

Pro se plaintiffs must set forth enough factual allegations to “nudge[] their claims across the line from conceivable to plausible,” or “their complaint must be dismissed.” [*Bell Atlantic Corp. v. Twombly*, 550 U.S. 544, 569-70 \(2007\)](#); *see also* [*Ashcroft v. Iqbal*, 556 U.S. 662, 678 \(2009\)](#) (“A claim has facial plausibility when the plaintiff pleads factual content that allows the court to draw the reasonable inference that the defendant is liable for the misconduct alleged.”).

“The essential function of a complaint under the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure is to give the opposing party ‘fair notice of the nature and basis or grounds for a claim, and a general indication of the type of litigation involved.’” [*Topchian v. JPMorgan Chase Bank, N.A.*, 760 F.3d 843, 848 \(8th Cir. 2014\)](#) (quoting [*Hopkins v. Saunders*, 199 F.3d 968, 973 \(8th Cir. 1999\)](#)). However, “[a] pro se complaint must be liberally construed, and pro se litigants are held to a lesser pleading standard than other parties.” [*Topchian*, 760 F.3d at 849](#) (internal quotation marks and citations omitted).

III. DISCUSSION OF CLAIM

“To state a claim under 42 U.S.C. § 1983, a plaintiff must allege the violation of a right secured by the Constitution and laws of the United States, and must show that the alleged deprivation was committed by a person acting under color of state law.” [*West v. Atkins*, 487 U.S. 42, 48 \(1988\)](#). The City of Omaha may only be liable under [section 1983](#) if its “policy” or “custom” caused a violation of Plaintiff’s constitutional rights. *See* [*Doe By and Through Doe v. Washington Cnty.*, 150 F.3d 920, 922 \(8th Cir. 1998\)](#) (citing [*Monell v. Dep’t of Soc. Servs.*, 436 U.S. 658, 694 \(1978\)](#)).

An “official policy” involves a deliberate choice to follow a course of action made from among various alternatives by an official who has the final authority to establish governmental policy. [*Jane Doe A By and Through Jane Doe B v. Special School Dist. of St. Louis Cnty.*, 901 F.2d 642, 645 \(8th Cir. 1990\)](#) (citing [*Pembaur v.*](#)

City of Cincinnati, 475 U.S. 469, 483 (1986)). To establish the existence of a governmental custom, a plaintiff must prove:

- 1) The existence of a continuing, widespread, persistent pattern of unconstitutional misconduct by the governmental entity's employees;
- 2) Deliberate indifference to or tacit authorization of such conduct by the governmental entity's policymaking officials after notice to the officials of that misconduct; and
- 3) That plaintiff was injured by acts pursuant to the governmental entity's custom, i.e., that the custom was the moving force behind the constitutional violation.

Jane Doe, 901 F.2d at 646.

Plaintiff does not present any allegations of an official policy or custom in her Complaint. Therefore, she has not alleged sufficient facts to "nudge" her claim against the City of Omaha across the line from conceivable to plausible under the Jane Doe standard.

IV. CONCLUSION

Plaintiff's Complaint fails to state a claim upon which relief can be granted. On its own motion, however, the court will permit Plaintiff to file an Amended Complaint.

IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED:

1. Plaintiff will have 30 days in which to file an Amended Complaint that states a claim upon which relief can be granted.

2. Failure to file an Amended Complaint in accordance with this Memorandum and Order will result in dismissal of this action without further notice.

3. The clerk's office is directed to set a pro se case management deadline using the following text: January 12, 2017: check for amended complaint.

DATED this 13th day of December, 2016.

BY THE COURT:

s/ Richard G. Kopf
Senior United States District Judge