86 Fed.Appx. 426
This case was not selected for publication in the Federal Reporter.
Not for Publication in West's Federal Reporter See Fed. Rule of Appellate Procedure 32.1 generally governing citation of judicial decisions issued on or after Jan. 1, 2007. See also District of Columbia Rules 32.1, 36. (Find CTADC Rule 32.1 and Find CTADC Rule 36)
United States Court of Appeals,
District of Columbia Circuit.

Leonard CAMPBELL, et al., Appellants,
v.
Anderson MCGRUDER, Superintendent, et al., Appellees.

No. 03-7045. | Jan. 23, 2004.

Appeals from the United States District Court for the District of Columbia. (Nos. 71-cv01462 and 75cv01668).

Attorneys and Law Firms

J. Patrick Hickey, Jonathan Walter Gannon, Shaw Pittman, Washington, DC, for Plaintiff-Appellant.

Mary Larkin Wilson, Assistant Corporation Counsel, Charles L. Reischel, Deputy Corporation Counsel, Edward Eugene Schwab, Assistant Corporation Counsel, Office of Corporation Counsel (Appellate Division), Washington, DC, for Defendant-Appellee.

Before HENDERSON, GARLAND, Circuit Judges, and WILLIAMS, Senior Circuit Judge.

Opinion

JUDGMENT

PER CURIAM.

Consolidated with 03-7048, 03-7102 and 03-7103
These cases were heard on the record from the United States District Court for the District of Columbia and on the briefs and arguments of counsel. It is

ORDERED that the judgment from which these appeals have been taken be affirmed. The district court correctly terminated all injunctive relief related to the District of Columbia Central Detention Facility pursuant to the Prison Litigation Reform Act, 18 U.S.C. § 3626(b)(2), because the appellants, detainees in the facility, failed to demonstrate a "current and ongoing" constitutional violation as required by 18 U.S.C. § 3626(b)(3). As the district court observed, the conditions about which the appellants now complain do not approach the objective threshold for finding a constitutional violation under the Eighth Amendment, *see Farmer v. Brennan,* 511 U.S. 825, 834, 114 S.Ct. 1970, 128 L.Ed.2d 811 (1994) ("conditions posing a substantial risk of serious harm"); *Rhodes v. Chapman,* 452 U.S. 337, 347, 101 S.Ct. 2392, 69 L.Ed.2d 59 (1981) (conditions that "deprive inmates of the minimal civilized measure of life's necessities"); *Women Prisoners of the D.C. Dep't of Corr. v. District of Columbia,* 93 F.3d 910, 928 (D.C.Cir.1996) ("conditions that are so 'soul-chilling' " and "grossly wanting" (quoting *Rhodes,* 452 U.S. at 354, 101 S.Ct. 2392 (Brennan, J., concurring))); *Inmates of Occoquan v. Barry,* 844 F.2d 828, 836-839 (D.C.Cir.1988) ("conditions of unspeakable inhumanity"); nor have they shown that prison officials are "reckless[ly]" or "deliberate[ly] indifferent" to the welfare of inmates. *Farmer,* 511 U.S. at 838-842, 114 S.Ct. 1970.

Pursuant to D.C. Circuit Rule 36, this disposition will not be published. The Clerk is directed to withhold issuance of the mandate herein until seven days after resolution of any timely petition for rehearing or rehearing en banc. *See* Fed. R.App. P. 41(b); D.C.Cir. Rule 41.

Parallel Citations

2004 WL 180423 (C.A.D.C.)