

Discussion

I. Factual Allegations

Plaintiff Jeffrey Prater #259314, an inmate at the Hiawatha Correctional Facility, filed this *pro se* civil rights action pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983 against Defendants Corrections Officer Vern A. Malkowski, Assistant Deputy Warden Fredrick Robinson, and Warden Linda M. Metrish. Plaintiff alleges in his complaint that he was found guilty of a misconduct and lost his prison job. Plaintiff states that his conviction was later reversed, but he was not given his job back. Plaintiff claims that this conduct violated his procedural due process rights. Plaintiff seeks damages and equitable relief.

II. Failure to state a claim

A complaint fails to state a claim upon which relief can be granted when it is clear that no relief could be granted under any set of facts that could be proved consistent with the allegations of the complaint. *Jones v. City of Carlisle*, 3 F.3d 945, 947 (6th Cir. 1993). 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); *Street v. Corr. Corp. of Am.*, 102 F.3d 810, 814 (6th Cir. 1996). 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).

As noted above, Plaintiff claims that his due process rights were violated because he was deprived of his job as the result of a misconduct conviction, and that he was not reinstated at his job when his misconduct conviction was reversed. The court notes that this claim is without merit

on the basis of *Sandin v. Conner*, 515 U.S. 472, 115 S. Ct. 2293 (1995). In *Sandin*, the plaintiff alleged that prison officials deprived him of procedural due process by refusing to allow him to present witnesses during a disciplinary hearing and then sentencing him to segregation for misconduct. *Sandin*, 515 U.S. at 474, 115 S. Ct. at 2294. In reversing the Ninth Circuit's decision that the prisoner had a liberty interest in remaining free of disciplinary segregation, the Supreme Court abandoned the search for mandatory language in prisoner regulations as previously called for under *Hewitt v. Helms*, 459 U.S. 460 (1983), and ruled instead that it was time to return to the due process principles which were established in *Wolff v. McDonnell*, 418 U.S. 539 (1974), and *Meachum v. Fano*, 427 U.S. 215 (1976). *Sandin*, 515 U.S. at 483, 115 S. Ct. at 2300 (internal citations omitted).

In *Sandin*, the Supreme Court noted that in some cases, a restraint might be so extreme as to implicate rights arising directly from the Due Process Clause itself. *Sandin*, 515 U.S. at 483-484, 115 S. Ct. at 2300 (internal citations omitted). In addition, the Court recognized that States may create liberty interests protected by the Due Process Clause where the freedom from restraint imposed "atypical and significant hardship on the inmate in relation to the ordinary incidents of prison life." *Sandin*, 515 U.S. at 484, 115 S. Ct. at 2300. However, Plaintiff's inability to get his job back does not constitute an atypical and significant hardship because he has no inherent constitutional right to rehabilitation, education, job assignments, or other programming. See *Rhodes v. Chapman*, 452 U.S. 337, 348, 101 S. Ct. 2392, 2400 (1981); *Moody v. Daggett*, 429 U.S. 78, 88 n.9, 97 S. Ct. 274, 279 n.9 (1976); *Newsom v. Norris*, 888 F.2d 371, 374-75 (6th Cir. 1989); *Canterino v. Wilson*, 869 F.2d 948, 952-54 (6th Cir. 1989); *Ivey v. Wilson*, 832 F.2d 950, 955 (6th

Cir. 1987); *Bills v. Henderson*, 631 F.2d 1287 (6th Cir. 1980). Therefore, Plaintiff's complaint is properly dismissed.

Conclusion

Having conducted the review now required by the Prison Litigation Reform Act, the court determines that Plaintiff's action fails to state a claim and will therefore be dismissed pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §§ 1915(e)(2), 1915A(b); 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 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 appellate filing fee in one lump sum.

This dismissal counts as a strike for purposes of 28 U.S.C. § 1915(g).

A judgment consistent with this opinion will be entered.

Dated: 12/4/08 /s/ R. Allan Edgar
R. ALLAN EDGAR
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE