# UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT WESTERN DISTRICT OF MICHIGAN SOUTHERN DIVISION

RICKY ARISTER WILLIAMS,

Plaintiff,

Case No. 1:23-cv-474

v.

Honorable Phillip J. Green

HEIDI WASHINGTON, 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*. Pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(c) and Rule 73 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, Plaintiff consented to proceed in all matters in this action under the jurisdiction of a United States magistrate judge. (ECF No. 1, PageID.4.)

This case is presently before the Court for preliminary review under the Prison Litigation Reform Act, Pub. L. No. 104-134, 110 Stat. 1321 (1996) (PLRA), pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §§ 1915(e)(2) and 1915A(b), and 42 U.S.C. § 1997e(c). The Court is required to conduct this initial review prior to the service of the complaint. See In re Prison Litig. Reform Act, 105 F.3d 1131, 1131, 1134 (6th Cir. 1997); McGore v. Wrigglesworth, 114 F.3d 601, 604–05 (6th Cir. 1997). Service of the complaint on the named defendants is of particular significance in defining a putative defendant's relationship to the proceedings.

"An individual or entity named as a defendant is not obliged to engage in litigation unless notified of the action, and brought under a court's authority, by formal process." Murphy Bros. v. Michetti Pipe Stringing, Inc., 526 U.S. 344, 347 (1999). "Service of process, under longstanding tradition in our system of justice, is fundamental to any procedural imposition on a named defendant." Id. at 350. "[O]ne becomes a party officially, and is required to take action in that capacity, only upon service of a summons or other authority-asserting measure stating the time within which the party served must appear and defend." Id. (citations omitted). That is, "[u]nless a named defendant agrees to waive service, the summons continues to function as the sine qua non directing an individual or entity to participate in a civil action or forgo procedural or substantive rights." Id. at 351. Therefore, the PLRA, by requiring courts to review and even resolve a plaintiff's claims before service, creates a circumstance where there may only be one party to the proceeding—the plaintiff—at the district court level and on appeal. See, e.g., Conway v. Fayette Cnty. Gov't, 212 F. App'x 418 (6th Cir. 2007) ("Pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915A, the district court screened the complaint and dismissed it without prejudice before service was made upon any of the defendants . . . [such that] . . . only [the plaintiff] [wa]s a party to this appeal.").

Here, Plaintiff has consented to a United States magistrate judge conducting all proceedings in this case under 28 U.S.C. § 636(c). That statute provides that "[u]pon the consent of the parties, a full-time United States magistrate judge . . . may conduct any or all proceedings . . . and order the entry of judgment in the case . . . ."

28 U.S.C. § 636(c). Because the named Defendants have not yet been served, the undersigned concludes that they are not presently parties whose consent is required to permit the undersigned to conduct a preliminary review under the PLRA, in the same way they are not parties who will be served with or given notice of this opinion. See Neals v. Norwood, 59 F.3d 530, 532 (5th Cir. 1995) ("The record does not contain a consent from the defendants[; h]owever, because they had not been served, they were not parties to th[e] action at the time the magistrate entered judgment.").1

Under the PLRA, 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, the Court will dismiss Plaintiff's complaint on grounds of immunity.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> But see Coleman v. Lab. & Indus. Rev. Comm'n of Wis., 860 F.3d 461, 471 (7th Cir. 2017) (concluding that, when determining which parties are required to consent to proceed before a United States magistrate judge under 28 U.S.C. § 636(c), "context matters" and the context the United States Supreme Court considered in Murphy Bros. was nothing like the context of a screening dismissal pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §§ 1915(e)(2) and 1915A(b), and 42 U.S.C. § 1997e(c)); Williams v. King, 875 F.3d 500, 503–04 (9th Cir. 2017) (relying on Black's Law Dictionary for the definition of "parties" and not addressing Murphy Bros.); Burton v. Schamp, 25 F.4th 198, 207 n.26 (3d Cir. 2022) (premising its discussion of "the term 'parties' solely in relation to its meaning in Section 636(c)(1), and . . . not tak[ing] an opinion on the meaning of 'parties' in other contexts").

## **Discussion**

#### I. Factual Allegations

Plaintiff is presently incarcerated with the Michigan Department of Corrections (MDOC) at the Charles E. Egeler Reception and Guidance Center (RGC) in Jackson, Jackson County, Michigan. The events about which he complains occurred during Plaintiff's incarceration at the St. Louis Correctional Facility (SLF) in St. Louis, Gratiot County, Michigan. Plaintiff sues MDOC Director Heidi Washington and SLF Warden John Christiansen. Plaintiff indicates that he is suing Defendants in their official capacities only. (ECF No. 1, PageID.2.)

Plaintiff's complaint concerns Defendants' response to the COVID-19 pandemic in 2021. Plaintiff alleges that in January of 2021, Defendants demonstrated deliberate indifference to his "health and safety" during a "worldwide pandemic." (*Id.*, PageID.3.) Plaintiff contends that he contracted COVID-19 while incarcerated at SLF in January of 2021. (*Id.*) Plaintiff further contends that if Defendants had "followed the mandatory testing of employees of the MDOC," Plaintiff would not have contracted COVID-19. (*Id.*) Plaintiff alleges that COVID-19 has damaged him "for the rest of his life," because his eyesight, nervous system, and senses of smell and taste are still affected. (*Id.*) Based on the foregoing, Plaintiff asserts violations of his First, Fifth, Eighth, and Fourteenth Amendment rights. (*Id.*) He seeks \$19,000.00 in compensatory damages, as well as \$1 million in punitive damages. (*Id.*)

### II. Immunity

As noted above, Plaintiff sues Defendants in their official capacities only. A suit against an individual in his or her official capacity is equivalent to a suit against the governmental entity; in this case, the MDOC. See Will v. Mich. Dep't of State Police, 491 U.S. 58, 71 (1989); Matthews v. Jones, 35 F.3d 1046, 1049 (6th Cir. 1994). The states and their departments are immune under the Eleventh Amendment from suit in the federal courts, unless the state has waived immunity or Congress has expressly abrogated Eleventh Amendment immunity by statute. See Pennhurst State Sch. & Hosp. v. Halderman, 465 U.S. 89, 98–101 (1984); Alabama v. Pugh, 438 U.S. 781, 782 (1978); O'Hara v. Wigginton, 24 F.3d 823, 826 (6th Cir. 1994). Congress has not expressly abrogated Eleventh Amendment immunity by statute, Quern v. Jordan, 440 U.S. 332, 341 (1979), and the State of Michigan has not consented to civil rights suits in federal court. Abick v. Michigan, 803 F.2d 874, 877 (6th Cir. 1986). In numerous opinions, the United States Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit has specifically held that the MDOC is absolutely immune from a § 1983 suit under the Eleventh Amendment. See, e.g., Harrison v. Michigan, 722 F.3d 768, 771 (6th Cir. 2013); Diaz v. Mich. Dep't of Corr., 703 F.3d 956, 962 (6th Cir. 2013); McCoy v. Michigan, 369 F. App'x 646, 653–54 (6th Cir. 2010).

Here, Plaintiff seeks only monetary damages. Official capacity defendants, however, are absolutely immune from monetary damages. See Will, 491 U.S. at 71; Turker v. Ohio Dep't of Rehab. & Corr., 157 F.3d 453, 456 (6th Cir. 1998). For that reason alone, Plaintiff's complaint will be dismissed.

Case 1:23-cv-00474-PJG ECF No. 5, PageID.20 Filed 05/22/23 Page 6 of 6

Conclusion

Having conducted the review required by the Prison Litigation Reform Act, the

Court determines that Plaintiff's complaint will be dismissed on grounds of

immunity, under 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). Although the Court concludes that Plaintiff's claims

are properly dismissed, the Court does not conclude that any issue Plaintiff might

raise on appeal would be frivolous. Coppedge v. United States, 369 U.S. 438, 445

(1962). Accordingly, the Court does not certify that an appeal would not be taken in

good faith. 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.

A judgment consistent with this opinion will be entered.

Dated: May 22, 2023

/s/ Phillip J. Green

PHILLIP J. GREEN

United States Magistrate Judge

6