Taylor v. Berham Doc. 6

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT NORTHERN DISTRICT OF INDIANA

CURTIS D. TAYLOR,)	
Plaintiff,)	
v.)	CAUSE NO.: 3:16-CV-2-TLS
DOLLAR TREE, and BRET BERHAM,)	
Defendants.)	

OPINION AND ORDER

Curtis D. Taylor, a Plaintiff proceeding pro se, has filed an Amended Complaint [ECF No. 5] against the Dollar Tree and Bret Berham. He also filed a Petition to Proceed Without Prepayment of Fees and Costs [ECF No. 5]. The Court dismissed without prejudice the Plaintiff's previous complaint pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B)(ii), but granted him time to amend his complaint. The Plaintiff has now cured the deficiencies in the original complaint alleging discrimination and retaliation under Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, as he has identified the protected category to which he belongs, and stated what adverse action was taken against him. His allegations give "fair notice of what the . . . claim is and the grounds upon which it rests." EEOC v. Concentra Health Serv., Inc., 496 F.3d 773, 776–77 (7th Cir. 2007) (quoting Bell Atlantic Corp. v. Twombly, 550 U.S. 544, 555 (2007)) (other citation omitted); see also Tamayo v. Blagojevich, 526 F.3d 1074, 1084 (7th Cir. 2008) (pleading standard for "simple claims of race or sex discrimination" is minimal and requires only that the plaintiff on the basis of sex or race).

Additionally, the Plaintiff's Petition establishes that he is unable prepay the filing fee. 28 U.S.C. § 1915(a). Accordingly, the Court:

- (1) GRANTS the Plaintiff's Petition [ECF No. 5];
- (2) DEFERS payment of the filing fee;
- ORDERS the Plaintiff to pay the filing fee from the proceeds of any recovery that is received in this case; and
- (4) DIRECTS that, pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915(d), the United States Marshals Service effect service of process on the Defendant.

SO ORDERED on February 25, 2016.

s/ Theresa L. Springmann
THERESA L. SPRINGMANN
UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FORT WAYNE DIVISION