

FILED  
U.S. DISTRICT COURT  
STATESBORO DIV.

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF GEORGIA  
STATESBORO DIVISION  
CLERK R. Allen  
SO. DIST. OF GA.

KENNETH WAYNE DILAS, SR.,

Plaintiff,

v.

LYNN M. ANDERSON, Sheriff, Bulloch  
County; EFFINGHAM COUNTY SHERIFF;  
CHATHAM COUNTY SHERIFF; POOLER  
POLICE CHIEF; and McINTOSH  
COUNTY SHERIFF,

Defendants.

CIVIL ACTION NO.: CV610-079

**MAGISTRATE JUDGE'S REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION**

Plaintiff, who is currently housed at the Bulloch County Jail in Statesboro, Georgia, filed an action pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983. A detainee proceeding in a civil action against officers or employees of government entities must comply with the mandates of the Prison Litigation Reform Act, 28 U.S.C. §§ 1915 & 1915A. In determining compliance, the court shall be guided by the longstanding principle that *pro se* pleadings are entitled to liberal construction. Haines v. Kerner, 404 U.S. 519, 520 (1972); Walker v. Dugger, 860 F.2d 1010, 1011 (11th Cir. 1988).

28 U.S.C. § 1915A requires a district court to screen the complaint for cognizable claims before or as soon as possible after docketing. The court must dismiss the

complaint or any portion of the complaint that is frivolous, malicious, fails to state a claim upon which relief may be granted, or seeks monetary damages from a defendant who is immune from such relief. 28 U.S.C. § 1915A(b)(1) and (2).

In Mitchell v. Farcass, 112 F.3d 1483, 1490 (11th Cir. 1997), the Eleventh Circuit interpreted the language contained in § 1915(e)(2)(B)(ii), which is nearly identical to that contained in the screening provisions at § 1915A(b). As the language of § 1915(e)(2)(B)(ii) closely tracks the language of Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 12(b)(6), the court held that the same standards for determining whether to dismiss for failure to state a claim under Rule 12(b)(6) should be applied to prisoner complaints filed pursuant to § 1915(e)(2)(B)(ii). Mitchell, 112 F.3d at 1490. The Court may dismiss a complaint for failure to state a claim only where it appears beyond a doubt that a *pro se* litigant can prove no set of facts that would entitle him to relief. Hughes v. Rowe, 449 U.S. 5, 10 (1980); Mitchell, 112 F.3d at 1490. While the court in Mitchell interpreted § 1915(e), its interpretation guides this Court in applying the identical language of § 1915A.

Plaintiff asserts that he was "detained" by the Bulloch County Sheriff's Department and was not read his rights pursuant to Miranda v. Arizona, 384 U.S. 436 (1966), after being charged with several counts of deposit account fraud. (Doc. No. 1, p. 5). Plaintiff also asserts that he faces the same charges in Effingham, Chatham, and McIntosh Counties, as well as the City of Pooler. Plaintiff requests that this Court declare unconstitutional the charges and warrants and/or detainers filed against him and order his release from custody.

In general, the distinction between claims which may be brought under § 1983 and those which must be brought as habeas petitions is now reasonably well settled. Claims in which detainees assert that they are being subjected to unconstitutional punishment not imposed as part of their sentence, such as, for example, being exposed to an excessive amount of force, are § 1983 actions, not habeas actions. See, e.g., Farmer v. Brennan, 511 U.S. 825 (1994). Habeas actions, in contrast, are those that explicitly or by necessary implication challenge a prisoner's conviction or the sentence imposed on him by (or under the administrative system implementing the judgment of) a court. Thus, for example, when a prisoner makes a claim that, if successful, could shorten his term of imprisonment, the claim must be brought as a habeas petition, not as a § 1983 claim. See, e.g., Edwards v. Balisok, 520 U.S. 641 (1997); Heck v. Humphrey, 512 U.S. 477 (1994). While there is no evidence Plaintiff has been convicted in the state court, Plaintiff has available to him the option of filing motions in the appropriate state court to contest the validity of the detainers and charges filed against him.

Additionally, when a state prisoner challenges the "fact or duration of his physical imprisonment, and the relief he seeks is a determination that he is entitled to immediate release or a speedier release from that imprisonment, his sole federal remedy is a writ of habeas corpus." Harden v. Pataki, 320 F.3d 1289, 1294 n.6 (11th Cir. 2003) (quoting Preiser v. Rodriguez, 411 U.S. 475, 500 (1973)). Plaintiff must exhaust his available state remedies before a federal court can address these claims.

**CONCLUSION**

Based on the foregoing, it is my **RECOMMENDATION** that Plaintiff's Complaint be **DISMISSED** for failure to state a claim upon which relief may be granted.

**SO REPORTED** and **RECOMMENDED**, this 15<sup>th</sup> day of November, 2010.

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
JAMES E. GRAHAM  
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE