Provisions Involved - page. 6

7. Statement of the Case - page. 7

8. Basis for Federal Jurisdiction - page. 7

9. Reasons for Granting the Writ - page. 7
   A. Conflicts with Decisions of Other Courts
   B. Importance of the Question Presented

10. Conclusion - page. 9

11. Certificate of Oath - page. 10

12. Certificate of Service - page. 10

Appendix:

13. Decision of the United States Court of Appeals

14. Order of the United States District Court

∞ TABLE OF AUTHORITIES ∞

1. Bass V. Wallenstien, 769 F.2d 1173, 1184-86 (7th Cir. 1985).
2. Greeno V. Daley, 414 F.3d 645, 655 (7th Cir. 2005).
3. McElligot V. Foley, 182 F.3d 1248, 1256-57 (11th Cir. 1999).

DECISIONS BELOW

1. Petitioner asserts that the decision of the United States Court of Appeals for the Eleventh Circuit is unreported.

2. Petitioner further asserts that the order of the United States District Court for the Middle District of Florida is also not reported.

JURISDICTION

1. Petitioner asserts that the Judgement of the United States Court of Appeals for the Eleventh Circuit was entered on June 18th, 2026.

2. Petitioner asserts that Jurisdiction is conferred by 28 U.S.C. 1254.

CONSTITUTIONAL AND STATUTORY PROVISIONS INVOLVED

1. Petitioner asserts that this case involves Amendment VIII to the United States Constitution which provides:

"Excessive bail shall not be required, nor excessive fines imposed, nor cruel and unusual punishments inflicted."

2. Petitioner asserts that the Amendment is enforced by Title 42, Section 1983, United States Code:

"Every person, who under color of any statue, ordinance, regulation, custom, or usuage of any State or Territory or the District of Columbia, subjects, or causes to be subjected, any citizen of the United States or other person within the jurisdiction thereof to the deprivation of any rights, privileges, or immunities secured by the Constitution and laws, shall be liable to the party injured in an action of law, suit in equity, or other proper proceeding for redress, except that in any action brought against a judicial officer for an act or omission taken in such officer's judicial capacity injunctive relief shall not be granted unless a declaratory decree was violated or declaratory relief was unavailable for the purposes of this section, any Act of Congress applicable exclusively to the District of Columbia shall be considered to be a Statue of the District of Columbia."

STATEMENT OF THE CASE

1. Petitioner Complaint alleges that since the Year of 2019 he has been Suffering from Severe abdominal pain, bloating, indigestion, vomiting, and diarrah.

2. Petitioner Complaint also alleges that he Submitted numerous Sick call requests in regards to his medical condition and the medical staff repeatedly placed him on the Same medications that was only providing him with temporary relief from his Symptoms. But not healing his overall Condition.

3. Petitioner Complaint further alleges that he filed numerous grievances in regards to his medical condition and the medical staff Showed deliberate indifferences by failing to thoroughly investigate into his Complaints to ensure that he was being provided with adequate medical treatment for his medical Condition.

4. Petitioner's Complaint was dismissed by the District Court on the grounds that merely denying a grievance does not render one liable for the Constitutional violations occured and that he fails to State a plausible 1983 Claim for deliberate indifference.

5. Petitioner appealed to the Eleventh Circuit of Appeals and the Court of Appeals dismissed his appeal.

BASIS FOR FEDERAL JURISDICTION

1. Petitioner asserts that this case raises a question of interpretation of the Eight Amendment to the United States Constitution.

2. Petitioner further asserts that the District Court had Jurisdiction under the general Federal question Jurisdiction Conferred by 28 U.S.C. 1331.

REASONS FOR GRANTING THE WRIT

A. Conflicts with Decisions of Other Courts:

1. Petitioner asserts that the holding of the District Court that he failed to State a Claim for relief against the respondents A. Acevedo, M. Collins, E. Gilliom, M. Hall, C. Wiess, and T.C. Hughes is directly in Contrary to the holding of other Courts because the respondents

A. Acevedo, M. Collins, E. Gilliam, M. Hall, C. Wiess, and M. C. Hughes caused him to suffer from unnessary and wanton infliction of pain, which proves that he did in fact stated a claim of deliberate indifferences because the Supreme Court has stated that "deliberate indifference to serious medical needs of prisoners constitutes the 'unnecessary and wanton infliction of pain'... proscribed by the Eight Amendment." See McElligot V. Foley, 182 F. 3d 1248, 1256-57 (11th Cir. 1999) (holding failure to treat severe pain could constitute deliberate indifference). See also Greeno V. Daley, 414 F. 3d 645, 655 (7th Cir. 2005) (holding refusal to refer prisoner to a specialist or order endoscopy for two years despite intense abdominal pain could be deliberate indifference).

2. Petitioner further asserts that the holding of the District Court that merely denying a grievance does not the respondents A. Acevedo, [redacted] M. Hall, C. Wiess, E. Gilliam, and M. C. Hughes liable for the constitutional violations set forth in his complaint is also directly in contrary to the holding of other Courts because had the respondents A. Acevedo, M. Hall, C. Wiess, [redacted] M. C. Hughes, and E. Gilliam thoroughly investigated into his complaints, then he would have been provided with adequate medical treatment. See Bass v. Wallenstein, 769 F. 2d 1173, 1184-86 (7th Cir. 1985) (holding administrators could be held deliberately indifferent based on thier knowledge of deficiences in medical care system).

B. Importance of the Question Presented:

1. Petitioner asserts that this case presents a fundamental question of interpretation to determine as to whether or not did he state a claim for relief against the respondents A. Acevedo, M. Hall, C. Wiess, M. Collins, E. Gilliam, and M. C. Hughes.

2. Petitioner asserts that this question is important because it would determine if the Lower Tribunal Court errored by dismissing his complaint and if the Eleventh Circuit Court of Appeals errored by dismissing his complaint.

3. Petitioner asserts that he did in fact stated a plausible claim for deliberate indifference because the respondents A. Acevedo, M. Hall, C. Wiess, M. Collins, E.

Gilliom, and M. C. Hughes failed to ensure that he was being provided with adequate medical treatment, which caused him to suffer from unnecessary and wanton infliction of pain. See Greeno V. Daley, 414 F.3d 645, 655 (7th Cir. 2005) (holding refusal to refer prisoner to a specialist or order endoscopy for two years despite intense abdominal pain could be deliberate indifference).

4. Petitioner asserts that this case also presents a fundamental question of interpretation of the Eight Amendment, which holds that Supervisory officials may be held for deliberate indifference if they "knew of and disregards an excessive risk to inmate health or safety".

5. Petitioner asserts that his Complaint clearly shows that he has in fact met the requirements to satisfy a deliberate indifference claim against the respondents A. Acevedo, M. Hall, C. Wiess, E. Gilliom, and M. C. Hughes because he informed them via grievance on numerous occasions that he was being denied adequate medical treatment and they took no action to ensure that his medical needs were met. See Bass V. Wallenstien, 769 F.2d 1173, 1184-86 (7th Cir. 1985) (holding administrators could be held deliberately indifferent based on thier knowledge of deficiencies in medical care system).

6. Petitioner further asserts that his Complaint will also show that the respondents A. Acevedo, M. Hall, C. Wiess, E. Gilliom, and M. C. Hughes were all made aware of the facts from which the inference could be drawn that a substantial risk of serious harm exist and they failed to drow the inference by not investigating into his Complaints, which subjected him to unneccessary and wanton infliction of pain.

CONCLUSION

For the foregoing reasons, Certiorari should be granted in this case.