

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

---

LORENZO NEAL BILLINGSLEY

\*

Plaintiff,

\*

v.

\* CIVIL ACTION NO. 3:05-CV-428-F  
WO

JIMMY ABBETT, *et al.*,

\*

Defendants.

---

\*

**RECOMMENDATION OF THE MAGISTRATE JUDGE**

Plaintiff, an inmate incarcerated at the Tallapoosa County Jail located Dadeville, Alabama, filed this 42 U.S.C. § 1983 on May 9, 2005. He complains that he is being denied adequate medical care. The Tallapoosa County Jail is one of the named defendants.

Upon review of the complaint, the court concludes that dismissal of Plaintiff's claims against the Tallapoosa County Jail prior to service of process is appropriate under 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B)(i).

**DISCUSSION**

The Tallapoosa 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 (11<sup>th</sup> Cir. 1992). In light of the foregoing, the court concludes that Plaintiff's claims against the Tallapoosa County Jail are due to be dismissed. *Id.*

## CONCLUSION

Accordingly, it is the RECOMMENDATION of the Magistrate Judge that Plaintiff's claims against the Tallapoosa County Jail be dismissed 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 May 31, 2005. Any objections filed must specifically identify the findings in the Magistrate Judge's Recommendation objected to. 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

