

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF INDIANA
SOUTH BEND DIVISION**

ANDRE DEMETRIC PAYNE,)	
)	
Plaintiff,)	
)	
vs.)	CAUSE NO. 3:16-CV-854
)	
CHARLES W. LAHEY,)	
)	
Defendant.)	

OPINION AND ORDER

This matter is before the Court on the complaint filed by Andre Demetric Payne, a pro se prisoner, on December 15, 2016. "A document filed pro se is to be liberally construed, and a pro se complaint, however inartfully pleaded, must be held to less stringent standards than formal pleadings drafted by lawyers." *Erickson v. Pardus*, 551 U.S. 89, 94 (2007) (quotation marks and citations omitted). Nevertheless, pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915A, a court must review the merits of a prisoner complaint and dismiss it if the action is frivolous or malicious, fails to state a claim upon which relief may be granted, or seeks monetary relief against a defendant who is immune from such relief.

Payne alleges that his State court criminal defense attorney violated the Sixth Amendment by not introducing the interview statement of his co-defendant to prove that he acted in self-defense. "In order to state a claim under § 1983 a plaintiff must

allege: (1) that defendants deprived him of a federal constitutional right; and (2) that the defendants acted under color of state law." *Savory v. Lyons*, 469 F.3d 667, 670 (7th Cir. 2006). A criminal defense attorney, even an appointed public defender, does not act under color of state law. *Polk County v. Dodson*, 454 U.S. 312 (1981). Therefore Payne has not stated a federal law claim under § 1983.

Though it is usually necessary "to give pro se litigants one opportunity to amend after dismissing a complaint[,] that's unnecessary where, as here, it is certain from the face of the complaint that any amendment would be futile or otherwise unwarranted." *Carpenter v. PNC Bank, Nat. Ass'n*, No. 633 Fed. Appx. 346, 348 (7th Cir. Feb. 3, 2016) (quotation marks omitted). See *Luevano v. Wal-Mart*, 722 F.3d 1014 (7th Cir. 2013) and *Hukic v. Aurora Loan Servs.*, 588 F.3d 420, 432 (7th Cir. 2009) ("[C]ourts have broad discretion to deny leave to amend where . . . the amendment would be futile.").

For these reasons, this case is **DISMISSED** pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915A because it does not state a claim.

DATED: January 9, 2017

/s/RUDY LOZANO, Judge
United States District Court