

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA  
UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF MICHIGAN  
SOUTHERN DIVISION

JEREMY JASON JENNINGS,

Plaintiff,

Case No. 1:10-cv-1011

v.

Honorable Janet T. Neff

PATRICIA CARUSO et al.,

Defendants.

\_\_\_\_\_ /

**OPINION**

This is a civil rights action brought by a state prisoner pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983.

The Court has granted Plaintiff leave to proceed *in forma pauperis* and Plaintiff shall pay the initial partial filing fee when funds are available. Under the Prison Litigation Reform Act, PUB. L. NO. 104-134, 110 STAT. 1321 (1996), the Court is required to dismiss any prisoner action brought under federal law if the complaint is frivolous, malicious, fails to state a claim upon which relief can be granted, or seeks monetary relief from a defendant immune from such relief. 28 U.S.C. §§ 1915(e)(2), 1915A. The Court must read Plaintiff’s *pro se* complaint indulgently, *see Haines v. Kerner*, 404 U.S. 519, 520 (1972), and accept Plaintiff’s allegations as true, unless they are clearly irrational or wholly incredible. *Denton v. Hernandez*, 504 U.S. 25, 33 (1992). Applying these standards, Plaintiff’s action will be dismissed for failure to state a claim.

## Discussion

### I. Factual allegations

Plaintiff Jeremy Jason Jennings presently is incarcerated at the Pugsley Correctional Facility (MPF). Plaintiff pleaded nolo contendere in the Ogemaw County Circuit Court to one count of attempted third-degree criminal sexual conduct, MICH. COMP. LAWS § 750.520d(1)(b), and one count of attempted third-degree criminal sexual conduct (person thirteen years old through fifteen years old), MICH. COMP. LAWS § 750.520d(1)(a). On July 22, 2006, Plaintiff was sentenced to prison terms of 3 to 5 years and 2 years and 6 months to 5 years, respectively.<sup>1</sup> In his *pro se* complaint, Plaintiff sues the following Defendants: Michigan Department of Corrections (MDOC) Director Patricia Caruso, Michigan Governor Jennifer Granholm, MPF employee Brian Majerczyk and Michigan Parole Board Chairperson Barbara Sampson.

Plaintiff contends that Defendants Caruso, Granholm and Sampson are jointly responsible for creating and implementing parole policies, including the requirement that sexual offenders must complete the Sexual Offender Therapy (SOT) program. As part of the SOT program, a participant must admit full responsibility for his offense.

On August 1 and 4, 2010, Plaintiff sent requests to Defendant Majerczyk in order to be admitted to the SOT program “for the purpose of qualifying for parole.” (Compl., Page ID #3, docket #1.) On August 9, Defendant Majerczyk denied Plaintiff’s requests, in part, because Plaintiff had not accepted responsibility for his criminal behavior. Plaintiff argues that a “false admission of guilt would not facilitate the penological goal of rehabilitation.” (*Id.* at Page ID #5.)

---

<sup>1</sup>The Court obtained information regarding Plaintiff’s convictions from the MDOC Offender Information Tracking System at <http://www.state.mi.us/mdoc/asp/otis2profile.asp?mdocNumber=733741>.

In his complaint, Plaintiff raises claims under the First and Fifth Amendments. Plaintiff seeks declaratory and injunctive relief. For injunctive relief, Plaintiff requests an injunction ordering Defendants to change their SOT program policy to allow prisoners, who declare their innocence, into the SOT program or exempt those prisoners from participating in the program. Plaintiff also requests an injunction directing Defendants either to admit Plaintiff immediately into the SOT program or exempt him from that requirement without any effect on his parole eligibility.

## II. Failure to state a claim

A complaint may be dismissed for failure to state a claim if “it fails to give the defendant fair notice of what the . . . claim is and the grounds upon which it rests.” *Bell Atlantic Corp. v. Twombly*, 550 U.S. 544, 555 (2007) (quoting *Conley v. Gibson*, 355 U.S. 41, 45-46 (1957)). While a complaint need not contain detailed factual allegations, a plaintiff’s allegations must include more than labels and conclusions. *Twombly*, 550 U.S. at 555; *Ashcroft v. Iqbal*, 129 S. Ct. 1937, 1949 (2009) (“Threadbare recitals of the elements of a cause of action, supported by mere conclusory statements, do not suffice.”). The court must determine whether the complaint contains “enough facts to state a claim to relief that is plausible on its face.” *Twombly*, 550 U.S. at 570. “A 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*, 129 S. Ct. at 1949. Although the plausibility standard is not equivalent to a “probability requirement,” . . . it asks for more than a sheer possibility that a defendant has acted unlawfully.” *Ashcroft*, 129 S. Ct. at 1949 (quoting *Twombly*, 550 U.S. at 556). “[W]here the well-pleaded facts do not permit the court to infer more than the mere possibility of misconduct, the complaint has alleged – but it has

not ‘show[n]’ – that the pleader is entitled to relief.” *Ashcroft*, 129 S. Ct. at 1950 (quoting FED. R. CIV. P. 8(a)(2)).

To state a claim under 42 U.S.C. § 1983, a plaintiff must allege the violation of a right secured by the federal Constitution or laws and must show that the deprivation was committed by a person acting under color of state law. *West v. Atkins*, 487 U.S. 42, 48 (1988); *Dominguez v. Corr. Med. Servs.*, 555 F.3d 543, 549 (6th Cir. 2009). Because § 1983 is a method for vindicating federal rights, not a source of substantive rights itself, the first step in an action under § 1983 is to identify the specific constitutional right allegedly infringed. *Albright v. Oliver*, 510 U.S. 266, 271 (1994).

A challenge to the fact or duration of confinement ordinarily should be brought as a petition for habeas corpus and is not the proper subject of a civil rights action brought pursuant to § 1983. *See Preiser v. Rodriguez*, 411 U.S. 475, 484, 494 (1973) (the essence of habeas corpus is an attack by a person in custody upon the legality of that custody and the traditional function of the writ is to secure release from illegal custody). The Supreme Court has held that a state prisoner cannot make a cognizable claim under § 1983 for an alleged unconstitutional conviction or for “harm caused by actions whose unlawfulness would render a conviction or sentence invalid” unless a prisoner shows that the conviction or sentence has been “reversed on direct appeal, expunged by executive order, declared invalid by a state tribunal authorized to make such determination, or called into question by a federal court’s issuance of a writ of habeas corpus . . . .” *Heck v. Humphrey*, 512 U.S. 477, 486-87 (1994) (citation omitted); *see also Edwards v. Balisok*, 520 U.S. 641, 646-48 (1997). However, in *Wilkinson v. Dotson*, 544 U.S. 74, 81-82 (2005), the Supreme Court clarified the *Heck* rule, finding “that a state prisoner’s § 1983 action is barred (absent prior invalidation) –

no matter the relief sought (damages or equitable relief), no matter the target of the prisoner's suit (state conduct leading to conviction or internal prison proceedings) – if success in that action would necessarily demonstrate the invalidity of confinement or its duration.”) (emphasis in original). Plaintiff does not seek release from prison; rather, he requests admission to the SOT program. As a consequence, under *Wilkinson*, his success in the action would not necessarily demonstrate the invalidity of his continued confinement, so his action does not appear to be *Heck*-barred. Nevertheless, assuming that Plaintiff's action is cognizable under § 1983, it fails to state a claim as set forth herein.

#### **A. Due Process**

Reading Plaintiff's complaint liberally, *see Haines*, 404 U.S. at 520, Plaintiff appears to claim that Defendants violated his due process rights by creating a policy that prevents him from being considered for parole unless he falsely admits his guilt. To establish a procedural due process violation, a plaintiff must prove that (1) he was deprived of a protected liberty or property interest, and (2) such deprivation occurred without the requisite due process of law. *Club Italia Soccer & Sports Org., Inc. v. Charter Twp. of Shelby*, 470 F.3d 286, 296 (6th Cir. 2006); *see also Swihart v. Wilkinson*, 209 F. App'x 456, 458 (6th Cir. 2006). Plaintiff fails to raise a claim of constitutional magnitude because he has no liberty interest in being released on parole. There is no constitutional or inherent right to be conditionally released before the expiration of a prison sentence. *Greenholtz v. Inmates of Neb. Penal & Corr. Complex*, 442 U.S. 1, 7 (1979). Although a state may establish a parole system, it has no duty to do so; thus, the presence of a parole system by itself does not give rise to a constitutionally protected liberty interest in parole release. *Id.* at 7, 11; *Bd. of Pardons v. Allen*, 482 U.S. 369, 373 (1987). Rather, a liberty interest is present only if state law entitles an

inmate to release on parole. *Inmates of Orient Corr. Inst. v. Ohio State Adult Parole Auth.*, 929 F.2d 233, 235 (6th Cir. 1991).

In *Sweeton v. Brown*, 27 F.3d 1162, 1164-165 (6th Cir. 1994) (en banc), the Sixth Circuit, noting “the broad powers of the Michigan authorities to deny parole,” held that the Michigan system does not create a liberty interest in parole. Subsequent to its 1994 decision, the Sixth Circuit has recognized the continuing validity of *Sweeton* and has continued to find that Michigan’s parole scheme creates no liberty interest in being released on parole. See, e.g. *Foster v. Booker*, 595 F.3d 353, 368 (6th Cir. 2010); *Ward v. Stegall*, No. 03-1804, 2004 WL 614581, at \*1 (6th Cir. Mar. 24, 2004). Also, in unpublished decisions, the Sixth Circuit has held that particular parts of Michigan’s statutory parole scheme do not create a liberty interest in parole. See *Fifer v. Mich. Dep’t of Corr.*, No. 96-2322, 1997 WL 681518, at \*1 (6th Cir. Oct. 30, 1997); *Moran v. McGinnis*, No. 95-1330, 1996 WL 304344, at \*2 (6th Cir. June 5, 1996); *Leaphart v. Gach*, No. 95-1639, 1995 WL 734480, at \*2 (6th Cir. Dec. 11, 1995). In addition, the Michigan Supreme Court has recognized that there exists no liberty interest in parole under the Michigan system. *Glover v. Mich. Parole Bd.*, 596 N.W.2d 598, 603-04 (Mich. 1999).

Until Plaintiff has served his five-year maximum sentence, he has no reasonable expectation of liberty. In the absence of a liberty interest, even an allegation of arbitrary or capricious denial of release on parole states no federal claim. See *Haynes*, 1990 WL 41025, at \*1. The discretionary parole system in Michigan holds out “no more than a mere hope that the benefit will be obtained.” *Greenholtz*, 442 U.S. at 11. Plaintiff therefore fails to state a claim for a violation of his procedural due process rights.

Moreover, to the extent that Plaintiff intends to allege that his due process rights were violated when he was denied admission into the SOT program, he also fails to state a claim. Plaintiff does not have a federally cognizable liberty interest in participating in any rehabilitative program. Federal courts consistently have found that prisoners have no constitutionally protected liberty interest in prison vocational, rehabilitation, and educational programs. *See, e.g., Moody v. Daggett*, 429 U.S. 78, 88 n.9 (1976) (Due Process Clause not implicated by prisoner classification and eligibility for rehabilitative programs, even where inmate suffers “grievous loss”); *Argue v. Hofmeyer*, 80 F. App’x 427, 429 (6th Cir. 2003) (prisoners have no constitutional right to rehabilitation, education or jobs); *Canterino v. Wilson*, 869 F.2d 948, 952-54 (6th Cir. 1989) (no constitutional right to rehabilitation); *Newsom v. Norris*, 888 F.2d 371, 374 (6th Cir. 1989) (no constitutional right to prison employment); *Ivey v. Wilson*, 832 F.2d 950, 955 (6th Cir. 1987) (“[N]o prisoner has a constitutional right to a particular job or to any job”); *Antonelli v. Sheahan*, 81 F.3d 1422, 1431 (7th Cir. 1996) (participation in a rehabilitative program is a privilege that the Due Process Clause does not guarantee); *Rizzo v. Dawson*, 778 F.2d 527, 531 (9th Cir. 1985) (no constitutional right to rehabilitative services). Because Plaintiff has no liberty interest in a rehabilitative program, his due process rights were not violated by Defendant Majerczyk’s refusal to admit him into the SOT program.

#### **B. Fifth Amendment**

Plaintiff next alleges that Defendants violated his Fifth Amendment right against self-incrimination by requiring him to accept full responsibility for his crimes in order to participate in the SOT program even though Plaintiff claims that he is innocent of those crimes.

It is well-settled that the Fifth Amendment right against self-incrimination is not implicated by the alleged pressure on a prisoner to admit, in order to improve his chances for parole, that he committed the crime for which he is incarcerated. *See Hawkins v. Morse*, No. 98-2062, 1999 WL 1023780, at \*2 (6th Cir. Nov. 4, 1999) (citing *Ohio Adult Parole Auth. v. Woodard*, 523 U.S. 272, 285-88 (1998)); *see also Rice v. Mich. Parole Bd.*, No. 1:05-cv-549, 2005 WL 2297463, at \*3-4 (W.D. Mich. Sept. 21, 2005) (Fifth Amendment extends only to proceedings in which answers might incriminate the individual in *future* criminal proceedings; therefore refusal to admit to crimes of which prisoner had already been convicted did not implicate Fifth Amendment) (emphasis in original). Because a parole boards consideration of Plaintiff's claim of innocence for a crime of which he already was convicted does not implicate Plaintiff's Fifth Amendment rights, Plaintiff fails to state a claim.

### **C. First Amendment**

Plaintiff also claims that his First Amendment rights have been violated because he is required to say that he is guilty of the offenses for which he was convicted in order to be admitted into the SOT program. In *Hawkins*, 1999 WL 1023780, at \*2, the Sixth Circuit affirmed the dismissal of a prisoner's similar First Amendment claim, stating that "the parole board's consideration of a prisoner's willingness to accept responsibility for committing a crime does not force [the prisoner] to admit his guilt. [The prisoner] is free to maintain his innocence." *Id.*; *see also Hawkins v. Abramajtys*, No. 99-1995, 2000 WL 1434695, at \*1 (6th Cir. Sept. 19, 2000) (reaffirming the decision in *Hawkins v. Morse*, 1999 WL 1023780, at \*2). The Third Circuit recently addressed the issue in more detail. In *Newman v. Beard*, 617 F.3d 775, 781 (3d Cir. 2010), the court acknowledged that the First Amendment protects both the right to speak freely and the



right not to speak at all. *Id.* (citing *Wooley v. Maynard*, 430 U.S. 705, 714 (1977)). The Amendment ordinarily prevents the state from “inquir[ing] about a man’s views or associations solely for the purpose of withholding a right or benefit of what he believes.” *Newman*, 617 F.3d at 781. As the Supreme Court repeatedly has recognized, however, incarceration necessarily “imposes restrictions on a prisoner’s rights.” *Id.* (quoting *Jones v. N.C. Prisoners’ Labor Union, Inc.*, 433 U.S. 119, 129 (1977)). A prisoner retains only those First Amendment rights that are not “inconsistent with his status as a prisoner or with the legitimate penological objectives of the corrections system.” *Pell v. Procunier*, 417 U.S. 817, 822 (1974). “[W]hen a prison regulation impinges on inmates’ constitutional rights, the regulation is valid if it is reasonably related to legitimate penological interests.” *Turner v. Safley*, 482 U.S. 78, 89 (1987). The *Newman* court held that the prisoner failed to make the necessary showing under *Turner*. *See Newman*, 617 F.3d at 781.

Plaintiff claims that a false admission of guilt would not facilitate the penological goal of rehabilitation. (Compl., Page ID #5, docket #1.) The Supreme Court squarely has recognized that “‘States . . . have a vital interest in rehabilitating convicted sex offenders’ and ‘acceptance of responsibility for past offenses’ is a ‘critical first step’ in a prison’s rehabilitation program for such offenders.” *Newman*, 617 F.3d at 781 (quoting *McKune v. Lile*, 536 U.S. 24, 47 (2002)). Because Plaintiff entered a plea and was convicted of the offense, the state has no further burden of proving his guilt in relation to his eligibility for rehabilitation programs and parole. *See id.* Therefore, as in *Newman*, Plaintiff fails to allege that the requirement that he admit guilt is not “inconsistent with his status as a prisoner or with the legitimate penological objectives of the corrections system.” *Pell*, 417 U.S. at 822. As a consequence, Plaintiff fails to state a First Amendment claim.

### Conclusion

Having conducted the review now required by the Prison Litigation Reform Act, the Court determines that Plaintiff's action will be dismissed for failure to state a claim pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §§ 1915(e)(2) and 1915A(b).

The Court must next decide whether an appeal of this action would be in good faith within the meaning of 28 U.S.C. § 1915(a)(3). *See McGore v. Wrigglesworth*, 114 F.3d 601, 611 (6th Cir. 1997). For the same reasons that the Court dismisses the action, the Court discerns no good-faith basis for an appeal. Should Plaintiff appeal this decision, the Court will assess the \$455.00 appellate filing fee pursuant to § 1915(b)(1), *see McGore*, 114 F.3d at 610-11, unless Plaintiff is barred from proceeding *in forma pauperis*, e.g., by the "three-strikes" rule of § 1915(g). If he is barred, he will be required to pay the \$455.00 appellate filing fee in one lump sum.

This is a dismissal as described by 28 U.S.C. § 1915(g).

A Judgment consistent with this Opinion will be entered.

Dated: December 3, 2010

/s/ Janet T. Neff  
Janet T. Neff  
United States District Judge