UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT NORTHERN DISTRICT OF OHIO

CLIFFORD D. JACKSON, III,

Plaintiff,

v.

CUYAHOGA COUNTY PUBLIC DEFENDER,

Defendant.

CASE NO. 1:11 CV 2169 JUDGE DAN AARON POLSTER

MEMORANDUM OF OPINION AND ORDER

On October 13, 2011, plaintiff *pro se* Clifford D. Jackson, III, a pretrial detainee at the Cuyahoga County Jail, filed this 42 U.S.C. § 1983 action against the Cuyahoga County Public Defender. The complaint, which seeks monetary and injunctive relief, alleges plaintiff was not afforded a preliminary hearing, but was instead indicted. For the reasons stated below, this action is dismissed.

A district court is expressly required to dismiss any civil action filed by a prisoner seeking relief from a governmental officer or entity, as soon as possible after docketing, if the court concludes that the complaint fails to state a claim upon which relief may be granted, or if the plaintiff seeks monetary relief from a defendant who is immune from such relief. 28 U.S.C. §1915A; *Siller v. Dean*, No. 99-5323, 2000 WL 145167, at *2 (6th Cir. Feb. 1, 2000).

Principles requiring generous construction of *pro se* pleadings are not without limits. *Beaudett v. City of Hampton*, 775 F.2d 1274, 1277 (4th Cir. 1985). A complaint must contain either direct or inferential allegations respecting all the material elements of some viable legal theory to satisfy federal notice pleading requirements. *See Schied v. Fanny Farmer Candy Shops, Inc.*, 859 F.2d 434, 437 (6th Cir. 1988). District courts are not required to conjure up questions never squarely presented to them or to construct full blown claims from sentence fragments. *Beaudette*, 775 F.2d at 1278. To do so would "require ...[the courts] to explore exhaustively all potential claims of a *pro se* plaintiff, ... [and] would...transform the district court from its legitimate advisory role to the improper role of an advocate seeking out the strongest arguments and most successful strategies for a party." *Id*.

Even liberally construed, the complaint does not contain allegations reasonably suggesting plaintiff might have a valid federal claim. The purpose of a preliminary hearing is to determine whether sufficient facts exist to allow the court to bind the accused over to the gand jury. *State v. Wigglesworth*, 18 Ohio St.2d 171, 174(1969). There is no constitutional right to a preliminary hearing, however, when an indictment is returned. *Zaffino v. Konteh*, 2006 WIL 2360902 * 4 (N.D.Ohio, Aug. 15, 2006); *State ex rel. Pena v. Konteh*, 2007 WL 2216967 *1 (Ohio App. 6th Dist., Aug. 1, 2007). Further, to the extent plaintiff seeks to challenge "the very fact or duration of his physical imprisonment, ... his sole federal remedy is a writ of habeas corpus." *Preiser v. Rodriguez*, 411 U.S. 475, 501 (1973).

Accordingly, this action is dismissed under 28 U.S.C. § 1915A. Further, the court certifies, pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915(a)(3), that an appeal from this decision could not be taken in good faith.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

<u>/s/Dan Aaron Polster 12/19/11</u> DAN AARON POLSTER UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE