Runkle v. Pancake et al Doc. 101

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT WESTERN DISTRICT OF KENTUCKY AT LOUISVILLE

SHEILA RENEE RUNKLE, Administratrix of the Estate of Robert Earl Runkle, Deceased **PLAINTIFF**

v.

CIVIL ACTION NO. 3:08-CV-188-S

BECKY W. PANCAKE, et al.

DEFENDANTS

MEMORANDUM OPINION

This matter is before the Court upon the motion of defendant Commonwealth of Kentucky, Department of Corrections ("DOC") to dismiss the claims filed against it by plaintiff Sheila Renee Runkle, Administratrix of the Estate of Robert Earl Runkle, Deceased ("Runkle") (DN 64). Runkle did not respond to DOC's motion.

DOC is one of several named defendants in the above-styled action involving allegations of inadequate prison medical care. Runkle alleges claims against DOC under 42 U.S.C. § 1983 based on the Eighth Amendment, Kentucky's statutory right for prisoners to have health care, medical negligence, outrage, negligence and wrongful death. Runkle argues that DOC is liable for the acts and/or omissions of its employees under the doctrine of *repondeat superior*.

The Court lacks subject matter jurisdiction over Runkle's claims against DOC, an arm of the Commonwealth of Kentucky, by operation of the Eleventh Amendment to the U.S. Constitution. The Eleventh Amendment precludes a State from being sued in federal court absent that State's consent to suit or abrogation by Congressional act pursuant to the exercise of a valid Constitutional power. *Welch v. Texas Dept. of Highways and Public. Transp.*, 483 U.S. 468, 472-474, 107 S. Ct.

¹Exec. Order No. 2004-730 (July 9, 2004); Ky. Rev. Stat. Ann. § 12.250.

2941, 97 L. Ed. 2d. 389 (1987); *Mixon v. Ohio*, 193 F.3d 389, 397 (6th Cir. 1999). Congress did not intend to abrogate the Eleventh Amendment immunity of the States by the passage of § 1983. *Quern v. Jordan*, 440 U.S. 332, 338-342, 99 S. Ct. 1139 (1979). Kentucky has not waived its immunity from suit in federal court for claims under § 1983. Accordingly, DOC must be dismissed. A separate order will be entered this date in accordance with this opinion.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

August 28, 2009

Charles R. Simpson III, Judge United States District Court