

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

BEVERLEY WEST

PLAINTIFF

V.

CASE NO. 3:22-CV-03026

**CHARLES SCOTT JACKSON and
CIRCUIT COURT OF CARROLL
COUNTY, ARKANSAS**

DEFENDANTS

OPINION AND ORDER

Before the Court is the Report and Recommendation (“R&R”) (Doc. 5) filed in this case on May 19, 2022, by the Honorable Mark E. Ford, United States Magistrate Judge for the Western District of Arkansas, regarding Plaintiff Beverley West’s civil rights case submitted pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983. The Magistrate Judge conducted a pre-service screening of the Complaint as per 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e) and recommended the case be dismissed for frivolousness and/or for failure to state claims upon which relief may be granted. In response, Ms. West, who is proceeding *pro se*, filed Objections to the R&R (Doc. 6). The Court conducted a *de novo* review of the record in accordance with 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(c).

The R&R correctly observes that Defendant Charles Scott Jackson is a Carroll County Circuit Judge. He is not an “administrative clerk,” as Ms. West insists in her Objections. Judge Jackson enjoys judicial immunity from Section 1983 liability for all judicial actions, and Ms. West’s Complaint only concerns judicial decisions he made that were adverse to her. The R&R is also correct that the Circuit Court of Carroll County is not

an entity subject to suit. Ms. West's insistence to the contrary is nonsensical. See Doc. 6, p. 3.

IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED that the Objections to the R&R are without merit and are **OVERRULED**. The R&R (Doc. 5) is **ADOPTED IN ITS ENTIRETY**, and the Complaint is **DISMISSED WITHOUT PREJUDICE** under 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(2)(B).

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that a filing restriction is hereby imposed on Ms. West in view of the fact that this case marks the third time she has filed frivolous complaints in this Court and the second time she has done so against Judge Jackson. The Clerk of Court is directed **NOT TO FILE** any complaint that Ms. West submits for filing, *pro se*, unless and until Chambers has screened the complaint first. This filing restriction is intended to curtail Ms. West's practice of filing frivolous, meritless pleadings and to avoid a further waste of the Court's valuable resources. Nothing in this Order shall preclude a licensed attorney from filing actions on Ms. West's behalf or restrict her from representing herself as a defendant in any matter.

IT IS SO ORDERED on this 21st day of June, 2022.



TIMOTHY L. BROOKS
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE