

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
EASTERN DISTRICT OF ARKANSAS
JONESBORO DIVISION**

JAMES ERIC MARTIN
ADC #110186

PLAINTIFF

V.

NO: 3:09CV00096 SWW/HDY

DAN LANGSTON *et al.*

DEFENDANTS

PROPOSED FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

INSTRUCTIONS

The following recommended disposition has been sent to United States District Judge Susan W. Wright. Any party may serve and file written objections to this recommendation. Objections should be specific and should include the factual or legal basis for the objection. If the objection is to a factual finding, specifically identify that finding and the evidence that supports your objection. An original and one copy of your objections must be received in the office of the United States District Court Clerk no later than eleven (11) days from the date of the findings and recommendations. The copy will be furnished to the opposing party. Failure to file timely objections may result in waiver of the right to appeal questions of fact.

If you are objecting to the recommendation and also desire to submit new, different, or additional evidence, and to have a hearing for this purpose before the District Judge, you must, at the same time that you file your written objections, include the following:

1. Why the record made before the Magistrate Judge is inadequate.
2. Why the evidence proffered at the hearing before the District Judge (if such a hearing is granted) was not offered at the hearing before the Magistrate Judge.
3. The detail of any testimony desired to be introduced at the

hearing before the District Judge in the form of an offer of proof, and a copy, or the original, of any documentary or other non-testimonial evidence desired to be introduced at the hearing before the District Judge.

From this submission, the District Judge will determine the necessity for an additional evidentiary hearing, either before the Magistrate Judge or before the District Judge.

Mail your objections and “Statement of Necessity” to:

Clerk, United States District Court
Eastern District of Arkansas
600 West Capitol Avenue, Suite A149
Little Rock, AR 72201-3325

DISPOSITION

Plaintiff, currently held at the Greene County Detention Facility, filed a *pro se* complaint (docket entry #2), on June 24, 2009, alleging that Defendants lost or stole his personal property.

I. Screening

Before docketing the complaint, or as soon thereafter as practicable, the Court must review the complaint to identify cognizable claims or dismiss the complaint if it: (1) is frivolous or malicious; (2) fails to state a claim upon which relief may be granted; or (3) seeks monetary relief against a defendant who is immune from such relief. *See* 28 U.S.C. § 1915A. Fed.R.Civ.P. 8(a)(2) requires only “a short and plain statement of the claim showing that the pleader is entitled to relief.” In *Bell Atlantic Corporation v. Twombly*, 127 S.Ct. 1955, 1964-5 (2007) (overruling *Conley v. Gibson*, 355 U.S. 41 (1967), and setting new standard for failure to state a claim upon which relief may be granted), the Court stated, “a plaintiff’s obligation to provide the ‘grounds’ of his ‘entitle[ment]to relief’ requires more than labels and conclusions, and a formulaic recitation of the elements of a cause of action will not do....Factual allegations must be enough to raise a right to

relief above the speculative level,” *citing* 5 C. Wright & A. Miller, Federal Practice and Procedure § 1216, pp. 235-236 (3d ed. 2004). A complaint must contain enough facts to state a claim to relief that is plausible on its face, not merely conceivable. *Twombly* at 1974. Although *Twombly* involved allegations of conspiracy in violation of the Sherman Act, 15 U.S.C. § 1, the holding has been applied in a § 1983 context as well. *See Robbins v. Oklahoma*, Case No. 07-7021, 2008 U.S. App. LEXIS 5915 (10th Cir. March 21, 2008). However, a *pro se* plaintiff’s allegations must be construed liberally. *Burke v. North Dakota Dept. of Corr. & Rehab.*, 294 F.3d 1043, 1043-1044 (8th Cir.2002) (citations omitted).

II. Analysis

According to Plaintiff’s complaint, Defendants are responsible for losing his personal property, including medications, when he entered and then was released from the Greene County Detention Facility. The loss apparently occurred in September of 2007. Plaintiff demands that his property to be found or replaced, or to be paid approximately \$5,000.00.

Even if all of Plaintiff’s claims are true, he has failed to state a claim upon which relief may be granted. *See Hudson v. Palmer*, 468 U.S. 517, 530-537 (1984) (when state actor deprives individual of personal property, individual does not have a § 1983 claim if state law provides adequate post-deprivation remedy); *McQuillian v. Mercedes-Benz Credit Corp.*, 331 Ark. 242, 247, 961 S.W.2d 729, 732 (Ark.1998) (conversion is a common-law tort action for the wrongful possession or disposition of another’s property). Because Plaintiff may bring a state lawsuit for his conversion claims, his federal civil rights complaint should be dismissed. *See also Bausley v. Dugan*, 110 Fed.Appx. 736 (8th Cir. 2004)(unpub. per curiam) (prisoner’s remedy for property seized in a cell search was state-law action for conversion).

III. Conclusion

IT IS THEREFORE RECOMMENDED THAT:

1. Plaintiff's complaint be DISMISSED WITH PREJUDICE for failure to state a claim upon which relief may be granted.
2. This dismissal count as a "strike" for purposes of 28 U.S.C. § 1915(g).
3. The Court certify that an *in forma pauperis* appeal taken from the order and judgment dismissing this action is considered frivolous and not in good faith.

DATED this 29 day of June, 2009.



UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE