

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

**BRIDGET R. JONES**

**PLAINTIFF**

**v.**

**CASE NO. 4:11CV00003 BSM**

**UNITED STATES PROBATION OFFICE,  
SHERIE GRIMES, and SELINA EARSA**

**DEFENDANTS**

**ORDER**

On January 3, 2011, plaintiff Bridget R. Jones filed an application to proceed *in forma pauperis* and a *pro se* complaint. [Doc. Nos. 1, 2]. At the direction of Magistrate Judge H. David Young, Jones filed an amended complaint. Jones's amended complaint alleges that she was harmed by the actions of Sherie Grimes and Selina Earsa, two officers with the United States Probation Office (USPO). As to Grimes and Earsa, Jones proceeds under *Bivens v. Six Unknown Agents*, 403 U.S. 388 (1971). In addition to naming the officers as defendants, Jones joined the USPO as a defendant. As set forth below, however, that joinder is not proper, and the USPO must be dismissed from this case.

28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2) requires dismissal of all or part of the complaint if the court determines that the action is frivolous or malicious, fails to state a claim on which relief may be granted, or seeks monetary relief against a defendant who is immune from such relief.

Liberally construing Jones's amended complaint, she appears to allege that the USPO bears some responsibility for the alleged misdeeds of the two individual defendants. The

USPO, however, is immune from suit. *See Farrow v. Western District of Pennsylvania Parol and Probation*, 2008 WL 597189, at \*2 (W.D. Pa. 2008) (“The Probation Office is a part of the Administrative Office of the United States Courts and is a federal agency. Absent a waiver, the federal government and its agencies enjoy sovereign immunity.”). Accordingly, the USPO is dismissed from this case prior to the service of Jones’s amended complaint.

IT IS SO ORDERED this 21st day of January, 2011.

  
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE