



accusation. *Id.* A pleading that offers “labels and conclusions” or “a formulaic recitation of the elements of a cause of action will not do.” *Id.* Nor does a complaint suffice if it tenders naked assertion devoid of further factual enhancement. *Id.* It must contain sufficient factual matter, accepted as true, to “state a claim to relief that is plausible on its face.” *Id.* A claim has facial plausibility when the plaintiff pleads factual content that allows the court to draw the reasonable inference that the defendant is liable for the misconduct alleged. *Id.* The plausibility standard is not akin to a “probability requirement,” but it asks for more than a sheer possibility that a defendant has acted unlawfully. *Id.* Where a complaint pleads facts that are “merely consistent with” a defendant's liability, it “stops short of the line between possibility and plausibility of ‘entitlement to relief.’ ” *Id.*

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. *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). Further, even if Plaintiff had otherwise set forth a viable claim, it is apparent on the face of the Complaint that

the two-year statute of limitations for bringing a § 1983 claim<sup>1</sup> expired well before this action was filed. There would thus be no purpose in allowing this case to go forward. *See, e.g., Castillo v. Grogan*, 52 F. App'x 750, 751 (6th Cir.2002) (district court may *sua sponte* dismiss complaint as time-barred when the defect is obvious); *Alston v. Tennessee Dept. of Corrections*, 2002 WL 123688 \* 1 (6th Cir. Jan.28, 2002) (*sua sponte* dismissal of complaint which is time-barred on its face is appropriate); *Fraley v. Ohio Gallia County*, 1998 WL 789385 \* 1 (6th Cir., Oct.30, 1998) (affirming *sua sponte* dismissal of pro se § 1983 action filed after two-year statute of limitations for bringing such an action had expired).

Accordingly, this action is dismissed under section 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/ Christopher A. Boyko  
CHRISTOPHER A. BOYKO  
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

DATED: July 30, 2015

---

<sup>1</sup> *See, LRL Properties v. Portage Metro Housing Authority*, 55 F.3d 1097 (6<sup>th</sup> Cir.1995).