

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE MIDDLE DISTRICT OF GEORGIA
MACON DIVISION**

ROBERT TUCKER, III,	:	
	:	
Plaintiff,	:	
vs.	:	CASE NO: 5:12-CV-244-MTT-MSH
	:	
Sheriff PEACOCK, et. al.	:	
	:	
Defendants.	:	PROCEEDINGS UNDER 42 U.S.C. § 1983
	:	BEFORE THE U.S. MAGISTRATE JUDGE

ORDER & RECOMMENDATION

Plaintiff Robert Tucker, a prisoner at Macon State Prison, filed a *pro se* civil rights complaint under 42 U.S.C. § 1983. Plaintiff has paid the initial partial filing fee required by this Court; however, he is still obligated to pay the full filing fee under 28 U.S.C. § 1915(b), as is discussed herein. The Clerk of Court shall thus send a copy of this Order & Recommendation to the business manager of Macon State Prison.

Because Plaintiff is a prisoner “seeking redress from a governmental entity or [an] officer or employee of a governmental entity,” the Court is required to also conduct a preliminary screening of his Complaint. *See* 28 U.S.C. § 1915A(a). Having now done so, the undersigned finds that Plaintiff’s Eighth Amendment claim for damages against Captain Ralph Searcy should be allowed to proceed beyond the frivolity review stage. It is **RECOMMENDED** that all other claims and Defendants be **DISMISSED**.

STANDARD OF REVIEW

When conducting a preliminary review under § 1915A, the district court must accept all factual allegations in the Complaint as true. *Brown v. Johnson*, 387 F.3d 1344, 1347 (11th Cir. 2004). *Pro se* pleadings, like the one in this case, are also “held to a less stringent standard than pleadings drafted by attorneys” and must be “liberally construed.” *Tannenbaum v. United States*, 148 F.3d 1262, 1263 (11th Cir. 1998). Nonetheless, a district court may still dismiss a prisoner complaint after the initial review if it finds that the complaint (1) “is frivolous, malicious, or fails to state a claim upon which relief may be granted”; or (2) “seeks monetary relief from a defendant who is immune from such relief.” 28 U.S.C. §1915A(b); *see also* 28 U.S.C. §1915(2)(B).

A claim is frivolous when it appears from the face of the complaint that the factual allegations are “clearly baseless” or that the legal theories are “indisputably meritless.” *Carroll v. Gross*, 984 F.2d 392, 393 (11th Cir. 1993). A complaint is thus properly dismissed by the district court *sua sponte* if it is found to be “without arguable merit either in law or fact.” *Bilal v. Driver*, 251 F.3d 1346, 1349 (11th Cir. 2001).

A complaint fails to state a claim when it does not include “enough factual matter (taken as true)” to “give the defendant fair notice of what the . . . claim is and the grounds upon which it rests[.]” *Bell Atlantic Corp. v. Twombly*, 550 U.S. 544, 555-56 (2007). The factual allegations in a complaint “must be enough to raise a right to relief above the speculative level” and cannot “merely create[] a suspicion [of] a legally cognizable right of action.” *Id.* In other words, the complaint must allege “enough facts to raise a reasonable expectation that discovery will reveal evidence” supporting a claim. *Id.*

“[T]hreadbare recitals of the elements of a cause of action, supported by mere conclusory statements, do not suffice.” *Ashcroft v. Iqbal*, 556 U.S. 662, 663, 129 S.Ct. 1937, 1949, 173 L.Ed.2d 868 (2009).

To state a claim for relief under §1983, a plaintiff must allege that: (1) an act or omission deprived him of a right, privilege, or immunity secured by the Constitution or a statute of the United States; and (2) the act or omission was committed by a person acting under color of state law. *Hale v. Tallapoosa County*, 50 F.3d 1579, 1581 (11th Cir. 1995). If a litigant cannot satisfy these requirements, or fails to provide factual allegations in support of his claim or claims, the complaint is subject to dismissal. *See Chappell v. Rich*, 340 F.3d 1279, 1282-84 (11th Cir. 2003).

STATEMENT AND ANALYSIS OF CLAIMS

The present action arises out of an alleged denial of medical care at the Upson County Jail. Plaintiff’s Complaint alleges that he was diagnosed with “diabetic retinitis” of his left eye on February 11, 2011. Plaintiff was seen by a “specialist,” and Defendant Captain Ralph Searcy was apparently informed that Plaintiff required “immediate medical attention.” Plaintiff alleges that he was nonetheless denied treatment for this condition, that his condition continued to “get worse,” and that he needs corrective surgery.

To state an Eighth Amendment claim for inadequate medical care, a prisoner must allege acts or omissions sufficiently harmful to evidence deliberate indifference to a serious medical need. *Estelle v. Gamble*, 429 U.S. 97, 106 (1976). These allegations must satisfy both an objective and subjective component. *Hill v. DeKalb Reg’l Youth Det.*

Ctr., 40 F.3d 1176, 1186 (11th Cir. 1994), *overruled in part on other grounds by Hope v. Peltzer*, 536 U.S. 730, 739 (2002). Under the first component, a prisoner must set forth evidence of an “objectively serious medical” need that, if left unattended, poses a substantial risk of serious harm. *Taylor v. Adams*, 221 F.3d 1254, 1257 (11th Cir. 2000). A medical need is serious if it has been diagnosed by a doctor as mandating treatment or is so obvious that even a layperson would easily recognize the necessity for a doctor’s attention. *Hill*, 40 F.3d at 1187. The prisoner must then demonstrate that a prison official had subjective knowledge of the risk of serious harm and disregarded that risk. *Bozeman v. Orum*, 422 F.3d 1265, 1272 (11th Cir. 2005).

Though it is not yet clear whether Plaintiff in fact suffered from a serious medical condition, the undersigned accepts that, in some circumstances, Plaintiff’s condition may be considered serious. Therefore, his allegations, when read in a light most favorable to Plaintiff, may support an Eighth Amendment claim for damages against Defendant Captain Ralph Searcy under 42 U.S.C. § 1983. It is thus **ORDERED** that service be made on Defendant Searcy and that he file an Answer, or such other response as may be appropriate under Rule 12 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, 28 U.S.C. § 1915, and the Prison Litigation Reform Act. Defendant Searcy is of course reminded of his duty to avoid unnecessary service expenses, and of the possible imposition of expenses for failure to waive service pursuant to Rule 4(d).

It is **RECOMMENDED**, however, that any claims for injunctive relief against Defendant Searcy be **DISMISSED** as **MOOT**. Plaintiff cannot obtain injunctive relief against any official at the Upson County Jail because he is no longer incarcerated at that

facility. Under established law in this Circuit, a prisoner's claim for injunctive relief is mooted by his transfer to another prison. *Zatler v. Wainwright*, 802 F.2d 397, 399 (11th Cir. 1986); *Wahl v. McIver*, 773 F.2d 1169, 1173 (11th Cir. 1985).

It is also **RECOMMENDED** that all other Defendants be **DISMISSED** from this action under 28 U.S.C. § 1915A. Though the caption of Plaintiff's Complaint identifies Upson County, Sheriff Peacock, Mayor Kilgore, Dr. Busbee, and the Board of County Commissioners as Defendants in this action, Plaintiff fails to make any allegations against these parties in his Complaint. It is well-settled that a district court properly dismisses defendants where a prisoner, other than naming the defendant in the caption of the complaint, fails to state any allegations that connect the defendants with the alleged constitutional violation. *Douglas v. Yates*, 535 F.3d 1316, 1322 (11th Cir. 2008) (citing *Pamel Corp. v. P.R. Highway Auth.*, 621 F.2d 33, 36 (1st Cir. 1980) ("While we do not require technical niceties in pleading, we must demand that the complaint state with some minimal particularity how overt acts of the defendant caused a legal wrong.")).

Pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1), Plaintiff may serve and file written objections to these recommendations with the district judge to whom this case is assigned within fourteen (14) days after being served a copy of this Order.

ORDER FOR SERVICE

DUTY TO ADVISE OF ADDRESS CHANGE

During the pendency of this action, all parties shall at all times keep the Clerk of this Court and all opposing attorneys and/or parties advised of their current address. **Failure to promptly advise the Clerk of a change of address may result in the dismissal of a**

party's pleadings.

DUTY TO PROSECUTE ACTION

Plaintiff is also advised that he must diligently prosecute his Complaint or face the possibility that it will be dismissed under Rule 41(b) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure for failure to prosecute. Defendants are similarly advised that they are expected to diligently defend all allegations made against them and to file timely dispositive motions as hereinafter directed. This matter will be set down for trial when the Court determines that discovery has been completed and that all motions have been disposed of or the time for filing dispositive motions has passed.

FILING AND SERVICE OF MOTIONS, PLEADINGS, AND CORRESPONDENCE

It is the responsibility of each party to file original motions, pleadings, and correspondence with the Clerk of Court. A party need not serve the opposing party by mail if the opposing party is represented by counsel. In such cases, any motions, pleadings, or correspondence shall be served electronically at the time of filing with the Court. If any party is not represented by counsel, however, it is the responsibility of each opposing party to serve copies of all motions, pleadings, and correspondence upon the unrepresented party and to attach to said original motions, pleadings, and correspondence filed with the Clerk of Court a certificate of service indicating who has been served and where (i.e., at what address), when service was made, and how service was accomplished (i.e., by U.S. Mail, by personal service, etc.).

DISCOVERY

Plaintiff shall not commence discovery until an answer or dispositive motion has been filed on behalf of Defendants from whom discovery is sought by Plaintiff. Defendants shall not commence discovery until such time as an answer or dispositive motion has been filed. Once an answer or dispositive motion has been filed, the parties are authorized to seek discovery from one another as provided in the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure. Plaintiff's deposition may be taken at any time during the time period hereinafter set out, provided that prior arrangements are made with her custodian. Plaintiff is hereby advised that failure to submit to a deposition may result in the dismissal of her lawsuit under Rule 37 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure.

It is hereby **ORDERED** that discovery (including depositions and interrogatories) shall be completed within 90 days of the date of filing of an answer or dispositive motion by Defendants (whichever comes first) unless an extension is otherwise granted by the Court upon a showing of good cause therefor or a protective order is sought by Defendants and granted by the Court. This 90-day period shall run separately as to each Defendant beginning on the date of filing of each Defendant's answer or dispositive motion (whichever comes first). The scheduling of a trial may be advanced upon notification from the parties that no further discovery is contemplated or that discovery has been completed prior to the deadline.

Discovery materials shall not be filed with the Clerk of Court. No party shall be required to respond to any discovery not directed to him or served upon him by the opposing counsel/party. The undersigned incorporates herein those parts of the Local

Rules imposing the following limitations on discovery: except with written permission of the Court first obtained, INTERROGATORIES may not exceed TWENTY-FIVE (25) to each party, REQUESTS FOR PRODUCTION OF DOCUMENTS AND THINGS under Rule 34 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure may not exceed TEN (10) requests to each party, and REQUESTS FOR ADMISSIONS under Rule 36 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure may not exceed FIFTEEN (15) requests to each party. No party is required to respond to any request which exceed these limitations.

REQUESTS FOR DISMISSAL AND/OR JUDGMENT

Dismissal of this action or requests for judgment will not be considered in the absence of a separate motion therefor accompanied by a brief/memorandum of law citing supporting authorities. Dispositive motions should be filed at the earliest time possible, but in any event no later than thirty (30) days after the close of discovery unless otherwise directed by the Court.

DIRECTIONS TO CUSTODIAN OF PLAINTIFF

Following the payment of the required initial partial filing fee or the waiving of the payment of same, the Warden of the institution wherein Plaintiff is incarcerated, or the Sheriff of any county wherein she is held in custody, and any successor custodians, shall each month cause to be remitted to the Clerk of this court twenty percent (20%) of the preceding month's income credited to Plaintiff's account at said institution until the \$350.00 filing fee has been paid in full. In accordance with provisions of the Prison Litigation Reform Act, Plaintiff's custodian is hereby authorized to forward payments from the prisoner's account to the Clerk of Court each month until the filing fee is paid in

full, provided the amount in the account exceeds \$10.00.

It is further **ORDERED** and **DIRECTED** that collection of monthly payments from Plaintiff's trust fund account shall continue until the entire \$350.00 has been collected, notwithstanding the dismissal of Plaintiff's lawsuit or the granting of judgment against her prior to the collection of the full filing fee.

PLAINTIFF'S OBLIGATION TO PAY FILING FEE

Pursuant to provisions of the Prison Litigation Reform Act, in the event Plaintiff is hereafter released from the custody of the State of Georgia or any county thereof, she shall remain obligated to pay any balance due on the filing fee in this proceeding until said amount has been paid in full; Plaintiff shall continue to remit monthly payments as required by the Prison Litigation Reform Act. Collection from Plaintiff of any balance due on the filing fee by any means permitted by law is hereby authorized in the event Plaintiff is released from custody and fails to remit payments. In addition, Plaintiff's Complaint is subject to dismissal if she has the ability to make monthly payments and fails to do so.

SO ORDERED and RECOMMENDED, this 29th day of August, 2012.

S/ Stephen Hyles
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE