


NOT RECOMMENDED FOR PUBLICATION

File Name: 20a0213n.06

Case No. 19-3131

**UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE SIXTH CIRCUIT**



KRIS J. KINSEY,)
)
 Plaintiff-Appellant,)
)
)
 v.)
)
 STATE OF OHIO, et al.,)
)
 Defendants,)
)
)
 COUNTY OF LORAIN, et al.,)
)
 Defendants-Appellees.)

**ON APPEAL FROM THE
UNITED STATES DISTRICT
COURT FOR THE NORTHERN
DISTRICT OF OHIO**

BEFORE: BOGGS, BATCHELDER, and DONALD, Circuit Judges.

ALICE M. BATCHELDER, Circuit Judge. Kris Kinsey, represented by attorney James Georgian, sued the State of Ohio, the City of Elyria, Lorain County, the County Sheriff, the Jail Administrator, three corrections officers, a jail counselor, and a nurse for the jail, claiming that they violated Kinsey’s constitutionally protected rights during his incarceration at the Lorain County Jail. Georgian’s most outrageous claim is that the six hours of surveillance video in the record is not authentic but was fabricated by the Jail to show a “doppelganger” “purporting to be Mr. Kinsey.” Georgian nonetheless repeatedly cites to and relies on this allegedly falsified video. This claim is not merely doubtful, nor merely even implausible; it is clearly preposterous.

Kinsey’s other claims include false arrest, false imprisonment, negligent failure to provide medical care, assault and battery, intentional and negligent infliction of emotional distress, First Amendment retaliation, Sixth Amendment assistance of counsel and notice of accusation, Eighth Amendment excessive bail and fines and cruel and unusual punishment, Fourteenth Amendment

due process and equal protection, Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) and Rehabilitation Act discrimination, abuse of process, and malicious prosecution. The district court rejected Georgian's canard about the doppelganger video and found that, even ignoring the video and accepting Kinsey's own account of the events at the Jail, he had failed to state viable constitutional claims and the individual defendants were entitled to qualified immunity; he failed to state viable ADA or state-law claims and the defendants were entitled to state-law immunity; and Lorain County is not a political entity and, therefore, not a proper defendant. Consequently, the district court granted summary judgment to all defendants on all claims. On appeal, Kinsey and Georgian merely reassert the same arguments they pressed in the district court.

After carefully reviewing the record, the law, and the arguments on appeal, we conclude that the district court correctly set out the applicable law and correctly applied that law to the facts before it. The issuance of a full written opinion by this court would serve no useful purpose. Accordingly, for the reasons stated in the district court's opinion, we **AFFIRM**.