

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF OHIO
WESTERN DIVISION**

Sidney L. Byrd,

Case No. 3:14 CV 2680

Plaintiff

v.

ORDER

Supplemental Staffing, et al.

Defendants

On December 8, 2014, Plaintiff *pro se* Sidney L. Byrd filed this *in forma pauperis* action against Supplemental Staffing, Calvary Cemetery, Malcolm C. Richards, “Lockwood,” and Karen E. Asbury. The Complaint is very brief and contains no allegations. Plaintiff appears, however, to be challenging an Ohio Workers Compensation benefits decision.

Although *pro se* pleadings are liberally construed, *Boag v. MacDougall*, 454 U.S. 364, 365 (1982) (per curiam); *Haines v. Kerner*, 404 U.S. 519, 520 (1972), 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. *Neitzke v. Williams*, 490 U.S. 319 (1989); *Lawler v. Marshall*, 898 F.2d 1196 (6th Cir. 1990); *Sistrunk v. City of Strongsville*, 99 F.3d 194, 197 (6th Cir. 1996).

Even construing the Complaint liberally, there are no allegations indicating a basis for this Court's jurisdiction. Plaintiff does not invoke a federal statute in support of his claim, and there is no suggestion the requirements for diversity of citizenship jurisdiction are met. See, 28

U.S.C. § 1332. This case is therefore appropriately subject to summary dismissal. *Lowe v. Hustetler*, No. 89-5996, 1990 WL 66822 (6th Cir. May 21, 1990).

Accordingly, the request to proceed *in forma pauperis* is granted, and this action is dismissed under section 1915(e). I certify, pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915(a)(3), that an appeal from this decision could not be taken in good faith.

So ordered.

S/James G. Carr
Sr. U.S. District Judge