

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF KANSAS**

MARCQUAL D. HIGHTOWER,

Plaintiff,

v.

CASE NO. 17-3044-SAC-DJW

**STATE OF KANSAS, YOLANDA COLLINS,
and FNU LNU SEDGWICK COUNTY
DISTRICT COURT CHILD SUPPORT JUDGE,**

Defendants.

NOTICE AND ORDER TO SHOW CAUSE

Plaintiff Marcqual D. Hightower is hereby required to show good cause, in writing, to the Honorable Sam A. Crow, United States District Judge, why this action should not be dismissed due to the deficiencies in Plaintiff's Complaint that are discussed herein.

I. Nature of the Matter before the Court

Plaintiff brings this *pro se* civil rights action pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983. Plaintiff is detained at the Sedgwick County Detention Center in Wichita, Kansas. Plaintiff filed a Complaint (Doc. 1), alleging the following. In 2009, Plaintiff was informed that he may possibly be the father of a child and that he would be notified for a paternity test. A paternity test was not administered at that time by "an authorized State of Kansas Health and/or licensed representative." Plaintiff was arrested for nonpayment of child support. Plaintiff filed a motion with the state court requesting a paternity test, but the judge informed him "it was too late." A year and a half later, Plaintiff again motioned for a paternity test and the judge denied the request. Plaintiff then had his own paternity test administered and it was "negative." He showed this test to the state court, to the child support office and to the child's mother—defendant Yolanda Collins. Plaintiff names as defendants the State of Kansas, the state court judge, and

Yolanda Collins. Plaintiff challenges the state court judge's denial of his two motions for paternity testing and Collins' actions in allowing him to go to jail and in allowing garnishment his checks.

II. Statutory Screening of Prisoner Complaints

The Court is required to screen complaints brought by prisoners seeking relief against a governmental entity or an officer or an employee of a governmental entity. 28 U.S.C. § 1915A(a). The Court must dismiss a complaint or portion thereof if a plaintiff has raised claims that are legally frivolous or malicious, that fail to state a claim upon which relief may be granted, or that seek monetary relief from a defendant who is immune from such relief. 28 U.S.C. § 1915A(b)(1)–(2).

“To state a claim under § 1983, a plaintiff must allege the violation of a right secured by the Constitution and laws of the United States, and must show that the alleged deprivation was committed by a person acting under color of state law.” *West v. Atkins*, 487 U.S. 42, 48 (1988) (citations omitted); *Northington v. Jackson*, 973 F.2d 1518, 1523 (10th Cir. 1992). A court liberally construes a pro se complaint and applies “less stringent standards than formal pleadings drafted by lawyers.” *Erickson v. Pardus*, 551 U.S. 89, 94 (2007). In addition, the court accepts all well-pleaded allegations in the complaint as true. *Anderson v. Blake*, 469 F.3d 910, 913 (10th Cir. 2006). On the other hand, “when the allegations in a complaint, however true, could not raise a claim of entitlement to relief,” dismissal is appropriate. *Bell Atlantic Corp. v. Twombly*, 550 U.S. 544, 558 (2007).

A pro se litigant's “conclusory allegations without supporting factual averments are insufficient to state a claim upon which relief can be based.” *Hall v. Bellmon*, 935 F.2d 1106, 1110 (10th Cir. 1991). “[A] plaintiff's obligation to provide the ‘grounds’ of his ‘entitlement to

relief” requires “more than labels and conclusions, and a formulaic recitation of the elements of a cause of action.” *Twombly*, 550 U.S. at 555 (citations omitted). The complaint’s “factual allegations must be enough to raise a right to relief above the speculative level” and “to state a claim to relief that is plausible on its face.” *Id.* at 555, 570.

The Tenth Circuit Court of Appeals has explained “that, to state a claim in federal court, a complaint must explain what each defendant did to [the *pro se* plaintiff]; when the defendant did it; how the defendant’s action harmed [the plaintiff]; and, what specific legal right the plaintiff believes the defendant violated.” *Nasious v. Two Unknown B.I.C.E. Agents*, 492 F.3d 1158, 1163 (10th Cir. 2007). The court “will not supply additional factual allegations to round out a plaintiff’s complaint or construct a legal theory on a plaintiff’s behalf.” *Whitney v. New Mexico*, 113 F.3d 1170, 1173-74 (10th Cir. 1997) (citation omitted).

The Tenth Circuit has pointed out that the Supreme Court’s decisions in *Twombly* and *Erickson* gave rise to a new standard of review for § 1915(e)(2)(B)(ii) dismissals. *See Kay v. Bemis*, 500 F.3d 1214, 1218 (10th Cir. 2007) (citations omitted); *see also Smith v. United States*, 561 F.3d 1090, 1098 (10th Cir. 2009). As a result, courts “look to the specific allegations in the complaint to determine whether they plausibly support a legal claim for relief.” *Kay*, 500 F.3d at 1218 (citation omitted). Under this new standard, “a plaintiff must ‘nudge his claims across the line from conceivable to plausible.’” *Smith*, 561 F.3d at 1098 (citation omitted). “Plausible” in this context does not mean “likely to be true,” but rather refers “to the scope of the allegations in a complaint: if they are so general that they encompass a wide swath of conduct, much of it innocent,” then the plaintiff has not “nudged [his] claims across the line from conceivable to plausible.” *Robbins v. Oklahoma*, 519 F.3d 1242, 1247 (10th Cir. 2008) (citing *Twombly*, 127 S. Ct. at 1974).

III. DISCUSSION

A. State of Kansas

To bring a § 1983 claim, a plaintiff must show a “deprivation of a civil right by a ‘person’ acting under color of state law.” *McLaughlin v. Bd. of Trustees of State Coll. of Colo.*, 215 F.3d 1168, 1172 (10th Cir. 2000). The Supreme Court has held that “neither a State nor its officials acting in their official capacities are ‘persons’ under § 1983.” *Will v. Michigan Dep’t of State Police*, 491 U.S. 58, 71 (1989); *see also Howlett v. Rose*, 496 U.S. 356, 365 (1990) (“*Will* establishes that the State and arms of the State, which have traditionally enjoyed Eleventh Amendment immunity, are not subject to suit under § 1983.”). Furthermore, the Eleventh Amendment presents a jurisdictional bar to suits against a state and “arms of the state” unless the state waives its immunity. *Peterson v. Martinez*, 707 F.3d 1197, 1205 (10th Cir. 2013) (quoting *Wagoner Cnty. Rural Water Dist. No. 2 v. Grand River Dam Auth.*, 577 F.3d 1255, 1258 (10th Cir. 2009)). Therefore, in the absence of some consent, a suit in which an agent or department of the state is named as a defendant is “proscribed by the Eleventh Amendment.” *Pennhurst State Sch. & Hosp. v. Halderman*, 465 U.S. 89, 100 (1984). Therefore, this action is subject to dismissal against defendant State of Kansas because this defendant is not a “person” amenable to suit under § 1983 and it is immune from suit under the Eleventh Amendment.

B. State Actor

A complaint brought under § 1983 must allege “the violation of a right secured by the Constitution and laws of the United States, and must show that the alleged deprivation was committed by a person acting under color of state law.” *Bruner v. Baker*, 506 F.3d 1021, 1025–26 (10th Cir. 2007) (citation omitted). A defendant acts “under color of state law” when he

“exercises[s] power possessed by virtue of state law and made possible only because the wrongdoer is clothed with the authority of state law.” *West v. Atkins*, 487 U.S. 42, 49 (1988) (citation omitted). Thus, it is of no consequence how discriminatory or wrongful the actions a plaintiff may describe; merely private conduct does not satisfy the “under color of” element and therefore no § 1983 liability exists. *See Brentwood Acad. v. Tennessee Secondary Athletic Ass’n*, 531 U.S. 288, 294–96 (2001). Plaintiff’s claim against Defendant Collins fails to show that she was acting under color of state law.

C. Judicial Immunity

Plaintiff also names as a defendant the state court judge presiding over his child support case.

1. Eleventh Amendment Immunity

Although it is unclear whether Plaintiff sues the state court judge in her official capacity, a claim against state officials for monetary damages is barred by sovereign immunity. An official-capacity suit is another way of pleading an action against the governmental entity itself. *Kentucky v. Graham*, 473 U.S. 159, 165 (1985). “When a suit alleges a claim against a state official in his official capacity, the real party in interest in the case is the state, and the state may raise the defense of sovereign immunity under the Eleventh Amendment.” *Callahan v. Poppell*, 471 F.3d 1155, 1158 (10th Cir. 2006) (quotation omitted). Sovereign immunity generally bars actions in federal court for damages against state officials acting in their official capacities. *Harris v. Owens*, 264 F.3d 1282, 1289 (10th Cir. 2001). It is well established that Congress did not abrogate the states’ sovereign immunity when it enacted § 1983. *Quern v. Jordan*, 440 U.S. 332, 338–45 (1979); *Ruiz v. McDonnell*, 299 F.3d 1173, 1181 (10th Cir. 2002).

The bar also applies when the entity is an arm or instrumentality of a state. *Sturdevant v. Paulsen*, 218 F.3d 1160, 1164 (10th Cir. 2000). In determining whether an entity is an instrumentality or arm of the state for purposes of Eleventh Amendment immunity, the Tenth Circuit has established a two-party inquiry, requiring an examination of: (1) “the degree of autonomy given to the agency, as determined by the characterization of the agency by state law and the extent of guidance and control exercised by the state,” and (2) “the extent of financing the agency receives independent of the state treasury and its ability to provide for its own financing.” *Duke v. Grady Mun. Sch.*, 127 F.3d 972, 974 (10th Cir. 1997) (citations omitted). “The governmental entity is immune from suit if the money judgment sought is to be satisfied out of the state treasury.” *Id.* (citations omitted).

Kansas state law clearly characterizes the district courts as arms of the state government—part of a unified judicial branch along with the Kansas Supreme Court and Kansas Court of Appeals. *Wilkins v. Skiles*, No. 02–3190, 2005 WL 627962, at *4 (D. Kan. March 4, 2005); *see generally*, KAN. CONST. art 3. The legislature defines “state agency,” for purposes of the state workers’ compensation fund, as “the state, or any department or agency of the state, but not including . . . the district court with regard to district court officers or employees whose total salary is payable by counties.” K.S.A. 44–575(a). The only court personnel who are not included in the judicial personnel pay system, and are instead paid by the county, are county auditors, coroners, court trustees and personnel in each trustee’s office, and personnel performing services in adult or juvenile detention or correctional facilities. K.S.A. 20–162(a), (b). District court judges are state officials. *Schroeder v. Kochanowski*, 311 F. Supp. 2d 1241, 1256 (D. Kan. 2004), *see also Sigg v. Dist. Court of Allen Cty., Kan.*, No. 11-2625-JTM, 2012

WL 941144, at *4 (D. Kan. March 20, 2012) (district court judge is a state official and official capacity claims against judge for money damages are barred).

Any official capacity claim against the state official for monetary damages is barred by sovereign immunity. Furthermore, state officers acting in their official capacity are not considered “persons” against whom a claim for damages can be brought under § 1983. *Will v. Mich. Dept. of State Police*, 491 U.S. 58, 71 (1989).

B. Personal Immunity

The defendant state court judge also enjoys personal immunity. “Personal immunities . . . are immunities derived from common law which attach to certain governmental officials in order that they not be inhibited from ‘proper performance of their duties.’” *Russ v. Uppah*, 972 F.2d 300, 302–03 (10th Cir. 1992) (citing *Forrester v. White*, 484 U.S. 219, 223, 225 (1988)).

Plaintiff’s claim against the state court judge should be dismissed on the basis of judicial immunity. A state judge is absolutely immune from § 1983 liability except when the judge acts “in the clear absence of all jurisdiction.” *Stump v. Sparkman*, 435 U.S. 349, 356–57 (1978) (articulating broad immunity rule that a “judge will not be deprived of immunity because the action he took was in error, was done maliciously, or was in excess of his authority”); *Hunt v. Bennett*, 17 F.3d 1263, 1266 (10th Cir. 1994). Only actions taken outside a judge’s judicial capacity will deprive the judge of judicial immunity. *Stump*, 435 U.S. at 356–57. Plaintiff alleges no facts whatsoever to suggest that the state court judge was acting outside her judicial capacities.

The Court must dismiss a case if it finds that the plaintiff is seeking monetary relief against a defendant “who is immune from such relief.” 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B)(iii); *see also* 28 U.S.C. § 1915A(b).

D. State Court Proceedings

Plaintiff's allegations undermining the validity of his confinement on state charges are barred absent a showing that the basis for his state confinement has been overturned or invalidated. *Heck v. Humphrey*, 512 U.S. 477, 486–87 (2009). To the extent Plaintiff seeks to undermine or invalidate any state charges that may remain pending against him, habeas corpus is the sole available remedy after first exhausting state court remedies. *Preiser v. Rodriguez*, 411 U.S. 475, 476 – 77, 500 (1973). Generally, federal habeas corpus relief is not available to a state prisoner unless all state court remedies were exhausted before the petition was filed. 28 U.S.C. § 2254(b)(1)(A); see also *Wainwright v. Sykes*, 433 U.S. 72, 80–81 (1977). “States should have the first opportunity to address and correct alleged violations of state prisoner’s federal rights.” *Coleman v. Thompson*, 501 U.S. 722, 731 (1991) (explaining that the exhaustion requirement is “grounded in principles of comity”). “A state prisoner must give the state courts an opportunity to act on his claims before he presents those claims to a federal court in a habeas petition.” *O’Sullivan v. Boerckel*, 526 U.S. 838, 842 (1999). It is the petitioner’s burden to prove that he fully exhausted all state court remedies prior to filing his petition in federal court. Generally, the exhaustion prerequisite is not satisfied unless all claims asserted have been presented by “invoking one complete round of the State’s established appellate review process.” *Id.* at 845. This means that each claim must have been “properly presented” as a federal constitutional issue “to the highest state court, either by direct review of the conviction or in a post-conviction attack.” *Dever v. Kansas State Penitentiary*, 36 F.3d 1531, 1534 (10th Cir. 1994). It has long

been established that a § 2254 petition containing federal claims which have not been exhausted in state court must be dismissed. *See Rose v. Lundy*, 455 U.S. 509, 513-20 (1982).

To the extent Plaintiff's state court proceedings are still pending, the abstention doctrine generally precludes action by this Court on Plaintiff's federal claims. Under *Younger v. Harris*, 401 U.S. 37 (1971), this court must abstain from review of such proceedings. *Younger* abstention is jurisdictional. *D.L. v. Unified Sch. Dist. No. 497*, 392 F.3d 1223, 1228 (10th Cir. 2004) (citing *Steel Co. v. Citizens for a Better Env.*, 523 U.S. 83, 100 n. 3 (1998)). According to the Supreme Court, federal courts are to avoid interference with ongoing state proceedings if the state court provides an adequate forum to present any federal constitutional challenges. *Younger*, 401 U.S. at 45, 49.

The *Younger* abstention doctrine, if applied, obligates the Court to dismiss an action in favor of an ongoing state proceeding. *Weitzel v. Div. of Occupational & Prof'l Licensing*, 240 F.3d 871, 875 (10th Cir. 2001); *Amanatullah v. Colorado Bd. of Med. Exam'rs*, 187 F.3d 1160, 1163 (10th Cir.1999)). Under *Younger*, "[e]ven when a federal court would otherwise have jurisdiction to hear a claim, the court may be obliged to abstain when a federal court judgment on the claim would interfere with an ongoing state proceeding implicating important state interests." *Unified Sch. Dist. No. 497*, 392 F.3d at 1227–28. Therefore, this Court must abstain from exercising jurisdiction if the following conditions are met:

- (1) there is an ongoing state criminal, civil, or administrative proceeding, (2) the state court provides an adequate forum to hear the claims raised in the federal complaint, and (3) the state proceedings involve important state interests, matters which traditionally look to state law for their resolution or implicate separately articulated state policies.

Weitzel, 240 F.3d at 875.

IV. Response Required

For the reasons stated herein, it appears that this action is subject to dismissal in its entirety. Plaintiff is therefore required to show good cause why his Complaint (Doc. 1) should not be dismissed for the reasons stated herein. The failure to file a timely, specific response waives de novo review by the District Judge, *see Thomas v. Arn*, 474 U.S. 140, 148–53 (1985), and also waives appellate review of both factual and legal questions. *Makin v. Col. Dept. of Corr.*, 183 F.3d 1205, 1210 (10th Cir. 1999).

IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED BY THE COURT that Plaintiff is granted until **August 24, 2017**, in which to show good cause, in writing, to the Honorable Sam A. Crow, United States District Judge, why Plaintiff's Complaint (Doc. 1) should not be dismissed for the reasons stated herein.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated in Kansas City, Kansas, on this 25th day of July, 2017.

s/ David J. Waxse
David J. Waxse
U. S. Magistrate Judge