


IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF SOUTH CAROLINA

Akeem Alim-Nafis Abdullah-Malik,)	C/A No.: 1:14-109-RBH-SVH
)	
Plaintiff,)	
)	
vs.)	
)	ORDER
Bruce M. Bryant, Sheriff; James F.)	
Arwood, Jail Administrator; Richard L.)	
Martin, Jr., Assistant Jail Administrator;)	
Gary L. Davis, Security Commander;)	
Sandie Stervul, Dietitian Trinity Food)	
Services Oldsmar, Florida Contracted)	
thru York County Detention Facility,)	
)	
Defendants.)	
)	

Plaintiff Akeem Alim-Nafis Abdullah-Malik, proceeding pro se and in forma pauperis, brings this action pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983, alleging a violation of his constitutional rights while incarcerated at the York County Detention Center. [ECF No. 47]. Plaintiff is now incarcerated at Kershaw Correctional Institution (“KCI”) in the custody of the South Carolina Department of Corrections. This matter comes before the court on Plaintiff’s motion for an arrest warrant for KCI officer Catherine Amason. Plaintiff’s motion is denied. Plaintiff does not have a constitutional right to, or a judicially-cognizable interest in, the criminal prosecution or non-prosecution of another person or entity. See *Leeke v. Timmerman*, 454 U.S. 83, 86–87 (1981). “The benefit that a third party may receive from having someone else arrested for a crime generally does not trigger protections under the Due Process Clause, neither in its procedural nor in its ‘substantive’ manifestations.” *Town of Castle Rock v. Gonzales*, 545 U.S. 748, 768

(2005). Therefore, Plaintiff is not entitled to an arrest warrant for Amason.

IT IS SO ORDERED.



November 18, 2014
Columbia, South Carolina

Shiva V. Hodges
United States Magistrate Judge