UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT NORTHERN DISTRICT OF OHIO

DANIEL A. ROBINSON, JR., Plaintiff, v. DEEP DARK ORDER OF SEDUCEES, et al.,

Defendants.

CASE NO. 5:11 CV 2307 JUDGE JOHN R. ADAMS <u>MEMORANDUM OF OPINION</u> AND ORDER

On October 27, 2011, Plaintiff *pro se* Daniel A. Robinson, Jr. filed this *in forma pauperis* action against the following Defendants: Deep Dark Order of Seducees, Worldwide Order, Satanic Order, Worldwide Officers, City of Akron, City of Akron Police Department, Officer Murphy, Akron Summit County Jail, Seducees Personnel, Joe Goldberg, and Akron St. Thomas Hospital.¹ The Complaint, which is barely legible, consists of series of disjointed statements which are not intelligible to this Court.

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.² *Neitzke v. Williams*, 490 U.S. 319 (1989);

¹ The Complaint lists 31 other plaintiffs, but only Robinson signed the Complaint.

² A 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. *McGore v. Wrigglesworth*, 114 F.3d 601, 608-09 (6th Cir. 1997); *Spruytte v. Walters*, 753 F.2d 498, 500 (6th Cir. 1985), *cert. denied*, 474 U.S. 1054 (1986); *Harris v. Johnson*, 784 F.2d 222, 224 (6th Cir. 1986); *Brooks v. Seiter*, 779 F.2d 1177, 1179 (6th Cir. 1985).

Lawler v. Marshall, 898 F.2d 1196 (6th Cir. 1990); Sistrunk v. City of Strongsville, 99 F.3d 194, 197 (6th Cir. 1996).

Under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 8(a)(2), a pleading must contain a "short and plain statement of the claim showing that the pleader is entitled to relief." Ashcroft v. Iqbal, 129 S.Ct. 1937, 1949 (2009). The pleading standard Rule 8 announces does not require "detailed factual allegations," but it demands more than an unadorned, the-defendant-unlawfully-harmed-me 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. Even liberally construed, the Complaint does not contain allegations reasonably suggesting Plaintiff might have a valid 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).

Accordingly, the request to proceed *in forma pauperis* is granted and this action is dismissed under section 1915(e). 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.

<u>12/29/2011</u> DATE /s/ John R. Adams JOHN R. ADAMS UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE