



Ultimately, Martin says that she is seeking \$350,000 in punitive damages, and she asks the Court to restore her good time credits and expunge her disciplinary record. [R. 1 at 14.]

The Court, however, will dismiss Martin's claims. As an initial matter, Martin's claims for money damages against the defendants in their official capacities are barred by the Eleventh Amendment. *See Rodgers v. Banks*, 344 F.3d 587, 594 (6th Cir. 2003). Moreover, Martin cannot challenge her disciplinary conviction and loss of good time credits in a § 1983 action; instead her remedy is to pursue relief under state law and then, if necessary, file a habeas action. *See Smith v. Corrections Corp. of America*, 5 F. App'x 443, 444-45 (6th Cir. 2001) (discussing *Heck v. Humphrey*, 512 U.S. 477 (1994) and *Edwards v. Balisok*, 520 U.S. 641 (1997)). And to the extent that Martin takes exception to the procedures related to her disciplinary conviction, she is not currently eligible for relief on that basis because there is no indication from the record that her disciplinary conviction has been overturned. *See Smith*, 5 F. App'x at 445; *see also Lee-Bey v. Gundy*, 80 F. App'x 435, 437 (6th Cir. 2003) (citing *Edwards v. Balisok*, 520 U.S. at 646).

Accordingly, **IT IS ORDERED** that:

1. Martin's claims for money damages against the defendants in their official capacities are **DISMISSED WITH PREJUDICE**.
2. Martin's claims challenging her disciplinary conviction and loss of good time credits, as well as the related procedures, are **DISMISSED WITHOUT PREJUDICE**.
3. This action is **STRICKEN** from the Court's docket.
4. A corresponding judgment will be entered this date.

This the 19th day of June, 2017.



Gregory F. Van Tatenhove  
United States District Judge