

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

<hr style="width:10%; margin-left:auto; margin-right:auto;"/> <p>JAMES STOOPS #483451,</p>)	
)	
Plaintiff,)	Case No. 2:08-cv-222
)	
v.)	HON. ROBERT HOLMES BELL
)	
R. SHAW, et al.,)	
)	<u>OPINION</u>
Defendants.)	
)	
<hr style="width:40%; margin-left:0;"/>)	

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, the Court will dismiss Plaintiff's complaint for failure to state a claim.

Discussion

I. Factual Allegations

Plaintiff James Stoops #483451, an inmate at the Chippewa Correctional Facility (URF), filed this *pro se* civil rights action pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983 against Defendants Corrections Officer R. Shaw, Corrections Officer E. Warner, and Assistant Deputy Warden J. Andrzejak. In his complaint, Plaintiff alleges that on July 2, 2008, Defendant Warner confiscated his television and turned it over to Defendant Shaw for an informal administrative hearing. Plaintiff states that Defendant Andrzejak upheld the finding of the hearing and ordered the disposal of the property. Plaintiff asserts that Defendants violated his due process rights. Plaintiff seeks damages.

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).

Plaintiff claims that Defendants deprived him of his property, thereby violating his Fourteenth Amendment due process rights. The Due Process Clause does not prohibit deprivation of property by the state; instead it prohibits such deprivations without *due process of law*. *Parratt*

v. Taylor, 451 U.S. 527, 537 (1981), overruled in part on other grounds *Daniels v Williams*, 474 U.S. 327 (1986).

A plaintiff alleging infringement of property rights must show that the deprivation was caused by action taken pursuant to established state procedures. *Hudson v. Palmer*, 468 U.S. 517, 532 (1984); *Logan v. Zimmerman Brush Co.*, 455 U.S. 422, 435-436 (1982). Plaintiff herein fails to make the required distinction between challenging the “established state procedure” itself and the failure of the state employee to follow that procedure. *Id.* If the official performing the state procedure fails to follow the state procedure or conform his conduct to state law, the plaintiff’s injury is the result of a “random and unauthorized act” which the state was unable to foresee and thus prevent. In *Parratt*, the Supreme Court held that no procedural due process violation occurs when the deprivation is the result of a “random and unauthorized act,” unless the state failed to provide the plaintiff with an “adequate post-deprivation remedy.”

Application of the principles recited above to this case leads us to conclude the respondent has not alleged a violation of the Due Process Clause of the Fourteenth Amendment. Although he has been deprived of property under color of state law, the deprivation did not occur as a result of some established state procedure. Indeed, the deprivation occurred as a result of the unauthorized failure of agents of the state to follow established state procedure. There is no contention that the procedures themselves are inadequate nor is there any contention that it was practicable for the State to provide a predeprivation hearing. Moreover, the State of Nebraska has provided respondent with the means by which he can receive redress for the deprivation.

Parratt, 451 U.S. at 543.

The Sixth Circuit has held that in procedural due process claims brought pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983, the “Parratt doctrine” allows dismissal where the state provides an adequate postdeprivation remedy if:

1) the deprivation was unpredictable or “random”; 2) predeprivation process was impossible or impracticable; and 3) the state actor was not authorized to take the action that deprived the plaintiff of property or liberty.

Copeland v. Machulis, 57 F.3d 476, 479 (6th Cir. 1995); *see also Pilgrim v. Littlefield*, 92 F.3d 413, 416-417 (6th Cir. 1996). In cases where these conditions are present, “a procedural due process claim will not be stated unless the plaintiff pleads and proves that his available state remedies are inadequate to redress the wrong.” *Copeland*, 57 F.3d at 479; *Pilgrim*, 92 F.3d at 417.

Plaintiff in this case has not demonstrated the absence of adequate state remedies for Defendants’ alleged misconduct. Plaintiff was entitled to file a grievance regarding Defendants’ behavior, which he was entitled to appeal through Step III. See MDOC PD 03.02.130(A)-(LL). It does not appear from the complaint that Plaintiff filed a grievance. In addition, Plaintiff had a right to pursue a claim through the Prisoner Benefit Fund per Policy Directive 04.02.110 for reimbursement of his lost property. Prisoners may also pursue claims of up to \$1,000 through the State Administrative Board, or through the courts if over \$1,000. See Policy Directive 04.07.112. The fact that the remedies provided by the state do not provide all the relief which may be available under 42 U.S.C. § 1983 does not mean that the state remedies are ineffective. *Parratt*, 451 U.S. at 544. Therefore, pursuant to *Parratt*, Plaintiff’s due process claims should be 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: November 10, 2008

/s/ Robert Holmes Bell
ROBERT HOLMES BELL
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE