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

RAYMOND E. KIRKENDALL,

Plaintiff,

Case No. 1:15-cv-1210

Honorable Robert J. Jonker

v.

JOHN D. JARAMILLO, et al.,

Defendants.

## **OPINION**

This is a civil rights action brought by a state prisoner under 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 Kirkendall is incarcerated with the Michigan Department of Corrections (MDOC) at the Ionia Correctional Facility in Ionia, Michigan. He is housed in administrative segregation at Ionia because he assaulted a prison employee at another MDOC facility on October 17, 2014. Plaintiff alleges that in retaliation for that assault, he has been subjected to cruel and unusual punishment in the form of threats, false misconduct reports, excessive force, sexual harassment, destruction of property (including mail), and confinement in a cell with inhumane conditions. Plaintiff lists nineteen names as the perpetrators of these wrongs, but he does not identify which defendant perpetrated any particular wrong. He goes on to list nine defendants who are apparently also liable for the wrongs because they failed to investigate Plaintiff's allegations. Finally he contends that two defendants denied him due process by placing Plaintiff on modified access to the prison grievance system.

#### **Discussion**

### I. <u>Failure to state a claim</u>

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)).

## II. General and conclusory allegations

It is a basic pleading essential that a plaintiff attribute factual allegations to particular defendants. *See Twombly*, 550 U.S. at 544 (holding that, in order to state a claim, a plaintiff must make sufficient allegations to give a defendant fair notice of the claim). Where a person is named as a defendant without an allegation of specific conduct, the complaint is subject to dismissal, even under the liberal construction afforded to *pro se* complaints. *See Gilmore v. Corr. Corp. of Am.*, 92 F. App'x 188, 190 (6th Cir. 2004) (dismissing complaint where plaintiff failed to allege how any named defendant was involved in the violation of his rights); *Frazier v. Michigan*, 41 F. App'x 762, 764 (6th Cir. 2002) (dismissing plaintiff's claims where the complaint did not allege with any degree of specificity which of the named defendants were personally involved in or responsible for each alleged violation of rights); *Griffin v. Montgomery*, No. 00-3402, 2000 WL 1800569, at \*2 (6th Cir. Nov. 30, 2000) (requiring allegations of personal involvement against each defendant); *Rodriguez* 

*v. Jabe*, No. 90-1010, 1990 WL 82722, at \*1 (6th Cir. June 19, 1990) ("Plaintiff's claims against those individuals are without a basis in law as the complaint is totally devoid of allegations as to them which would suggest their involvement in the events leading to his injuries.").

Plaintiff's claims fall far short of the minimal pleading standards under FED. R. CIV.

P. 8 (requiring "a short and plain statement of the claim showing that the pleader is entitled to

relief"). Plaintiff alleges generally that he has been subjected to cruel and unusual punishment by

Ionia staff. He then offers the following allegation:

3. These allegations arise from the following correctional officers: MAXM; CONNER; WATKINS; SHERWOOD; FRALICK; MOTTS; DUN; FERGUSON; SWICH; SHELDON; STANBUGH; HAIR; PERKINS; SIMON; SCHAFER; HILLZEY; BARRA; BOWERMAN; AND MINARD actions between October to November of 2015 alleging that these staff members threatened the plaintiff, wrote false misconduct reports on him, used excessive force on him while he was housed in administrative segregation, sexually harassed him while he was housed in administrative segregation, destroyed his personal property, personal and legal mail, and placed him in a cell unfit for human living conditions, in prison or out.

ECF No. 8, PageID.25. Such general and conclusory allegations are simply insufficient to give the

named defendants fair notice of the claims against them.<sup>1</sup>

# III. <u>Alleged constitutional violations</u>

Even where Plaintiff's allegations are not wholly conclusory and where he has sufficiently attributed his description of misconduct to a group of defendants, he has failed to state a claim. 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

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup>The allegations at issue here are taken from Plaintiff's amended complaint filed on February 25, 2016. The Court directed Plaintiff to file an amended complaint because his initial effort simply listed the wrongs that Plaintiff had suffered at the Ionia Correctional Facility and then listed as defendants twenty-five names. Plaintiff never connected the wrong to the wrongdoer. (ECF No. 1.)

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. Due process

Plaintiff alleges that Defendant C. Lewis, the grievance coordinator, and Defendant Christiansen, the assistant deputy warden, violated Plaintiff's due process rights by denying him access to the grievance process. (ECF No. 8, PageID.25, ¶5.) The elements of a procedural due process claim are: (1) a life, liberty, or property interest requiring protection under the Due Process Clause, and (2) a deprivation of that interest (3) without adequate process. *Women's Med. Prof'l Corp. v. Baird*, 438 F.3d 595, 611 (6th Cir. 2006). "Without a protected liberty or property interest, there can be no federal procedural due process claim." *Experimental Holdings, Inc. v. Farris*, 503 F.3d 514, 519 (6th Cir. 2007) (citing *Bd. of Regents of State Colleges v. Roth*, 408 U.S. 564, 579 (1972)).

Plaintiff has no due process right to file a prison grievance. The courts repeatedly have held that there exists no constitutionally protected due process right to an effective prison grievance procedure. *See Hewitt v. Helms*, 459 U.S. 460, 467 (1983); *Walker v. Mich. Dep't of Corr.*, 128 F. App'x 441, 445 (6th Cir. 2005); *Argue v. Hofmeyer*, 80 F. App'x 427, 430 (6th Cir. 2003); *Young v. Gundy*, 30 F. App'x 568, 569-70 (6th Cir. 2002); *Carpenter v. Wilkinson*, No. 99-3562, 2000 WL 190054, at \*2 (6th Cir. Feb. 7, 2000); *see also Antonelli v. Sheahan*, 81 F.3d 1422, 1430 (7th Cir. 1996); *Adams v. Rice*, 40 F.3d 72, 75 (4th Cir. 1994) (collecting cases). Michigan law does not create a liberty interest in the grievance procedure. *See Olim v. Wakinekona*, 461 U.S. 238,

249 (1983); *Keenan v. Marker*, 23 F. App'x 405, 407 (6th Cir. 2001); *Wynn v. Wolf*, No. 93-2411, 1994 WL 105907, at \*1 (6th Cir. Mar. 28, 1994). Because Plaintiff has no liberty interest in the grievance process, the conduct of defendants Lewis and Christiansen did not deprive Plaintiff of due process.

## B. Respondeat superior

Plaintiff accuses another group of defendants (Warden Willie O. Smith, Assistant Warden Christopher S. Motts, Resident Unit Manager Gary Minarc, Captain Woods, Lt. Rykse, Inspector Barber, Sergeant Leitheim, Sergeant John D. Jaramillo, and Sergeant Conklin) of violating Plaintiff's constitutional rights by failing to investigate the constitutional violations committed by other defendants. (ECF No. 8, PageID.25, ¶4.) Government officials may not be held liable for the unconstitutional conduct of their subordinates under a theory of respondeat 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, 575-76 (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 576; 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. With respect to Plaintiff's "failure to investigate claim, Plaintiff has failed to allege that these Defendants engaged in any active unconstitutional behavior. Accordingly, he fails to state a claim against them.

C. Retaliation

Plaintiff suggests that he has a retaliation claim against these Defendants because they acted in retaliation for his assault on a prison employee at a different correctional facility. Retaliation based upon a prisoner's exercise of his or her constitutional rights violates the Constitution. *See Thaddeus-X v. Blatter*, 175 F.3d 378, 394 (6th Cir. 1999) (en banc). In order to set forth a First Amendment retaliation claim, a plaintiff must establish that: (1) he was engaged in protected conduct; (2) an adverse action was taken against him that would deter a person of ordinary firmness from engaging in that conduct; and (3) the adverse action was motivated, at least in part, by the protected conduct. *Id*.

Plaintiff's retaliation claim fails at the first step. Plaintiff's criminal act of assault on a prison employee is not protected conduct. Plaintiff has failed to state a claim for retaliation.

#### **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: March 15, 2016

/s/ Robert J. Jonker ROBERT J. JONKER CHIEF UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE