

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF OHIO
WESTERN DIVISION AT DAYTON**

RANDY LEE WRIGHT,

Plaintiff,

:

Case No. 3:10-cv-201
Consolidated with 3:10-cv-286

-vs-

District Judge Thomas M. Rose
Magistrate Judge Michael R. Merz

:

CHARLES A. COX, SHERIFF, et al.,

Defendants.

DECISION AND ORDER

The above-numbered cases have been ordered consolidated. All further filings in either case will be filed in Case No. 3:10-cv-201 with the above caption with both case numbers shown.

Case No. 3:10-cv-286 is before the Court for review prior to issuance of process. Plaintiff is a prisoner within the meaning of 28 U.S.C. §1915A(c). §1915A was added to the Judicial Code by the Prison Litigation Reform Act of 1995 Title VIII of P.L. 104-134, 110 Stat. 1321(effective April 26, 1996)(the "PLRA") and provides in pertinent part:

(a) Screening -- The court shall review, before docketing, if feasible or, in any event, as soon as practicable after docketing, a complaint in a civil action in which a prisoner seeks redress from a governmental entity or officer or employee of a governmental entity.

(b) Grounds for Dismissal -- On review, the court shall identify cognizable claims or dismiss the complaint, or any portion of the complaint, if the complaint --

(1) is frivolous, malicious, or fails to state a claim upon which relief can be granted; or

(2) seeks monetary relief from a defendant who is immune from such relief.

The PLRA also amends 28 U.S.C. §1915(e)(2) to read as follows:

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

(A) the allegation of poverty is untrue; or

(B) the action or appeal --

(I) is frivolous or malicious;

(ii) fails to state a claim upon which relief can be granted; or

(iii) seeks monetary relief against a defendant who is immune from such relief.

A district court must screen prisoner complaints under both §1915A and §1915(e)(2). *McGore v. Wrigglesworth*, 114 F.3d 601 (6th Cir., 1997); *In re Prison Litigation Reform Act*, 105 F.3d 1131 (6th Cir. 1997)(Administrative Order 97-01 of Chief Judge Martin). The PLRA is constitutional. *Hampton v. Hobbs*, 106 F.3d 1281 (6th Cir. 1997).

A complaint is frivolous under 28 U.S.C. §1915 if it lacks an arguable basis either in law or in fact. *Denton v. Hernandez*, 504 U.S. 25 (1992); *Neitzke v. Williams*, 490 U.S. 319 (1989); the language of §1915A suggests strongly that Congress intended to carry the same meaning over to the new Act. The Court "is not bound, as it usually is when making a determination based solely on the pleadings, to accept without question the truth of the plaintiff's allegations." *Denton*, 118 L. Ed. 2d at 349.

The test for dismissal under Fed. R. Civ. P. 12(b)(6) has recently been re-stated by the Supreme Court:

Factual allegations must be enough to raise a right to relief above the speculative level, see 5 C. Wright & A. Miller, *Federal Practice and Procedure* § 1216, pp. 235-236 (3d ed.2004)("[T]he pleading must contain something more ... than ... a statement of facts that merely creates a suspicion [of] a legally cognizable right of action"), on the assumption that all the allegations in the complaint are true (even if doubtful in fact), see, e.g., *Swierkiewicz v. Sorema N. A.*, 534 U.S. 506, 508, n. 1, 122 S.Ct. 992, 152 L.Ed.2d 1 (2002); *Neitzke v. Williams*, 490 U.S. 319, 327, 109 S.Ct. 1827, 104 L.Ed.2d 338 (1989)(" Rule 12(b)(6) does not countenance ... dismissals based on a judge's disbelief of a complaint's factual allegations"); *Scheuer v.*

Rhodes, 416 U.S. 232, 236, 94 S.Ct. 1683, 40 L.Ed.2d 90 (1974) (a well-pleaded complaint may proceed even if it appears “that a recovery is very remote and unlikely”).

Bell Atlantic Corp. v. Twombly, 550 U.S.544, 555 (2007).

[W]hen the allegations in a complaint, however true, could not raise a claim of entitlement to relief, “ ‘this basic deficiency should ... be exposed at the point of minimum expenditure of time and money by the parties and the court.’ ” 5 Wright & Miller § 1216, at 233-234 (quoting *Daves v. Hawaiian Dredging Co.*, 114 F.Supp. 643, 645 (D. Hawaii 1953)); see also *Dura [Pharmaceuticals, Inc. v. Broudo]*, 544 U.S. 336, 125 S.Ct. 1627, 161 L.Ed.2d 577 (2005), at 346, 125 S.Ct. 1627; *Asahi Glass Co. v. Pentech Pharmaceuticals, Inc .*, 289 F.Supp.2d 986, 995 (N.D.Ill.2003) (Posner, J., sitting by designation) (“[S]ome threshold of plausibility must be crossed at the outset before a patent antitrust case should be permitted to go into its inevitably costly and protracted discovery phase”).

Bell Atlantic, 550 U.S. at 558; see also *Association of Cleveland Fire Fighters v. City of Cleveland, Ohio*, 502 F.3d 545 (6th Cir. 2007).

Having conducted the initial screening as required by 28 U.S.C. § 1915, the Magistrate Judge finds that the Complaint and Amended Complaint may state a claims for relief under 42 U.S.C. § 1983. Given that conclusion, the Magistrate Judge believes it would be inappropriate to attempt to resolve the case on Plaintiff’s Complaint and Amended Complaint alone.

Accordingly, it is hereby ordered that the Clerk issued process and deliver the same to the United States Marshal for service upon presentation by Plaintiff of summonses and Marshal 285 forms.

July 28, 2010.

s/ **Michael R. Merz**
United States Magistrate Judge