

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

EMMANUEL QUITEN HOOKS

*

Plaintiff,

*

v.

*

1:08-CV-776-TMH
(WO)

HOUSTON COUNTY JAIL, *et al.*,

*

Defendants.

*

RECOMMENDATION OF THE MAGISTRATE JUDGE

Plaintiff is an inmate incarcerated at the Houston County Jail located in Dothan, Alabama. He filed this 42 U.S.C. § 1983 action on September 19, 2008. He complains that Defendants have failed to provide him with constitutionally adequate medical care and treatment. Among the named defendants is the Houston County Jail. Upon review of the complaint, the court concludes that dismissal of Plaintiff's claims against the Houston County Jail prior to service of process is appropriate under 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B)(i).

DISCUSSION

The Houston County Jail is not a legal entity and, therefore, is not subject to suit or liability under § 1983. *See 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 should be dismissed. *Id.*

CONCLUSION

Accordingly, it is the RECOMMENDATION of the Magistrate Judge that:

1. Plaintiff's claims against the Houston County Jail be DISMISSED with prejudice prior to service of process pursuant to the provisions of 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B)(i);
2. The Houston County Jail be DISMISSED as a party to this complaint; and
3. 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 **October 9, 2008**. 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 26th day of September 2008.

/s/ Wallace Capel, Jr.
WALLACE CAPEL, JR.
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE