



defendant who is immune from such relief.” Id. § 1915A(b)(1) and (b)(2).

Upon review, this Court must determine whether the complaint raises an indisputably meritless legal theory or is founded upon clearly baseless factual contentions, such as fantastic or delusional scenarios. Neitzke v. Williams, 490 U.S. 319, 327–28 (1989). While a pro se complaint must be construed liberally, Haines v. Kerner, 404 U.S. 519, 520 (1972), the liberal construction requirement will not permit a district court to ignore a clear failure to allege facts in the complaint which set forth a claim that is cognizable under federal law. Weller v. Dep't of Soc. Servs., 901 F.2d 387, 391 (4th Cir. 1990).

### III. DISCUSSION

“To state a claim under § 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). Plaintiff’s complaint will be dismissed for the simple reason that he has not identified any individual defendant that may have allegedly violated his federally protected rights. 28 U.S.C. § 1915A(b)(1).

**IT IS, THEREFORE, ORDERED** that Plaintiff’s complaint is **DISMISSED without prejudice** for failure to state a claim. (Doc. No. 1).

The Clerk of Court is respectfully directed to close this civil case.

**IT IS SO ORDERED.**

Signed: July 2, 2015



Frank D. Whitney  
Chief United States District Judge

