

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
WESTERN DISTRICT OF KENTUCKY
LOUISVILLE DIVISION**

REGINALD FARRELL

PLAINTIFF

v.

CIVIL ACTION NO. 3:17-CV-692-JHM

CAPT. DAWN THOMPSON et al.

DEFENDANTS

MEMORANDUM OPINION

Pro se Plaintiff Reginald Farrell filed the instant action. Because Plaintiff is proceeding *in forma pauperis* under 28 U.S.C. § 1915, the Court must undertake a preliminary review of the complaint. See 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e); *McGore v. Wrigglesworth*, 114 F.3d 601 (6th Cir. 1997), *overruled on other grounds by Jones v. Bock*, 549 U.S. 199 (2007). For the following reasons, the action will be dismissed.

I. SUMMARY OF CLAIMS

Plaintiff names as Defendants Louisville Metro Police Captain Dawn Thompson and the following Louisville Metro Department of Corrections employees: Chief Mark Bolton; Sgt. Heacock; Assistant Chief Dwayne Clark; and Lt. Chuck Eggers. He states in the portion of the complaint form asking for the basis of federal jurisdiction: “HIPPA medical violations.” Plaintiff alleges in the state of the claim portion of the complaint form: “violation of HIPPA medical rights[;] internal affairs showed up flashing badges at my doctors office asking medical ‘personal question[.]’” As relief, he asks for \$5,000,000 “and health insurance for rest of life or back-pay since 2011 plus reinstated with rare weekends off take home car.”

II. ANALYSIS

Because Plaintiff is proceeding *in forma pauperis*, this Court must review the instant action. See 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2); *McGore v. Wrigglesworth*, 114 F.3d at 608. Upon review,

this Court must dismiss a case at any time if the Court determines that the action is “frivolous or malicious,” fails to state a claim upon which relief may be granted, or seeks monetary relief from a defendant who is immune from such relief. 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B). A claim is legally frivolous when it lacks an arguable basis either in law or in fact. *Neitzke v. Williams*, 490 U.S. 319, 325 (1989). The Court may, therefore, dismiss a claim as frivolous where it is based on an indisputably meritless legal theory or where the factual contentions are clearly baseless. *Id.* at 327.

When determining whether a plaintiff has stated a claim upon which relief can be granted, the Court must construe the complaint in a light most favorable to the plaintiff and accept all of the factual allegations as true. *Prater v. City of Burnside, Ky.*, 289 F.3d 417, 424 (6th Cir. 2002). A complaint, or portion thereof, should be dismissed for failure to state a claim upon which relief may be granted “only if it appears beyond a doubt that the plaintiff can prove no set of facts in support of his claim that would entitle him to relief.” *Brown v. Bargery*, 207 F.3d 863, 867 (6th Cir. 2000). While a reviewing court must liberally construe *pro se* pleadings, *Boag v. MacDougall*, 454 U.S. 364, 365 (1982) (per curiam), to avoid dismissal, a complaint must include “enough facts to state a claim to relief that is plausible on its face.” *Bell Atl. Corp. v. Twombly*, 550 U.S. 544, 570 (2007).

Plaintiff alleges violations of the Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act of 1996 (HIPAA). Title II of HIPAA, codified at 42 U.S.C. § 1320a *et seq.*, was created to protect against the unauthorized disclosure of health records and information. *Gratton v. United Parcel Serv., Inc.*, No. CV 07-3071, 2008 WL 4934056, at *4 (E.D.N.Y. Nov. 14, 2008). However, only the Secretary of the Department of Health and Human Services may file suit to enforce its provisions. 42 U.S.C. § 1320d-5(d); *Sneed v. Pan Am. Hosp.*, 370 F. App’x 47, 50 (11th Cir.

2010). Private citizens have no standing to sue a covered entity for a violation of HIPAA. *Adams v. Eureka Fire Prot. Dist.*, 352 F. App'x 137, 139 (8th Cir. 2009) (holding that HIPAA cannot be enforced through either an implied private right of action or through 42 U.S.C. § 1983); *see also Carpenter v. Phillips*, 419 F. App'x 658, 658 (7th Cir. 2011); *Siegler v. Ohio State Univ.*, No. 2:11-cv-170, 2011 WL 1990570, at *8 (S.D. Ohio May 23, 2011). Accordingly, Plaintiff's complaint fails to state a claim and will be dismissed with prejudice.

III. CONCLUSION

For the foregoing reasons, by separate Order, this action will be dismissed.

Date: January 31, 2018


Joseph H. McKinley, Jr., Chief Judge
United States District Court

cc: Plaintiff, *pro se*
Defendants
4414.009