

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF INDIANA**

ERIC BOWMAN,)	
)	
Plaintiff,)	
)	
v.)	No. 1:12-cv-277-JMS-DML
)	
STATE OF INDIANA, et al.,)	
)	
Defendants.)	

Entry and Order Dismissing Action

I.

AA complaint must always . . . allege enough facts to state a claim to relief that is plausible on its face. *Limestone Development Corp. v. Village of Lemont, Ill.*, 520 F.3d 797, 803 (7th Cir. 2008)(quoting *Bell Atlantic Corp. v. Twombly*, 550 U.S. 544, 555 (2007)). AA claim has facial plausibility when the plaintiff pleads factual content that allows the court to draw the reasonable inference that the defendant is liable for the misconduct alleged." *Ashcroft v. Iqbal*, 129 S. Ct. 1937, 1949 (2009).


Eric Bowman’s complaint was dismissed on May 30, 2012, because it failed to state a claim upon which relief can be granted and violated the “short and plain statement” requirement of Rule 8(a)(2) of the *Federal Rules of Civil Procedure*. Bowman was given a period of time in which to file an amended complaint and given guidelines to do so adequately. An amended complaint was filed, but lacks the facial plausibility required by Rule 8(a)(2).

II.

Judgment consistent with this Entry shall now issue.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Date: 07/30/2012



Hon. Jane Magnus-Stinson, Judge
United States District Court
Southern District of Indiana

Distribution:

**ERIC R. BOWMAN
1486 Stanford Drive
Avon, IN 46123**