

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

---

JEFFERY B. JONES	*	
Plaintiff,	*	
v.	*	3:06-CV-178-MEF
		(WO)
JURISDICTION SYSTEM, <i>et al.</i> ,	*	
Defendants.	*	

---

**RECOMMENDATION OF THE MAGISTRATE JUDGE**

Plaintiff is an inmate incarcerated in the Lee County Detention Center located in Opelika, Alabama. He complains that his constitutional rights are being violated at the jail because he is subject to unconstitutional conditions of confinement. Among the named defendants is "Jurisdiction System." Upon review of the complaint, the court concludes that dismissal of Plaintiff's claims against "Jurisdiction System" prior to service of process is appropriate under 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B)(i).

**DISCUSSION**

"Jurisdiction System" is not a legal entity and, therefore, is not subject to suit or liability under § 1983. *Cf. Dean v. Barber*, 951 F.2d 1210, 1214 (11<sup>th</sup> Cir. 1992); *see also Moity v. Louisiana State Bar Association*, 414 F. Supp. 180, 182 (E.D. La. 1976), *aff'd*, 537 F.2d 1141 (5<sup>th</sup> Cir. 1976) (courts are not persons within the meaning of 42 U.S.C. § 1983). 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 "Jurisdiction System" be DISMISSED with prejudice prior to service of process pursuant to the provisions of 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B)(i);
2. "Jurisdiction System" 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 **March 20, 2006**. 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 decisions of the former Fifth Circuit handed down prior to the close of business on September 30, 1981.

Done, this 14<sup>th</sup> day of March 2006.

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