

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF ILLINOIS  
EASTERN DIVISION**

<b>VICTOR PATTERSON,</b>	)	
	)	
Plaintiff,	)	
	)	
v.	)	Case No. 15 C 9369
	)	
<b>COOK COUNTY INC. et al.,</b>	)	
	)	
Defendants.	)	


**MEMORANDUM OPINION AND ORDER**

Victor Patterson ("Patterson") has utilized the Clerk's-Office-supplied printed form of "Complaint under the Civil Rights Act, Title 42 Section 1983" to charge defendants whom he incorrectly labels as "Cook County Inc.," "Cook County Sheriff Dept. Inc." and "Cook County Dept. of Corr.," as well as three "Doe" defendants affiliated with the Cook County Department of Corrections, with having violated his constitutional rights. In addition, Patterson has accompanied that Complaint with another Clerk's-Office-supplied printed form, an In Forma Pauperis Application ("Application"). This memorandum order is issued sua sponte because on its face the Complaint carries its own death warrant in terms of the current non-viability of any potential constitutional claim.

Although Patterson's submissions exhibit several other deficiencies, some of which might perhaps be curable through further input on his part, for present purposes it suffices to identify a noncurable deficiency that calls for dismissal of the action: its patent untimeliness. All Illinois-based claims sought to be advanced under 42 U.S.C. § 1983 ("Section 1983") are subject to the two-year limitation period prescribed by Illinois law, and in this instance Complaint ¶ IV's narrative of Harris' Statement of Claim charges misconduct on the part of governmental

defendants dating back to August 2013 -- but Patterson did not file this action until October 22, 2015, two years and two months after the complained-of misconduct.

As already stated, that untimeliness cannot be cured by amendment -- and any prospect that Patterson's governmental defendants would waive that flaw (as keenly aware as they are of that fundamental component of Section 1983 jurisprudence) is nonexistent. Accordingly both the Complaint and this action are dismissed. That calls for denial of the Application as moot, and this Court so orders.



---

Milton I. Shadur  
Senior United States District Judge

Date: October 26, 2015