

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

---

ROBERT LEE ALLEN

\*

Plaintiff,

\*

v.

\*

2:07-CV-90-ID

(WO)

LOWNDES COUNTY SHERIFF  
DEPT., *et al.*,

\*

\*

Defendants.

---

**RECOMMENDATION OF THE MAGISTRATE JUDGE**

Plaintiff, Robert Allen [“Allen”], files this 42 U.S.C. § 1983 action, alleging that rights, privileges, or immunities afforded him under the Constitution or laws of the United States are being abridged by the conduct and actions of Defendants. Upon review of the complaint, the court concludes that dismissal of the Lowndes County Sheriff’s Department prior to service of process is appropriate under 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B).<sup>1</sup>

**I. DISCUSSION**

Allen names as a defendant the Lowndes County Sheriff’s Department. The Lowndes 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 (11<sup>th</sup> Cir. 1992). In light of the

---

<sup>1</sup>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).

foregoing, the court concludes that Allen's claims against this defendant are due to be dismissed. *Id.*

## II. CONCLUSION

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

1. Plaintiff's claims against the Lowndes 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);

2. The Lowndes County Sheriff's Department be DISMISSED as a party to this complaint;

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 Recommendation on or before **February 14, 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 (5<sup>th</sup> Cir. 1982). *See Stein v. Reynolds Securities, Inc.*, 667 F.2d 33 (11<sup>th</sup> Cir. 1982). *See also Bonner v. City of Prichard*, 661 F.2d 1206 (11<sup>th</sup> 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 2<sup>nd</sup> day of February 2007.

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