

**UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE SIXTH CIRCUIT**

Deborah S. Hunt
Clerk

100 EAST FIFTH STREET, ROOM 540
POTTER STEWART U.S. COURTHOUSE
CINCINNATI, OHIO 45202-3988

Tel. (513) 564-7000
www.ca6.uscourts.gov

Filed: August 03, 2020

Mr. John T. Bragg
Grafton Correctional Institution
2500 S. Avon Belden Road
Grafton, OH 44044

Mr. David Joseph Carey
American Civil Liberties Union of Ohio Foundation
1108 City Park Avenue
Suite 203
Columbus, OH 43206

Mr. Benjamin Michael Flowers
Mr. Shams Hanif Hirji
Ms. Mindy Ann Worly
Ohio Attorney General's Office
30 E. Broad Street, 17th Floor
Columbus, OH 43215

Mr. Gregory F. Laufer
Paul, Weiss, Rifkind, Wharton & Garrison
1285 Avenue of the Americas
New York, NY 10019-6064

Ms. Freda Levenson
ACLU of Ohio
4506 Chester Avenue
Cleveland, OH 44103

Mr. Jeffrey D. Mann
Grafton Correctional Institution
2500 S. Avon Belden Road
Grafton, OH 44044

Mr. Eric Pastrano
Grafton Correctional Institution
2500 S. Avon Belden Road
Grafton, OH 44044

Ms. Jennifer Wedekind
American Civil Liberties Union
915 15th Street, N.W.
7th Floor
Washington, DC 20005

Re: Case No. 19-4060, *Jeffrey Mann, et al v. Ohio Dept of Rehabilitation, et al*
Originating Case No. : 2:18-cv-01565

Dear Counsel,

The Court issued the enclosed opinion today in this case.

Sincerely yours,

s/Cathryn Lovely
Opinions Deputy

cc: Mr. Richard W. Nagel

Enclosure

Mandate to issue

NOT RECOMMENDED FOR PUBLICATION

File Name: 20a0452n.06

Case No. 19-4060

**UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE SIXTH CIRCUIT**

JEFFREY D. MANN; JOHN T. BRAGG;)
ERIC PASTRANO,)

Plaintiffs-Appellants,)

v.)

OHIO DEPARTMENT OF)
REHABILITATION AND CORRECTION;)
MONA C. PARKS; GARY C. MOHR; DAVID)
HANNAH; JANICE DOUGLAS, Doctor;)
ANDREW D. EDDY, Doctor; ANNETTE)
CHAMBERS-SMITH; GRAFTON)
CORRECTIONAL INSTITUTE HEALTH)
CARE ADMINISTRATOR,)

Defendants-Appellees.)

ON APPEAL FROM THE UNITED
STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR
THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF
OHIO

BEFORE: BOGGS, SUTTON, and WHITE, Circuit Judges.

PER CURIAM. Some Ohio prisoners suffer from Hepatitis C, a slow-moving infection that can cause serious harm in some people. Ohio monitors all infected prisoners and provides at least some prisoners state-of-the-art medication when a particular test indicates the disease has reached a certain stage. Three Ohio prisoners with Hepatitis C, each denied this medication when they asked for it, filed this putative class action under the Eighth (and Fourteenth) Amendment, challenging Ohio’s policy for allocating the medication. They sought damages and an injunction

Case No. 19-4060, *Mann, et al., v. Ohio Dep't of Rehab. and Corr., et al.*

compelling the defendants to provide the medication. The district court rejected their claims as a matter of law on the ground that no Eighth Amendment violation occurred.

After the three plaintiffs appealed that judgment, a few things happened. One: each of the named plaintiffs received at least some of the medication they asked for. That means their request for an injunction may be moot; we have no authority to compel the defendants to do something they have already done. *See Fialka-Feldman v. Oakland Univ. Bd. of Trs.*, 639 F.3d 711, 714 (6th Cir. 2011). Two: the defendants have raised qualified immunity as a defense to the plaintiffs' request for money damages. Because they did not raise the issue until now, the district court did not have an opportunity to consider the second prong of the defense: whether the defendants violated "clearly established law." *Taylor v. Barkes*, 135 S. Ct. 2042, 2044 (2015). Three: the Ohio Department of Rehabilitation and Correction has modified its protocols for treating Hepatitis C. According to representations from counsel at oral argument, a much larger group of inmates has become eligible for immediate medication.

In this evolving setting, we think it best to allow the district court to address these issues in the first instance: to determine whether the plaintiffs' request for injunctive relief is moot, to determine whether qualified immunity bars their money-damages claims, and to determine whether the new prison policy otherwise alters the landscape of this litigation. In the event some or all of the parties remain dissatisfied with the district court's rulings on remand, we stand ready to entertain a second appeal. *See* 6th Cir. I.O.P. 34(b)(2).