

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

RANDY JOE NICHOLS, #149910,)	
)	
Plaintiff,)	
)	
v.)	CIVIL ACTION NO. 2:06-CV-615-MEF
)	[WO]
)	
ALABAMA DEPT. OF CORRECTIONS, et al.,)	
)	
Defendants)	

RECOMMENDATION OF THE MAGISTRATE JUDGE

In this 42 U.S.C. § 1983 action, Randy Joe Nichols [“Nichols”], a state inmate, challenges the adequacy of medical treatment provided to him at the Easterling Correctional Facility.

Upon review of the complaint, the court concludes that dismissal of the plaintiff’s claims against the Alabama Department of Corrections and Easterling Correctional Facility prior to service of process is appropriate under 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B)(i).¹

DISCUSSION

The law is well-settled that state agencies are absolutely immune from suit. *Papasan v. Allain*, 478 U.S. 265 (1986). Thus, the plaintiff’s claims against the Alabama Department

¹1. A prisoner who is allowed to proceed *in forma pauperis* in this court will have his complaint screened in accordance with the provisions of 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B). This screening procedure requires the court to dismiss a prisoner’s civil action prior to service of process if it determines that the complaint is frivolous, malicious, fails to state a claim upon which relief may be granted, or seeks monetary damages from a defendant who is immune from such relief. 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B)(i)-(iii).

of Corrections are frivolous as they are "based on an indisputably meritless legal theory." *Neitzke v. Williams*, 490 U.S. 319, 327 (1989).² Additionally, Easterling Correctional Facility is not a legal entity subject to suit or liability under section 1983. *See Dean v. Barber*, 951 F.2d 1210, 1214 (11th Cir. 1992). The claims presented by the plaintiff against these defendants are therefore subject to summary dismissal pursuant to the directives of 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B)(i).

CONCLUSION

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

1. The plaintiff's claims against the Alabama Department of Corrections and Easterling Correctional Facility be dismissed prior to service of process in accordance with the provisions of 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B)(i).
2. The Alabama Department of Corrections and Easterling Correctional Facility be dismissed from this cause of action.
3. This case, with respect to the claims against Gwendolyn Mosley and Prison Health Care Services be referred back to the undersigned for appropriate proceedings.

It is further

ORDERED that on or before July 31, 2006 the parties shall file objections to the Recommendation. Any objections filed must specifically identify the findings in the Magistrate Judge's Recommendation to which the party is objecting. Frivolous, conclusive

²Although *Neitzke* interpreted 28 U.S.C. § 1915(d), the predecessor to 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2), the analysis contained therein remains applicable to the present statute.

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 advisements in the Magistrate Judge's Recommendation shall bar the party from a de novo determination by the District Court of issues covered in the Recommendation and shall bar the party from attacking on appeal factual findings in the Recommendation accepted or adopted by the District Court except upon grounds of plain error or manifest injustice. *Nettles v. WainNichols*, 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 17th day of July, 2006.

/s/ Delores R. Boyd
DELORES R. BOYD
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE