

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
CENTRAL DISTRICT OF ILLINOIS
SPRINGFIELD DIVISION**

RONALD TATRO,)	
)	
Plaintiff,)	
)	
v.)	No. 11-3384
)	
STATE OF ILLINOIS CRIMINAL)	
COURT, and SANGAMON)	
COUNTY JUVENILE DIVISION)	
)	
Defendants.)	

OPINION

SUE E. MYERSCOUGH, U.S. District Judge:

Ronald L. Tatro, proceeding *pro se*, seeks to file a document (petition) in which he asks this Court to intervene in a state court proceeding to permanently terminate his parental rights. Pending also is a motion for leave to proceed *in forma pauperis*. See d/e 2. For the reasons that follow, Defendant’s motion for leave to proceed *in forma pauperis* is DENIED and this action is DISMISSED.

I. BACKGROUND

The Court has reviewed Tatro’s petition. As stated, his proposed petition concerns a proceeding to terminate parental rights in the Circuit Court for the

Seventh Judicial Circuit of Illinois, Sangamon County.

Tatro claims that if the state court terminates his parental rights it would be “a life sentence on [Tatro’s] family.” Tatro asks this Court “to make a ruling the State of Illinois will have to respect.” Accordingly, it appears Tatro is requesting that this Court halt the state court proceedings and assume jurisdiction over the matter.

II. ANALYSIS

This action will be dismissed pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B)(i). The Court lacks the authority to grant Tatro’s request.

“[V]isitation and the termination of parental rights are beyond the scope of a federal court.” Lewis v. Family and Social Services Administration, 2005 WL 2562988, at * 1 (N.D. Ind. 2005) (citing Moore v. Sims, 442 U.S. 415 (1979).) Moreover, to the extent Tatro is asking this Court to review any decision of the state court in the termination proceedings, “federal district courts cannot review the merits of decisions made by state courts in civil litigation.” See Mannix v. Machnik, 244 F. App’x 37, 39 (7th Cir. 2007). Any relief from an adverse state court decision must be sought through the state appellate system. See id. Accordingly, this Court is unable to entertain Tatro’s claim.

III. CONCLUSION

THEREFORE, Tatro's motion for leave to proceed *in forma pauperis* (d/e 2)
is DENIED. This action is DISMISSED.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

ENTER: October 13, 2011.

FOR THE COURT:

s/ Sue E. Myerscough
SUE E. MYERSCOUGH
United States District Judge