

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 grand 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.

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