UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT NORTHERN DISTRICT OF OHIO

CORNELL SMITH,

Plaintiff,

v.

COMMISSIONER OF SOCIAL SECURITY,

Defendant.

CASE NO. 1:13 CV 645

JUDGE CHRISTOPHER A. BOYKO

MEMORANDUM OF OPINION AND ORDER

On March 25, 2013, Plaintiff pro se Cornell Smith filed this in forma pauperis action against

the Social Security Administration. The Complaint, which seeks \$1 million in damages, states in

its entirety as follows:

Social Security owes me for underpayments from 2008 to 2009. They also owe me for lawsuit against them for cutting people off Social Security for having a legal warrant - for the year 2006 - for the year 2009 - also for the last 10 years I've been disrespected by different Social Security offices in Cleveland, Ohio.

Although *pro se* pleadings are liberally construed, *Boag v. MacDougall*, 454 U.S. 364, 365 (1982) (per curiam), the district court is required to dismiss an action under 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e) if it fails to state a claim upon which relief can be granted, or if it lacks an arguable basis in law or fact.¹ *Neitzke v. Williams*, 490 U.S. 319 (1989); *Hill v. Lappin*, 630 F.3d 468, 470 (6th Cir. 2010).

¹ An *in forma pauperis* claim may be dismissed *sua sponte*, without prior notice to the plaintiff and without service of process on the defendant, if the court explicitly states that it is invoking section 1915(e) [formerly 28 U.S.C. § 1915(d)] and is dismissing the claim for one of the reasons set forth in the statute. *Chase Manhattan Mortg. Corp. v. Smith,* 507 F.3d 910, 915 (6th Cir. 2007); *Gibson v. R.G. Smith Co.,* 915 F.2d 260, 261 (6th Cir. 1990); *Harris v. Johnson,* 784 F.2d 222, 224 (6th Cir. 1986).

A cause of action fails to state a claim upon which relief may be granted when it lacks "plausibility in the complaint." *Bell At. Corp. V. Twombly*, 550 U.S. 544, 564 (2007). A pleading must contain a "short and plain statement of the claim showing that the pleader is entitled to relief." *Ashcroft v. Iqbal*, 556 U.S. 662, 677-78 (2009). The factual allegations in the pleading must be sufficient to raise the right to relief above the speculative level on the assumption that all the allegations in the complaint are true. *Twombly*, 550 U.S. at 555. The plaintiff is not required to include detailed factual allegations, but must provide more than "an unadorned, the-defendant-unlawfully-harmed-me accusation." *Iqbal*, 556 U.S. at 678 (2009). A pleading that offers legal conclusions or a simple recitation of the elements of a cause of action will not meet this pleading standard. *Id.*

Even construing the Complaint liberally in a light most favorable to the Plaintiff, *Brand v. Motley*, 526 F.3d 921, 924 (6th Cir. 2008), it does not contain allegations reasonably suggesting he might have a valid federal claim. *See, Lillard v. Shelby County Bd. of Educ,*, 76 F.3d 716 (6th Cir. 1996)(court not required to accept summary allegations or unwarranted legal conclusions in determining whether complaint states a claim for relief). Furthermore, there is no indication Plaintiff exhausted the administrative appeal process regarding a decision of Defendant with which he disagrees, a prerequisite for this Court to obtain subject matter jurisdiction to review any such decision. *Pohlmeyer v. Secretary of Health and Human Services*, 939 F.2d 318, 320 (6th Cir. 1991).

Accordingly, the automatic reference is removed, the request to proceed *in forma pauperis* is granted, and this action is dismissed under section 1915(e). 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/ Christopher A. Boyko CHRISTOPHER A. BOYKO UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

DATED: March 28, 2013