UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF OHIO EASTERN DIVISION

RICKY WHITMORE,

Plaintiff,

v.

Civil Action 2:15-cv-2468 Judge Gregory L. Frost Magistrate Judge Elizabeth P. Deavers

ELMEACO MALLORY,

Defendant.

ORDER AND INITIAL SCREEN REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION

Plaintiff, Ricky Whitmore, an Ohio resident who is proceeding without the assistance of counsel, brings this action against Elmeaco Mallory, an investigator for the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission ("EEOC") who handled Plaintiff's discrimination claims. Plaintiff's request to proceed *in forma pauperis* is **GRANTED**. (ECF No. 1.) All judicial officers who render services in this action shall do so as if the costs had been prepaid. 28 U.S.C. § 1915(a). This matter before the United States Magistrate Judge for the initial screen of Plaintiff's Complaint under 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2) to identify cognizable claims and to recommend dismissal of Plaintiff's 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. 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2). Having performed the initial screen, for the reasons that follow, it is **RECOMMENDED** that the Court **DISMISS** this action for failure to state a claim.

Congress enacted 28 U.S.C. § 1915, the federal *in forma pauperis* statute, seeking to "lower judicial access barriers to the indigent." *Denton v. Hernandez*, 504 U.S. 25, 31 (1992). In doing so, however, "Congress recognized that 'a litigant whose filing fees and court costs are assumed by the public, unlike a paying litigant, lacks an economic incentive to refrain from filing frivolous, malicious, or repetitive lawsuits." *Id.* at 31 (quoting *Neitzke v. Williams*, 490 U.S. 319, 324 (1989)). To address this concern, Congress included subsection (e)¹ as part of the statute, which provides in pertinent part:

(2) Notwithstanding any filing fee, or any portion thereof, that may have been paid, the court shall dismiss the case at any time if the court determines that--

* * *

(B) the action or appeal--

(i) is frivolous or malicious;

(ii) fails to state a claim on which relief may be granted; or

28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B)(i) & (ii); *Denton*, 504 U.S. at 31. Thus, § 1915(e) requires *sua sponte* dismissal of an action upon the Court's determination that the action is frivolous or malicious, or upon determination that the action fails to state a claim upon which relief may be granted.

To properly state a claim upon which relief may be granted, a plaintiff must satisfy the basic federal pleading requirements set forth in Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 8(a). *See also Hill v. Lappin*, 630 F.3d 468, 470–71 (6th Cir. 2010) (applying Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 12(b)(6) standards to review under 28 U.S.C. §§ 1915A and 1915(e)(2)(B)(ii)). Under Rule 8(a)(2), a complaint must contain a "short and plain statement of the claim showing that the

¹Formerly 28 U.S.C. § 1915(d).

pleader is entitled to relief." Fed. R. Civ. P. 8(a)(2). Thus, Rule 8(a) "imposes legal *and* factual demands on the authors of complaints." *16630 Southfield Ltd.*, *P'Ship v. Flagstar Bank*, *F.S.B.*, 727 F.3d 502, 503 (6th Cir. 2013).

Although this pleading standard does not require "detailed factual allegations,' ... [a] pleading that offers 'labels and conclusions' or 'a formulaic recitation of the elements of a cause of action," is insufficient. Ashcroft v. Iqbal, 556 U.S. 662, 678 (2009) (quoting Bell Atlantic Corp. v. Twombly, 550 U.S. 544, 555 (2007)). A complaint will not "suffice if it tenders 'naked assertion[s]' devoid of 'further factual enhancement.'" Id. (quoting Twombly, 550 U.S. at 557). Instead, to survive a motion to dismiss for failure to state a claim under Rule 12(b)(6), "a complaint must contain sufficient factual matter . . . to 'state a claim to relief that is plausible on its face." Id. (quoting Twombly, 550 U.S. at 570). Facial plausibility is established "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 of an inference depends on a host of considerations, including common sense and the strength of competing explanations for the defendant's conduct." Flagstar Bank, 727 F.3d at 504 (citations omitted). Further, the Court holds pro se complaints "to less stringent standards than formal pleadings drafted by lawyers." Garrett v. Belmont Cnty. Sheriff's Dep't., No. 08-3978, 2010 WL 1252923, at *2 (6th Cir. April 1, 2010) (quoting Haines v. Kerner, 404 U.S. 519, 520 (1972)). This lenient treatment, however, has limits; "courts should not have to guess at the nature of the claim asserted." Frengler v. Gen. Motors, 482 F. App'x 975, 976-77 (6th Cir. 2012) (quoting Wells v. Brown, 891 F.2d 591, 594 (6th Cir. 1989)).

II.

According to the Complaint, Plaintiff filed a discrimination charge against his former employer with the EEOC. Defendant was assigned to investigate Plaintiff's charge. Plaintiff filed this instant action against Defendant because he is dissatisfied with Defendant's investigation and resolution of his charge against his former employer. In terms of relief, Plaintiff asks this Court to construe the terms of an agreement he apparently entered into with his former employer and also to declare that Defendant improperly handled his claim against his former employer.

Plaintiff's dissatisfaction with Defendant's handling of his discrimination charges fails to state a claim upon which relief may be granted because no private right of action to assert such a claim exists. *Darby v. United States Dep't of Energy*, No. 05-4325, 2006 WL 7348136, at *6 (6th Cir. June 9, 2006) (holding that "[t]he [plaintiff's] claim lacks merit because [she] has no cause of action against the EEOC for the alleged improper handling of her complaints") (citing *Ward v. EEOC*, 719 F.2d 311, 313–14 (9th Cir. 1983) (no private right of action against EEOC for unsatisfactory resolution of discrimination complaint)); *Jackson v. Frank*, No. 90-1266, 1990 WL 182029, at *1 (6th Cir. Nov. 23, 1990) ("The district court properly dismissed [the plaintiff's] claims against [the EEOC investigator] as the courts have consistently recognized that the EEOC and its employees are not subject to suit for actions taken in their review of complaints for discrimination." (citations omitted)). Accordingly, it is **RECOMMENDED** that the Court **DISMISS** this action for failure to state a claim.

III.

For the reasons set forth above, it is **RECOMMENDED** that Plaintiff's Complaint in the above-captioned actions be **DISMISSED** pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B)(ii).

PROCEDURE ON OBJECTIONS

If any party seeks review by the District Judge of this Report and Recommendation, that party may, within fourteen (14) days, file and serve on all parties objections to the Report and Recommendation, specifically designating this Report and Recommendation, and the part in question, as well as the basis for objection. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1); Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(b). Response to objections must be filed within fourteen (14) days after being served with a copy. Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(b).

The parties are specifically advised that the failure to object to the Report and Recommendation will result in a waiver of the right to *de novo* review of by the District Judge and waiver of the right to appeal the judgment of the District Court. *See, e.g., Pfahler v. Nat'l Latex Prod. Co.*, 517 F.3d 816, 829 (6th Cir. 2007) (holding that "failure to object to the magistrate judge's recommendations constituted a waiver of [th defendant's] ability to appeal the district court's ruling"); *United States v. Sullivan*, 431 F.3d 976, 984 (6th Cir. 2005) (holding that defendant waived appeal of district court's denial of pretrial motion by failing to timely object to magistrate judge's report and recommendation). Even when timely objections are filed, appellate review of issues not raised in those objections is waived. *Robert v. Tesson*, 507 F.3d 981, 994 (6th Cir. 2007) ("[A] general objection to a magistrate judge's report, which fails to specify the issues of contention, does not suffice to preserve an issue for appeal ...," (citation omitted)). **IT IS SO ORDERED.**

Date: July 7, 2015

<u>/s/ Elizabeth A. Preston Deavers</u> Elizabeth A. Preston Deavers United States Magistrate Judge