Hadley v. Andrews et al Doc. 6

## IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT EASTERN DISTRICT OF ARKANSAS PINE BLUFF DIVISION

CHAUNCEY HADLEY, ADC #132390

**PLAINTIFF** 

v.

No. 5:15-cv-228-DPM-JTK

JEREMY ANDREWS, Deputy Warden, Wvarner Unit; M. RICHARDSON, Lieutenant, Varner Unit; FRANKIE BROOKS, Sergeant, Varner Unit; and COOPER, Sergeant, Varner Unit

**DEFENDANTS** 

## **ORDER**

On *de novo* review, the Court adopts the recommendation,  $N_{\odot}$  4, as modified, and sustains Hadley's objections in part,  $N_{\odot}$ 5. FED. R. CIV. P. 72(b)(3). Hadley's allegations about his punitive confinement fail to state a claim, and are therefore dismissed without prejudice. And the Court agrees that a false-disciplinary allegation, standing alone, fails to state a claim in these circumstances. But the Court would appreciate a further recommendation about (1) whether Hadley states a claim that he was disciplined in retaliation for exercising his First Amendment rights,  $N_{\odot}$  2 at 4–5;  $N_{\odot}$  5 at 1; and (2) if he has, whether *Heck*'s favorable-termination requirement applies to that claim. *Muhammad v. Close*, 540 U.S. 749, 754–55 (2004) (*per curiam*); *Woods v. Smith*, 60 F.3d 1161, 1164–66 (5th Cir. 1995).

So Ordered.

D.P. Marshall Jr.

United States District Judge

28 September 2015