UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT NORTHERN DISTRICT OF OHIO

SHANA MCDADE,	CASE NO. 1:15 CV 266
Plaintiff,	JUDGE DONALD C. NUGENT
v. (MEMORANDUM OF OPINION
CLEVELAND STATE UNIVERSITY,	AND ORDER
Defendant.	

On February 10, 2015, plaintiff Shana McDade filed this *in forma pauperis* action against defendant Cleveland State University. Plaintiff filed an amended complaint on March 6, 2015, apparently intending to supplement the complaint. These pleadings reflect plaintiff was dismissed from the Baccalaureate Nursing Program at Cleveland State on the ground of misconduct. She asserts this violated her right to due process and constituted a conspiracy to violate her civil rights. She also sets forth numerous state law theories. Plaintiff's request to proceed *in forma pauperis* is granted. Now before the court is defendant's motion to dismiss this action pursuant to Fed.R.Civ.P. 12(b)(6).

A cause of action fails to state a claim upon which relief my be granted when it lack "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 pleading are true. *Twombly*, 550 U.S. at 555. The plaintiff is not required to include detailed factual allegations, but the complaint 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*.

While this court is mindful that *pro se* pleadings are to be liberally construed, *Boag v. MacDougall*, 454 U.S. 364, 365 (1982) (per curiam); *Haines v. Kerner*, 404 U.S. 519, 520 (1972), this principle is 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.*

Further, legal conclusions alone are not sufficient to present a valid claim, and this court is not required to accept unwarranted factual inferences. *Morgan v. Church's Fried Chicken*, 829 F.2d 10, 12 (6th Cir. 1987); *see also, Place v. Shepherd*, 446 F.2d 1239 (6th Cir. 1971) (conclusory section 1983 claim dismissed). Even liberally construed, the complaint does not contain allegations reasonably suggesting plaintiff might have a valid federal claim.

Accordingly, defendant's motion to dismiss is **granted**. 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.

DONALD C. NUGENT

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE