

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF MISSISSIPPI  
DELTA DIVISION**

**GLENN MOORE,**

**PLAINTIFF**

**V.**

**NO. 2:07CV156-P-B**

**WOODS SECURITY CO,**

**DEFENDANT**

**OPINION DISMISSING CLAIMS**

This matter is before the court, *sua sponte*, for consideration of dismissal. Plaintiff, an inmate currently incarcerated at the Coahoma County Jail, files this *pro se* complaint pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983. Plaintiff complains that he was assaulted by a private security guard prior to his arrest and incarceration. Plaintiff is seeking damages from the security company and immediate release from incarceration. Plaintiff's complaint does not involve MDOC personnel nor staff.

After carefully considering the contents of the *pro se* complaint and giving it the liberal construction required by *Haines v. Kerner*, 404 U.S. 519 (1972), this court has come to the following conclusion.

It is clear that whether claims are habeas corpus or civil rights in nature a plaintiff must be deprived of some right secured to him by the Constitution or the laws of the United States. *Irving v. Thigpen*, 732 F.2d 1215, 1216 (5th Cir. 1984)(citing 28 U.S.C. § 2254(a) (1982); *Baker v. McCollan*, 443 U.S. 137 (1979); and *Trussell v. Estelle*, 699 F.2d 256, 259 (5th Cir. 1983)). In the event there is no constitutional right, the plaintiff's complaint fails. *Irving*, 732 F.2d at 1216 (citing *Thomas v. Torres*, 717 F.2d 248, 249 (5th Cir. 1983)).

Despite Plaintiff's perception, the Constitution has not been implicated by the facts of this case. According to his own complaint, there is State action involved in this case. The assault of which he complains occurred outside of the penal system. If Plaintiff has stated a claim at all, it

would be based purely on state law and is not appropriate for section 1983 relief. Consequently, Plaintiff's complaint is dismissed for failing to state a claim upon which relief may be granted.

The court's dismissal of Plaintiff's complaint for failure to state a claim shall count as a "strike" under 28 U.S.C. § 1915(g). *See Adepegba v. Hammons*, 103 F.3d 383, 387-88 (5th Cir. 1996). Mr. Moore is cautioned that once he accumulates three strikes, he may not proceed *in forma pauperis* in any civil action or appeal filed while he is incarcerated or detained in any facility unless he is under imminent danger of serious physical injury. *See* 28 U.S.C. § 1915(g).

A final judgment in accordance with this opinion will be entered.

THIS the 30<sup>th</sup> day of October, 2007.

/s/ W. Allen Pepper, Jr.  
W. ALLEN PEPPER, JR.  
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE