

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF CONNECTICUT**

CHAZ GULLEY,
Plaintiff,

v.

COMMISSIONER SEMPLE, et al.,
Defendants.

:
:
:
:
:
:
:

Case No. 3:18-cv-2140 (SRU)

ORDER

Chaz Gulley (“Gulley”) initiated this action by filing a complaint pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983 against Commissioner Scott Semple, Directors of Security Antonio Santiago and Christine Whidden, District Administrator Angel Quiros, Counselor Supervisor Aldi, Warden William Mulligan, District Administrator Edward Maldonado, Counselor Fiore, Captain Lizon, and Captain Michelle Walsh. Gulley alleges that the defendants violated his rights under the First, Eighth, and Fourteenth Amendments.

On January 27, 2020, I dismissed the Fourteenth Amendment procedural due process claim arising from the issuance of a disciplinary report to Gulley on August 23, 2018 and all other federal claims asserted against defendants Walsh, Fiore, Semple, Maldonado, Santiago, and Whidden. *See generally* Initial Review Order, Doc. No. 17. In addition, I dismissed without prejudice the First Amendment retaliation claim asserted against defendant Aldi, the Eighth Amendment handcuffing claim asserted against defendants Aldi, Lizon, Mulligan and Quiros, and the Fourteenth Amendment claim that defendants Aldi, Lizon, Mulligan and Quiros violated Gulley’s procedural due process rights when they regressed him to phase one of the security group program in March 2018. *Id.* I permitted Gulley thirty (30) days to file an amended complaint to reassert the First Amendment retaliation claim against defendant Aldi, the Eighth Amendment recreation claim against defendants Aldi, Lizon, Mulligan, and Quiros, and the

Fourteenth Amendment procedural due process claim against defendants Aldi, Lizon, Mulligan, and Quiros. *Id.* at 12. I cautioned Gulley that if he did not file an amended complaint within the time specified, the Clerk would enter judgment for the defendants and close the case. *Id.*

To date, Gulley has not filed an amended complaint in response to the Court's Order. Nor has he sought an extension of time to file an amended complaint or otherwise contacted the Court. Because Gulley has not filed an amended complaint within the time specified by the Court, the Clerk is directed to enter judgment for the defendants in accordance with the prior Order and close the case. *See* Doc. No. 17.

The Motions for Status Conference, [**Doc. Nos. 13, 16**], filed by Gulley before the Court dismissed the complaint with leave to amend, are **DENIED** as moot.

So ordered.

Dated at Bridgeport, Connecticut, this 21st day of August 2020.

/s/ STEFAN R. UNDERHILL
Stefan R. Underhill
United States District Judge