

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
DISTRICT OF CONNECTICUT**

EARL OSBORN,  
Plaintiff,

v.

OFFICER WILLIAMS, ET AL.,  
Defendants.

:  
:  
:  
:  
:  
:  
:

Case No. 3:14-cv-1386

**RULING ON MOTION FOR SUMMARY JUDGMENT**

Plaintiff, Earl Osborn, commenced this civil rights action *pro se* and *in forma pauperis* against Correctional Officers Williams, Stander, Burggos, BeeBee and Doe, Social Worker Castro, Social Worker Jane Doe 1, and Captain Jane Doe 2. The plaintiff asserted claims of deliberate indifference to safety and failure to protect from harm. On February 10, 2015, the Court dismissed all claims against defendant John Doe and concluded that the Eighth Amendment claims of failure to protect and deliberate indifference to safety would proceed against defendants Stander, Burggos, Castro, BeeBee, Jane Doe 1, and Jane Doe 2.

On September 22, 2015, the defendants filed a motion for summary judgment. On April 18, 2016, the Court concluded that proper and effective litigation of this case could not be achieved without appointing *pro bono* counsel to represent the plaintiff. On July 5, 2016, the Clerk appointed Attorney Margaret B. Ferron to represent the plaintiff as *pro bono* counsel.

In view of the appointment of *pro bono* counsel and the likelihood that counsel will need to conduct additional discovery and possibly amend the complaint, the defendants' motion for summary judgment [**Doc. No. 21**] is **DENIED** without prejudice. The defendants may re-file their motion at the appropriate time, after the parties have conferred and a scheduling order has been approved by the Court.

**SO ORDERED** at Bridgeport, Connecticut this 6th day of July, 2016.

/s/ Victor A. Bolden  
VICTOR A. BOLDEN  
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE