

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

SEAN M. CARTER

*

Plaintiff,

*

v.

*

3:09-CV-606-ID

(WO)

DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTIONS,
et al.,

*

Defendants.

*

RECOMMENDATION OF THE MAGISTRATE JUDGE

Plaintiff, an inmate incarcerated at the Lee County Detention Center, files this 42 U.S.C. § 1983 action alleging that Defendants' failed to protect him from an inmate assault. Plaintiff names as one of the defendants the Alabama Department of Corrections. Upon review of the complaint, the court concludes that dismissal of Plaintiff's complaint against the Alabama Department of Corrections prior to service of process is appropriate under 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B).¹

I. DISCUSSION

Plaintiff's complaint against the Alabama Department of Corrections ["ADOC"] is due to be dismissed. The ADOC is not subject to suit or liability under § 1983. The Eleventh

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).

Amendment bars suit directly against a state or its agencies, regardless of the nature of relief sought. *Pennhurst State School & Hosp. v. Halderman*, 465 U.S. 89 (1984). In light of the foregoing, the court concludes that Plaintiff's complaint against the ADOC is due to be dismissed pursuant to the provisions of 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B)(I) and (iii). See *Neitzke v. Williams*, 490 U.S. 319, 327 (1989).

II. CONCLUSION

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

1. Plaintiff's complaint against the Alabama Department of Corrections be DISMISSED with prejudice prior to service of process pursuant to the directives of 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B)(I) - (iii);
2. The Alabama Department of Corrections be DISMISSED as a party to the complaint; and
3. This case with respect to the remaining defendants be referred back to the undersigned for further proceedings.

It is further

ORDERED that the parties are DIRECTED to file any objections to the Recommendation on or before **August 3, 2009**. 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 (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 20th day of July, 2009.

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