

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE MIDDLE DISTRICT OF ALABAMA
SOUTHERN DIVISION

ANTHONY RICHARDS, SR. *

Plaintiff, *

v. *

1:07-CV-261-WKW
(WO)

COFFEE COUNTY SHERIFF *
DEPARTMENT, *et al.*, *

Defendants. *

RECOMMENDATION OF THE MAGISTRATE JUDGE

Plaintiff, an inmate incarcerated at the Coffee County Jail located in New Brockton, Alabama, filed this 42 U.S.C. § 1983 on March 26, 2007. He complains that while he was incarcerated at the Coffee County Jail Defendants acted with deliberate indifference to his safety and tampered with his legal mail. Plaintiff names as Defendants the Coffee County Sheriff's Department, Sheriff Dave Sutton, Captain Richard Moss, and Officer Dallas Gibson. Upon review of the complaint, the court concludes that dismissal of Plaintiff's claims against the Coffee County Sheriff's Department prior to service of process is appropriate under 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B)(i).

DISCUSSION

The Coffee County Sheriff's Department is not a legal entity and, therefore, is not subject to suit or liability under § 1983. *Dean v. Barber*, 951 F.2d 1210, 1214 (11th Cir.

1992). In light of the foregoing, the court concludes that Plaintiff's claims against this defendant are due to be dismissed. *Id.*

CONCLUSION

Accordingly, it is the RECOMMENDATION of the Magistrate Judge that Plaintiff's claims against the Coffee County Sheriff's Department be DISMISSED with prejudice prior to service of process pursuant to the provisions of 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B)(i), and that this party be dismissed as a defendant to this complaint. It is further the Recommendation of the Magistrate Judge that this case with respect to the remaining defendants be referred back to the undersigned for additional proceedings.

It is further

ORDERED that the parties are DIRECTED to file any objections to the said Recommendation on or before **April 13, 2007**. Any objections filed must specifically identify the findings in the Magistrate Judge's Recommendation to which a party objects. Frivolous, conclusive or general objections will not be considered by the District Court. The parties are advised that this Recommendation is not a final order of the court and, therefore, it is not appealable.

Failure to file written objections to the proposed findings and recommendations in the Magistrate Judge's report shall bar the party from a *de novo* determination by the District Court of issues covered in the report and shall bar the party from attacking on appeal factual findings in the report accepted or adopted by the District Court except upon grounds of plain error or manifest injustice. *Nettles v. Wainwright*, 677 F.2d 404 (5th Cir. 1982). *See Stein*

v. Reynolds Securities, Inc., 667 F.2d 33 (11th Cir. 1982). *See also Bonner v. City of Prichard*, 661 F.2d 1206 (11th Cir. 1981) (*en banc*), adopting as binding precedent all of the decisions of the former Fifth Circuit handed down prior to the close of business on September 30, 1981.

DONE, this 30th day of March, 2007.

/s/ Susan Russ Walker _____
SUSAN RUSS WALKER
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE