

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

**STANLEY JOHNSON,**

**PLAINTIFF**

**V.**

**NO. 4:05CV126-D-B**

**CAROLYN WALKER,**

**DEFENDANT**

**OPINION**

This matter is before the court, *sua sponte*, for consideration of dismissal. Plaintiff, an inmate currently incarcerated at the Mississippi State Penitentiary, files this *pro se* complaint pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983. He states that he received a Rule Violation Report (RVR) for failing to obey an order of a correctional officer. He appeared before a disciplinary committee, chaired by the defendant, which conducted a hearing on the RVR. Plaintiff was found guilty of the offense and was punished for the violation. Plaintiff states that he was housed in Unit 29-K, but the report prepared by the defendant says Unit 29-L, and contends that this shows he did not commit the offense. He also says that the defendant exhibited unprofessional conduct toward him. He argues that the RVR should be revoked and that he should receive punitive damages.

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.

Federal courts do not "second-guess" the findings and determinations of prison disciplinary committees. The plaintiff was afforded a disciplinary hearing on the RVR, thus meeting the due process requirements of *Wolff v. McDonnell*, 418 U.S. 539 (1974). The Constitution does not demand "error-free decision making ...." *Collins v. King*, 743 F.2d 248, 253-54 (5th Cir. 1984) (quoting *McCrae v. Hankins*, 720 F.2d 863, 868 (5th Cir. 1983)).

It is clear that whether claims are habeas corpus or civil rights in nature the 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)). Since the acts complained of by plaintiff meet the due process requirements, they do not rise to the level of a constitutional violation. Therefore they must be dismissed as failing to state a cause of action upon which relief may be granted.

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

THIS the 30th day of June, 2005.

/s/ Glen H. Davidson  
CHIEF JUDGE