

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
EASTERN DISTRICT OF MICHIGAN  
SOUTHERN DIVISION

CARL DIXON, #191514,

Plaintiff,

v.

CASE NO. 2:08-CV-14496  
HONORABLE VICTORIA A. ROBERTS

JAN TROMBLEY, et al.,

Defendants.

---

**OPINION AND ORDER DISMISSING CIVIL RIGHTS COMPLAINT AND  
CONCLUDING THAT AN APPEAL CANNOT BE TAKEN IN GOOD FAITH**

**I. Introduction**

Carl Dixon (“Plaintiff”), a Michigan prisoner, has filed a civil rights complaint pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983. The Court has granted Plaintiff’s application to proceed without prepayment of the filing fee. *See* 28 U.S.C. § 1915(a). In his complaint, Plaintiff challenges his criminal proceedings concerning convictions for prisoner possessing a weapon and for carrying a weapon with unlawful intent which were imposed following an assaultive incident in 1999 while he was confined at the Saginaw Correctional Facility in Freeland, Michigan. Plaintiff names warden Jan Trombley, several prison officials, corrections officers, and medical personnel who investigated the incident and treated the victim, defense attorney George C. Bush, prosecutor Michael D. Thomas, court reporter Kathy Tagget, and Saginaw County Circuit Judge Robert L. Kaczmarek as defendants in this action. He requests that his convictions be expunged and seeks monetary damages and injunctive relief. Having reviewed the complaint, the Court dismisses it

as frivolous/for failure to state a claim upon which relief may be granted and on the basis of immunity. The Court also concludes that an appeal cannot be taken in good faith.

## **II. Discussion**

Under the Prison Litigation Reform Act, Pub. L. No. 104-134, 110 Stat. 1321 (1996) (“PLRA”), the Court is required to *sua sponte* dismiss an *in forma pauperis* complaint before service on a defendant if it determines that the action is frivolous or malicious, fails to state a claim upon which relief can be granted, or seeks monetary relief against a defendant who is immune from such relief. *See* 42 U.S.C. § 1997(e)(c); 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B). The Court is similarly required to dismiss a complaint seeking redress against government entities, officers, and employees which it finds to be frivolous or malicious, fails to state a claim upon which relief may be granted, or seeks relief from a defendant who is immune from suit. *See* 28 U.S.C. § 1915A. A complaint is frivolous if it lacks an arguable basis either in law or in fact. *See Denton v. Hernandez*, 504 U.S. 25, 31 (1992); *Neitzke v. Williams*, 490 U.S. 319, 325 (1989).

To state a federal civil rights claim, a plaintiff must show that: (1) the defendant is a person who acted under color of state or federal law, and (2) the defendant’s conduct deprived the plaintiff of a federal right, privilege, or immunity. *See Flagg Bros. v. Brooks*, 436 U.S. 149, 155-57 (1978); *Brock v. McWherter*, 94 F.3d 242, 244 (6th Cir. 1996). A *pro se* civil rights complaint is to be construed liberally. *See Haines v. Kerner*, 404 U.S. 519, 520-21 (1972); *Jones v. Duncan*, 840 F.2d 359, 361 (6th Cir. 1988). Despite the liberal pleading standard accorded *pro se* plaintiffs, the Court finds that the complaint is subject to summary dismissal.

Plaintiff’s complaint is subject to dismissal because he challenges his criminal convictions arising from the 1999 incident and related imprisonment – which fails to state a

claim upon which relief may be granted under 42 U.S.C. § 1983. A claim under § 1983 is an appropriate remedy for a state prisoner challenging a condition of his imprisonment, *see Preiser v. Rodriguez*, 411 U.S. 475, 499 (1973), not the validity of his continued confinement. *See Heck v. Humphrey*, 512 U.S. 477, 486-87 (1994) (holding that a state prisoner does not state a cognizable civil rights claim challenging his imprisonment if a ruling on his claim would necessarily render his continuing confinement invalid, until and unless the reason for his continued confinement has been reversed on direct appeal, expunged by executive order, declared invalid by a state tribunal, or has been called into question by a federal court's issuance or a writ of habeas corpus under 28 U.S.C. § 2254). This holds true regardless of the relief sought by the plaintiff. *Id.* at 487-89.

*Heck* and other Supreme Court cases, when “taken together, indicate that a state prisoner's § 1983 action is barred (absent prior invalidation) – no matter the relief sought (damages or equitable relief), no matter the target of the prisoner's suit (state conduct leading to conviction or internal prison proceedings) – if success in that action would necessarily demonstrate the invalidity of confinement or its duration.” *Wilkinson v. Dotson*, 544 U.S. 74, 81-82 (2005). If Plaintiff were to prevail on his claims, the validity of his convictions and his continued confinement relative to those convictions would be called into question. Accordingly, such claims are barred by *Heck* and must be dismissed.

Plaintiff's complaint against defense lawyer George Bush is also subject to dismissal because a public defender or court-appointed counsel, while acting in that capacity, is not a state actor subject to suit under § 1983. *See Polk Co. v. Dodson*, 454 U.S. 312, 325 (1981) (“[A] public defender does not act under color of state law when performing a lawyer's traditional

functions as counsel to a defendant in a criminal proceeding.”). Plaintiff’s complaint against defendant Bush must therefore be dismissed.

Additionally, prosecutor Michael Thomas is absolutely immune from suit to the extent that Plaintiff challenges his conduct in pursuing and prosecuting the disputed criminal charges. It is well-established that prosecutors are entitled to absolute immunity for conduct intimately associated with the judicial phase of the criminal process. *See Imbler v. Pachtman*, 424 U.S. 409, 430 (1976). This immunity extends to a prosecutor’s decision to file a criminal complaint. *See, e.g., Ireland v. Tunis*, 113 F.3d 1435, 1446 (6th Cir. 1997). Absolute prosecutorial immunity exists even when a prosecutor acts wrongfully or maliciously. *See Grant v. Hollenbach*, 870 F.2d 1135, 1138 (6th Cir. 1989). Defendant Thomas is entitled to absolute prosecutorial immunity for his actions in Plaintiff’s criminal proceedings.

Lastly, Saginaw County Circuit Court Judge Kaczmarek and court reporter Kathy Tagget are also entitled to absolute immunity. Judges and judicial employees are entitled to absolute judicial immunity on claims for damages. *See Mireles v Waco*, 502 U.S. 9, 9-10 (1991) (per curiam) (judge performing judicial functions is absolutely immune from suit seeking monetary damages even if acting erroneously, corruptly or in excess of jurisdiction); *Collyer v. Darling*, 98 F.3d 211, 221 (6th Cir. 1996). Moreover, the 1996 amendments to § 1983 extended absolute immunity for state judicial personnel to requests for injunctive or equitable relief. *See* 42 U.S.C. § 1983 (“in any action brought against a judicial officer for an act or omission taken in such officer’s judicial capacity, injunctive relief shall not be granted unless a declaratory decree was violated or declaratory relief is unavailable”); *see also Kipen v. Lawson*, 57 Fed. Appx. 691 (6th Cir. 2003) (discussing federal judges’ immunity); *Kircher v. City of Ypsilanti, et al.*, 458 F.

Supp. 2d 439, 446-47 (E.D. Mich. 2006) (Rosen, J.); *accord Asubuko v. Royal*, 443 F.3d 302, 304 (3rd Cir. 2006); *Hass v. Wisconsin, et al.*, 109 Fed. Appx. 107, 113-14 (7th Cir. 2004); *Bolin v. Story*, 225 F.3d 1234, 1240-42 (11th Cir. 2000). Allegations arising from Plaintiff's challenges to his state criminal proceedings involve the performance of judicial and quasi-judicial duties. Judge Kaczmarek and reporter Tagget are absolutely immune from suit for such conduct and the claims against them must be dismissed.

### **III. Conclusion**

For the reasons stated, the Court concludes that Plaintiff has failed to state a claim upon which relief may be granted under 42 U.S.C. § 1983, that defendant Bush is not subject to suit under 42 U.S.C. § 1983, and that defendants Thomas, Tagget, and Kaczmarek are entitled to immunity. Accordingly, the Court **DISMISSES** Plaintiff's civil rights complaint. The Court also concludes that an appeal from this order would be frivolous and therefore cannot be taken in good faith. *See* 28 U.S.C. § 1915(a)(3); *McGore v. Wrigglesworth*, 114 F.3d 601, 610-11 (6th Cir. 1997).

**IT IS SO ORDERED.**

S/Victoria A. Roberts  
Victoria A. Roberts  
United States District Judge

Dated: October 28, 2008

The undersigned certifies that a copy of this document was served on the attorneys of record and Carl Dixon by electronic means or U.S. Mail on October 28, 2008.

s/Carol A. Pinegar \_\_\_\_\_  
Deputy Clerk