

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
DISTRICT OF NEW JERSEY

\_\_\_\_\_  
DUSTIN D. DAVID,

Plaintiff,

v.

CAMDEN COUNTY JAIL,

Defendant.  
\_\_\_\_\_

HONORABLE JEROME B. SIMANDLE

Civil Action

No. 16-cv-06918 (JBS-AMD)

**OPINION**

APPEARANCES

Dustin D. David, Plaintiff Pro Se  
1409 Park Boulevard, Apt. B  
Camden, NJ 08103

**SIMANDLE, Chief District Judge:**

**I. INTRODUCTION**

Plaintiff Dustin D. David seeks to bring a civil rights complaint against Camden County Jail ("CCJ") pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983 for allegedly unconstitutional conditions of confinement. Complaint, Docket Entry 1.

28 U.S.C. 1915(e)(2) requires a court to review complaints prior to service in cases in which a plaintiff is proceeding *in forma pauperis*. The Court must *sua sponte* dismiss any claim that is frivolous, is malicious, fails to state a claim upon which relief may be granted, or seeks monetary relief from a defendant who is immune from such relief. This action is subject to *sua sponte* screening for dismissal under Section 1915(e)(2)(B) because Plaintiff is proceeding *in forma pauperis*.

For the reasons set forth below, the Court will dismiss the Complaint with prejudice for failure to state a claim. 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(b)(ii).

## **II. BACKGROUND**

Plaintiff's Complaint states: "I was forced to sleep on the floors of this jail due to it being crowded. There were times I had to sleep underneath tables and bunkbeds because the rooms are so small." Complaint § III(C).

Plaintiff states that the alleged events giving rise to his claims occurred: "March, April, July 2009[;] September 2012." *Id.* § III(B).

With respect to alleged injuries from these events, Plaintiff states: "None major, but I would wake up with pain in my side and back. I would also get neck cramps from the floor due to not having a pillow to sleep on." *Id.* § IV.

With respect to requested relief, Plaintiff states: "I would just like to recieve [*sic*] what I deserve. No one should go through jail in those conditions, no matter what you did to get there. From the least to the max amount, I['m] fine with either." *Id.* § V.

## **III. STANDARD OF REVIEW**

To survive *sua sponte* screening under 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2) for failure to state a claim, a complaint must allege "sufficient factual matter" to show that the claim is facially

plausible. *Fowler v. UPMS Shadyside*, 578 F.3d 203, 210 (3d Cir. 2009) (citation omitted). "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." *Fair Wind Sailing, Inc. v. Dempster*, 764 F.3d 303, 308 n.3 (3d Cir. 2014). "[A] pleading that offers 'labels or conclusions' or 'a formulaic recitation of the elements of a cause of action will not do.'" *Ashcroft v. Iqbal*, 556 U.S. 662, 678 (2009) (quoting *Bell Atlantic Corp. v. Twombly*, 550 U.S. 544, 555 (2007)).

#### **IV. DISCUSSION**

Plaintiff asserts claims against CCJ for allegedly unconstitutional conditions of confinement.

Primarily, the Complaint must be dismissed as CCJ is not a "state actor" within the meaning of § 1983. *See, e.g., Grabow v. Southern State Corr. Facility*, 726 F. Supp. 537, 538-39 (D.N.J. 1989) (correctional facility is not a "person" under § 1983). Accordingly, the claims against CCJ must be dismissed with prejudice.

Furthermore, "plaintiffs who file complaints subject to dismissal should receive leave to amend unless amendment would be inequitable under [§ 1915] or futile." *Grayson v. Mayview State Hosp.*, 293 F.3d 103, 114 (3d Cir. 2002). This Court denies leave to amend at this time as Plaintiff's Complaint is barred

by the statute of limitations, which is governed by New Jersey's two-year limitations period for personal injury.<sup>1</sup> See *Wilson v. Garcia*, 471 U.S. 261, 276 (1985); *Digue v. N.J. State Police*, 603 F.3d 181, 185 (3d Cir. 2010). The accrual date of a § 1983 action is determined by federal law, however. *Wallace v. Kato*, 549 U.S. 384, 388 (2007); *Montanez v. Sec'y Pa. Dep't of Corr.*, 773 F.3d 472, 480 (3d Cir. 2014). "Under federal law, a cause of action accrues when the plaintiff knew or should have known of the injury upon which the action is based." *Montanez*, 773 F.3d at 480 (internal quotation marks omitted).

Plaintiff states that the alleged events giving rise to his claims occurred: "March, April, July 2009[;] September 2012." Complaint § III(B). The allegedly unconstitutional conditions of confinement at CCJ would have been immediately apparent to Plaintiff at the time of detention. Accordingly, the statute of limitations for Plaintiff's claims expired in September 2014. As there are no grounds for equitable tolling of the statute of limitations,<sup>2</sup> the Complaint will be dismissed with prejudice.

---

<sup>1</sup> "Although the running of the statute of limitations is ordinarily an affirmative defense, where that defense is obvious from the face of the complaint and no development of the record is necessary, a court may dismiss a time-barred complaint sua sponte under § 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B)(ii) for failure to state a claim." *Ostuni v. Wa Wa's Mart*, 532 F. App'x 110, 111-12 (3d Cir. 2013) (per curiam).

<sup>2</sup> Equitable tolling "is only appropriate '(1) where the defendant has actively misled the plaintiff respecting the plaintiff's cause of action; (2) where the plaintiff in some extraordinary

*Ostuni v. Wa Wa's Mart*, 532 F. App'x 110, 112 (3d Cir. 2013)  
(per curiam) (affirming dismissal with prejudice due to  
expiration of statute of limitations).

**V. CONCLUSION**

For the reasons stated above, the Complaint is dismissed  
with prejudice for failure to state a claim. An appropriate  
order follows.

**February 3, 2017**

Date

**s/ Jerome B. Simandle**

JEROME B. SIMANDLE

Chief U.S. District Judge

---

way has been prevented from asserting his or her rights; or (3)  
where the plaintiff has timely asserted his or her rights  
mistakenly in the wrong forum.'" *Omar v. Blackman*, 590 F. App'x  
162, 166 (3d Cir. 2014) (quoting *Santos ex rel. Beato v. United  
States*, 559 F.3d 189, 197 (3d Cir. 2009)).