## UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT NORTHERN DISTRICT OF OHIO

DONNA J. GAINES,	) CASE NO. 5:16 CV 1657
Plaintiff,	) JUDGE JOHN R. ADAMS
v.	)
ACCEPTANCE INSURANCE CO.,	) <u>MEMORANDUM OF OPINION</u> ) <u>AND ORDER</u>
Defendant.	)

On June 28, 2016, Plaintiff *pro se* Donna J. Gaines filed this *in forma pauperis* action against Defendant Acceptance Insurance Co. Plaintiff alleges in her one-page Complaint that she was seriously injured when a driver insured by Defendant crashed his automobile into her living room.

Although *pro se* pleadings are liberally construed, *Boag v. MacDougall*, 454 U.S. 364, 365 (1982) (per curiam), the district court is required to dismiss an action under 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e) if it fails to state a claim upon which relief can be granted, or if it lacks an arguable basis in law or fact. <sup>1</sup> *Neitzke v. Williams*, 490 U.S. 319 (1989); *Hill v. Lappin*, 630 F.3d 468, 470 (6<sup>th</sup> Cir. 2010)

A cause of action fails to state a claim upon which relief may be granted when it lacks "plausibility in the complaint." *Bell At. Corp. v. Twombly*, 550 U.S. 544, 564 (2007). A pleading must contain a "short and plain statement of the claim showing that the pleader is entitled to relief." *Ashcroft v. Iqbal*, 556 U.S. 662, 677-78 (2009). The factual allegations in the pleading must be sufficient to raise the right to relief above the speculative level on the

An *in forma pauperis* claim may be dismissed *sua sponte*, without prior notice to the plaintiff and without service of process on the defendant, if the court explicitly states that it is invoking section 1915(e) [formerly 28 U.S.C. § 1915(d)] and is dismissing the claim for one of the reasons set forth in the statute. *Chase Manhattan Mortg. Corp. v. Smith*, 507 F.3d 910, 915 (6<sup>th</sup> Cir. 2007); *Gibson v. R.G. Smith Co.*, 915 F.2d 260, 261 (6<sup>th</sup> Cir. 1990); *Harris v. Johnson*, 784 F.2d 222, 224 (6th Cir. 1986).

assumption that all the allegations in the complaint are true. Twombly, 550 U.S. at 555. The

plaintiff is not required to include detailed factual allegations, but must provide more than "an

unadorned, the-defendant-unlawfully-harmed-me accusation." *Iqbal*, 556 U.S. at 678 (2009). A

pleading that offers legal conclusions or a simple recitation of the elements of a cause of action

will not meet this pleading standard. *Id*.

Principles requiring generous construction of *pro se* pleadings are not without limits.

Beaudett v. City of Hampton, 775 F.2d 1274, 1277 (4th Cir. 1985). A complaint must contain

either direct or inferential allegations respecting all the material elements of some viable legal

theory to satisfy federal notice pleading requirements. See Schied v. Fanny Farmer Candy

Shops, Inc., 859 F.2d 434, 437 (6th Cir. 1988). District courts are not required to conjure up

questions never squarely presented to them or to construct full blown claims from sentence

fragments. Beaudette, 775 F.2d at 1278. To do so would "require ...[the courts] to explore

exhaustively all potential claims of a pro se plaintiff, ... [and] would...transform the district court

from its legitimate advisory role to the improper role of an advocate seeking out the strongest

arguments and most successful strategies for a party." Id.

Even construing the Complaint liberally in a light most favorable to the Plaintiff, Brand

v. Motley, 526 F.3d 921, 924 (6th Cir. 2008), it does not contain allegations reasonably

suggesting she might have a valid federal claim. See, Lillard v. Shelby County Bd. of Educ,, 76

F.3d 716 (6th Cir. 1996)(court not required to accept summary allegations or unwarranted legal

conclusions in determining whether complaint states a claim for relief). This action is therefore

dismissed under section 1915(e). The Court certifies, pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915(a)(3), that

an appeal from this decision could not be taken in good faith.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Date: August 31, 2016

/s/ John R. Adams

JOHN R. ADAMS

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

2