

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
EASTERN DISTRICT OF MISSOURI
SOUTHEASTERN DIVISION**

CORNELL ROBINSON,)	
)	
Plaintiff,)	
)	
v.)	No. 1:16-CV-44-ACL
)	
JASIMANE FLENNOY, et al.,)	
)	
Defendants.)	

MEMORANDUM AND ORDER

This matter is before the Court on review of plaintiff’s second amended complaint [Doc. 12]. For the reasons stated below, the Court finds that this action should be dismissed pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B).

28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)

Pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B), the Court may dismiss a complaint filed in forma pauperis if the action is frivolous, malicious, fails to state a claim upon which relief can be granted, or seeks monetary relief against a defendant who is immune from such relief. An action is frivolous if “it lacks an arguable basis in either law or in fact.” *Neitzke v. Williams*, 490 U.S. 319, 328 (1989). An action fails to state a claim upon which relief can be granted if it does not plead “enough facts to state a claim to relief that is plausible on its face.” *Bell Atlantic Corp. v. Twombly*, 550 U.S. 544, 570 (2007).

In reviewing a pro se complaint under § 1915(e)(2)(B), the Court must give the complaint the benefit of a liberal construction. *Haines v. Kerner*, 404 U.S. 519, 520 (1972). The Court must also weigh all factual allegations in favor of the plaintiff, unless the facts alleged are clearly baseless. *Denton v. Hernandez*, 504 U.S. 25, 32-33 (1992).

The Second Amended Complaint

Plaintiff, an inmate at the Southeast Correctional Center (“SECC”), brings this action for the violation of his constitutional rights under 42 U.S.C. § 1983. The named defendants are Jasimane Flennoy (Correctional Officer) and Paula Reed (SECC Assistant Warden). Plaintiff alleges that “the staff at SECC has been harassing [him] making snide remarks at [his] cell door ever since [he] filed a complaint for sexual harassment against Jasimane Flennoy.” Plaintiff claims that defendant Reed issued him a false conduct violation in retaliation for complaining about Flennoy and for filing a lawsuit against Flennoy. Plaintiff states that Flennoy was fired because of her treatment towards him, and he complains that he does not feel safe at SECC.

Discussion

Having carefully reviewed the complaint, the Court concludes that dismissal is warranted under 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B). Plaintiff brings this action against

defendants in their official capacities. *See Egerdahl v. Hibbing Community College*, 72 F.3d 615, 619 (8th Cir. 1995) (where a complaint is silent about defendant's capacity, Court must interpret the complaint as including official-capacity claims); *Nix v. Norman*, 879 F.2d 429, 431 (8th Cir. 1989). Naming a government official in his or her official capacity is the equivalent of naming the government entity that employs the official, in this case the State of Missouri. *See Will v. Michigan Dep't of State Police*, 491 U.S. 58, 71 (1989). "[N]either a State nor its officials acting in their official capacity are 'persons' under § 1983." *Id.* As a result, the second amended complaint is legally frivolous and fails to state a claim upon which relief can be granted.

As additional grounds for dismissing this action, the Court notes that plaintiff has failed to assert any non-conclusory claims against defendant Flennoy. *See Ashcroft v. Iqbal*, 556 U.S. 662, 678-79 (2009) (legal conclusions and threadbare recitals of the elements of a cause of action that are supported by mere conclusory statements are not entitled to the assumption of truth); *Jeffers v. Gomez*, 267 F.3d 895, 915 (9th Cir. 2001) (§ 1983 liability arises only upon a showing of personal participation by defendant); *Ellis v. Norris*, 179 F.3d 1078, 1079 (8th Cir. 1999) (§ 1983 claimant must allege facts supporting individual defendant's personal involvement or responsibility for unconstitutional action); *Madewell v. Roberts*, 909

F.2d 1203, 1208 (8th Cir. 1990) (liability under § 1983 requires a causal link to, and direct responsibility for, the alleged deprivation of rights); *Martin v. Sargent*, 780 F.2d 1334, 1338 (8th Cir. 1985) (claim not cognizable under § 1983 where plaintiff fails to allege defendant was personally involved in or directly responsible for incidents that injured plaintiff).

Accordingly,

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that the Clerk shall not issue process or cause process to issue, because the second amended complaint is legally frivolous and fails to state a claim upon which relief can be granted. *See* 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B).

A separate Order of Dismissal shall accompany this Memorandum and Order.

Dated this 3rd day of June , 2016.

 /s/ Jean C. Hamilton
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE