

shielding employees from contemporaneous discipline by referring all misconduct allegations to OPR, which conducts delayed and lengthy investigations; (2) failing to conduct recorded interviews with employees involved in misconduct; and (3) modifying the grievance procedure to make it more difficult for inmates to exhaust their administrative remedies, thus insulating employees from civil lawsuits.

In order to establish liability against a government entity under section 1983, a plaintiff must allege that the purported constitutional violation occurred as the result of an official policy, custom, or practice. *Monell v. Dep't of Soc. Serv.*, 436 U.S. 658, 692, 98 S.Ct. 2018, 56 L.Ed.2d 611 (1978). Here, Chew-Harris has not alleged with adequate specificity how the injury in this case resulted from the policies, practices, or procedures alleged in the complaint. *See Vukadinovich v. McCarthy*, 901 F.2d 1439, 1444 (7th Cir. 1990) (holding that in order to prevail on a failure to investigate *Monell* claim a plaintiff must prove that the deficiency in the investigation actually caused the officer's conduct). Chew-Harris has accordingly failed to state a claim for *Monell* liability at this time. Accordingly, this Court need not address the defendants' arguments concerning the specific policies, practices, or customs alleged, although it may behoove plaintiff to address those arguments should he elect to amend his complaint.

SO ORDERED.



Sharon Johnson Coleman
United States District Court Judge

DATED: December 7, 2017