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

\_\_\_\_

AARON	JACKS(	ϽN,
-------	--------	-----

	,		
	Plaintiff,		Case No. 1:14-cv-753
v.			Honorable Robert J. Jonker
RICK SNYDER,			
	Defendant.	/	

#### **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*. 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; 42 U.S.C. § 1997e(c). 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.

#### **Factual Allegations**

Plaintiff Aaron Jackson presently is incarcerated with the Michigan Department of Corrections at the Richard A. Handlon Correctional Facility. He sues Governor Rick Snyder.

The instant action is one of five filed in this Court by Plaintiff between June 4 and July 17, 2014. *See Jackson v. Heyns et al.*, No. 1:14-cv-600 (W.D. Mich.); *Jackson v. Heyns et al.*, 1:14-cv-645 (W.D. Mich.); *Jackson v. Heyns et al.*, No. 1:14-cv-741 (W.D. Mich.); *Jackson v. Snyder*, No. 1:14-cv-753 (W.D. Mich.); *Jackson v. Heyns et al.*, No. 1:14-cv-780 (W.D. Mich.). In his complaint, Plaintiff alleges that Defendant Snyder has ignored Plaintiff's many complaints about an officer taking his radio, the loss of items from his footlocker, the placement of a hot substance in his food, staff interference with the payment of his court fees, and retaliation.

## **Discussion**

### I. 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 Atl. Corp. v. Twombly*, 550 U.S. 544, 555 (2007) (quoting *Conley v. Gibson*, 355 U.S. 41, 47 (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*, 556 U.S. 662, 678 (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." *Iqbal*, 556 U.S. at 679. 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." *Iqbal*, 556 U.S. at 678 (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." *Iqbal*, 556 U.S. at 679 (quoting FED. R. CIV. P. 8(a)(2)); *see also Hill v. Lappin*, 630 F.3d 468, 470-71 (6th Cir. 2010) (holding that the *Twombly/Iqbal* plausibility standard applies to dismissals of prisoner cases on initial review under 28 U.S.C. §§ 1915A(b)(1) and 1915(e)(2)(B)(i)).

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).

Plaintiff fails to make specific factual allegations against Defendant Snyder, other than his claim that Snyder failed to respond to his letters and complaints and otherwise failed to prevent unwanted actions by MDOC employees at MTU. Government officials may not be held liable for the unconstitutional conduct of their subordinates under a theory of respondent superior or vicarious liability. *Iqbal*, 556 U.S. at 676; *Monell v. New York City Dep't of Soc. Servs.*, 436 U.S. 658, 691(1978); *Everson v. Leis*, 556 F.3d 484, 495 (6th Cir. 2009). A claimed constitutional violation must be based upon active unconstitutional behavior. *Grinter v. Knight*, 532 F.3d 567, 575 (6th Cir. 2008); *Greene v. Barber*, 310 F.3d 889, 899 (6th Cir. 2002). The acts of one's subordinates

are not enough, nor can supervisory liability be based upon the mere failure to act. Grinter, 532 F.3d

at 575; Greene, 310 F.3d at 899; Summers v. Leis, 368 F.3d 881, 888 (6th Cir. 2004). Moreover,

§ 1983 liability may not be imposed simply because a supervisor denied an administrative grievance

or failed to act based upon information contained in a grievance. See Shehee v. Luttrell, 199 F.3d

295, 300 (6th Cir. 1999). "[A] plaintiff must plead that each Government-official defendant, through

the official's own individual actions, has violated the Constitution." *Igbal*, 556 U.S. at 676. Plaintiff

has failed to allege that Defendant Snyder engaged in any active unconstitutional behavior.

Accordingly, he fails to state a claim against him.

Conclusion

Having conducted the review 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), and 42 U.S.C. § 1997e(c).

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

\$505.00 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 \$505.00 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: \_\_\_\_ August 7, 2014

/s/ Robert J. Jonker

ROBERT J. JONKER

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

- 4 -