

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF OHIO  
EASTERN DIVISION

Jason Jones, :  
 :  
 Plaintiff : Civil Action 2:11-cv-0551  
 :  
 v. : Judge Marbley  
 :  
 Rob Jeffreys, *et al.*, : Magistrate Judge Abel  
 :  
 Defendants :

**Initial Screening Report and Recommendation**

Plaintiff Jason Jones brings this civil rights action under 42 U.S.C. §1983. Plaintiff's motion to proceed without prepayment of fees and costs is GRANTED on the CONDITION that he submits a prison cashier's statement of inmate account within thirty (30) days of the date of this Order.

This matter is before the Magistrate Judge for screening of the complaint under 28 U.S.C. §1915(e)(2) to identify cognizable claims, and to recommend dismissal of the complaint, or any portion of it, which is frivolous, malicious, fails to state a claim upon which relief may be granted, or seeks monetary relief from a defendant who is immune from such relief. *See, McGore v. Wrigglesworth*, 114 F.3d 601, 608 (6th Cir. 1997). The Magistrate Judge finds that the complaint fails to give defendants fair notice of the claims asserted against them and, therefore, recommends dismissal of the complaint.

The complaint alleges that defendants Rob Jeffreys, Ross Correctional Institution Warden; Ross Correctional Institution Institutional Inspector Witter, Ross Correctional

Institution Lt. Lungsford; Ross Correctional Institution Lt. Morison, and Ross Correctional Institution Lt. Powers conspired under color of state law to deprive plaintiff Jones of his constitutional right to be free from cruel and unusual punishment.

When considering whether a complaint fails to state a claim under Rule 12(b)(6), Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, a court must construe it in the light most favorable to the plaintiff and accept all well-pleaded material allegations in the complaint as true. *Scheuer v. Rhodes*, 416 U.S. 232, 236 (1974); *Roth Steel Products v. Sharon Steel Corp.*, 705 F.2d 134, 155 (6th Cir. 1983). Rule 8(a), Federal Rules of Civil Procedure provides for notice pleading. *Conley v. Gibson*, 355 U.S. 41, 47 (1957). The United States Supreme Court held in *Erickson v. Pardus*, 551 U.S. 89, 93 (2007):

. . . Rule 8(a)(2) requires only "a short and plain statement of the claim showing that the pleader is entitled to relief." Specific facts showing that the pleader is entitled to relief are not necessary; the statement need only "give the defendant fair notice of what the . . . claim is and the grounds upon which it rests.": *Bell Atlantic Corp. v. Twombly*, 550 U.S. 554, 555, 127 S.Ct. 1955 (2007) (quoting *Conley v. Gibson*, 355 U.S. 41, 47 (1957)).

Moreover, *pro se* complaints must be liberally construed. *Erickson*, 551 U.S. at 94; *Hughes v. Rowe*, 449 U.S. 5, 9-10 (1980). Nonetheless, "a complaint must contain sufficient factual matter, accepted as true, to 'state a claim to relief that is plausible on its face.' *Twombly*, 550 U.S. at 570." *Ashcroft v. Iqbal*, 129 S.Ct. 1937, 1949 (2009).

Analysis. The complaint does not allege the acts each individual defendant committed that subjected Jones to cruel and unusual punishment, when those acts occurred, where those acts occurred, or the injuries Jones sustained. Consequently, the

complaint does not give defendants fair notice of the claims asserted against them and the grounds upon which the claims rests.

Accordingly, the Magistrate Judge RECOMMENDS that the complaint be DISMISSED because it fails to state a claim under 42 U.S.C. §1983. Defendants do not have to respond to the complaint unless the Court rejects this Report and Recommendation.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that plaintiff's application to proceed without prepayment of fees be GRANTED. The United States Marshal is ORDERED to serve upon each defendant named in the complaint a copy of the complaint and a copy of this Order.

If any party objects to this Report and Recommendation, that party may, within fourteen (14) days, file and serve on all parties a motion for reconsideration by the Court, specifically designating this Report and Recommendation, and the part thereof in question, as well as the basis for objection thereto. 28 U.S.C. §636(b)(1)(B); Rule 72(b), Fed. R. Civ. P.

The parties are specifically advised that failure to object to the Report and Recommendation will result in a waiver of the right to *de novo* review by the District Judge and waiver of the right to appeal the judgment of the District Court. *Thomas v. Arn*, 474 U.S. 140, 150-52 (1985); *United States v. Walters*, 638 F.2d 947 (6th Cir. 1981). See also, *Small v. Secretary of Health and Human Services*, 892 F.2d 15, 16 (2d Cir. 1989).

The Clerk of Court is DIRECTED to mail a copy of the complaint and this Report and Recommendation to each defendant.

s/Mark R. Abel  
United States Magistrate Judge