

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

JIMMY FRANK CAMERON, #105591,)
)
Plaintiff,)
)
v.) CIVIL ACTION NO. 2:07-CV-35-WHA
) [WO]
)
STATE OF ALABAMA, et al.,)
)
Defendants.)

RECOMMENDATION OF THE MAGISTRATE JUDGE

In this 42 U.S.C. § 1983 action, Jimmy Frank Cameron [“Cameron”], a state inmate, challenges his classification as a sex offender and the constitutionality of the Alabama Community Notification Act.

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

DISCUSSION

Cameron names the State of Alabama and the Alabama Department of Corrections as defendants in this cause of action. The law is well-settled that both the State and all departments thereof are immune from suit. *Papasan v. Allain*, 478 U.S. 265 (1986).

¹A 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).

Moreover, the Alabama Department of Corrections is not a person within the meaning of 42 U.S.C. § 1983. *Will v. Michigan Dept. of State Police*, 491 U.S. 58, 65, 109 S.Ct. 2304, 2309 (1989). Thus, the plaintiff's claims against the State of Alabama and the Alabama Department of Corrections are frivolous as these claims are "based on an indisputably meritless legal theory." *Neitzke v. Williams*, 490 U.S. 319, 327 (1989).² Such claims are therefore subject to 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 State of Alabama and the Alabama Department of Corrections be dismissed prior to service of process in accordance with the provisions of 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B)(i).
2. The State of Alabama and the Alabama Department of Corrections be dismissed from this cause of action.
3. This case, with respect to the claims lodged against defendant King, be referred back to the undersigned for appropriate proceedings.

It is further

ORDERED that on or before January 23, 2007 the parties may 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 the provisions of 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. 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 10th day of January, 2007.

/s/ Terry F. Moorer
TERRY F. MOORER
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE