

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
DISTRICT OF SOUTH CAROLINA

RECEIVED  
U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE

2008 DEC -3 A 11:32

The Plaintiff, John Alan Miller (Plaintiff), proceeding pro se, files this civil complaint, which is construed as an action pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983.<sup>1</sup> Plaintiff is an inmate at Kershaw Correctional Institution, a facility of the South Carolina Department of Corrections (SCDC), and files this action *in forma pauperis* under 28 U.S.C. § 1915. The complaint names as the sole Defendant the York County Public Defender's Office.<sup>2</sup> The complaint should be dismissed for failure to state a claim upon which relief may be granted.

<sup>1</sup> Pursuant to the provisions of 28 U.S.C. §636(b)(1)(B), and Local Rule 73.02(B)(2)(d), D.S.C., the undersigned is authorized to review such complaints for relief and submit findings and recommendations to the District Court.

<sup>2</sup> Title 28 U.S.C. § 1915A (a) requires review of a "complaint in a civil action in which a prisoner seeks redress from a governmental entity or officer or employee of a governmental entity."

Pro Se and In Forma Pauperis Review

Under established local procedure in this judicial district, a careful review has been made of the *pro se* complaint pursuant to the procedural provisions of 28 U.S.C. § 1915; 28 U.S.C. § 1915A; and the Prison Litigation Reform Act, Pub. L. No. 104-134, 110 Stat. 1321 (1996). This review has been conducted in light of the following precedents: *Denton v. Hernandez*, 504 U.S. 25 (1992); *Neitzke v. Williams*, 490 U.S. 319, 324-25 (1989); *Haines v. Kerner*, 404 U.S. 519 (1972); *Nasim v. Warden, Md. House of Corr.*, 64 F.3d 951 (4<sup>th</sup> Cir. 1995) (*en banc*); *Todd v. Baskerville*, 712 F.2d 70 (4<sup>th</sup> Cir. 1983).

The complaint herein has been filed pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915, which permits an indigent litigant to commence an action in federal court without prepaying the administrative costs of proceeding with the lawsuit. To protect against possible abuses of this privilege, the statute allows a district court to dismiss the case upon a finding that the action "fails to state a claim on which relief may be granted" or is "frivolous or malicious." § 1915(e)(2)(B)(i), (ii). A finding of frivolity can be made where the complaint "lacks an arguable basis either in law or in fact." *Denton v. Hernandez*, 504 U.S. at 31. Hence, under § 1915(e)(2)(B), a claim based on a meritless legal theory may be dismissed *sua sponte*. *Neitzke v. Williams*, 490 U.S. 319 (1989); *Allison v. Kyle*, 66 F.3d 71 (5<sup>th</sup> Cir. 1995).

This Court is required to liberally construe *pro se* documents, *Estelle v. Gamble*, 429 U.S. 97 (1976), holding them to a less stringent standard than those drafted by attorneys, *Hughes v. Rowe*, 449 U.S. 9 (1980) (*per curiam*). Even under this less stringent standard, however, the *pro se* complaint is subject to summary dismissal. The mandated liberal construction afforded to *pro se* pleadings means that if the Court can reasonably read the pleadings to state a valid claim on which the Plaintiff could prevail, it should do so, but a district court may not rewrite a petition to include claims that were never presented, *Barnett v. Hargett*, 174 F.3d 1128, 1133 (10<sup>th</sup> Cir. 1999), construct the Plaintiff's legal arguments for him, *Small v. Endicott*, 998 F.2d 411, 417-18 (7<sup>th</sup> Cir. 1993), or "conjure up questions never squarely presented" to the court, *Beaudett v. City of Hampton*, 775 F.2d 1274, 1278 (4<sup>th</sup> Cir. 1985). The requirement of liberal construction does not mean that the Court can ignore a clear failure in the pleading to allege facts which set forth a claim currently cognizable in a federal district court. *Weller v. Dep't of Soc. Servs.*, 901 F.2d 387, (4th Cir. 1990).

#### Background

Plaintiff claims that the York County Public Defender's Office has "ignored and denied continually" Plaintiff's requests for a copy of his file. Plaintiff alleges that the Defendant is withholding his file "due to the fact that [Plaintiff has] a pending Post-conviction relief, and they are afraid that there may

be incriminating evidence contained in the said files." Plaintiff claims that the Defendant's actions violate the Federal Freedom of Information Act (FOIA) and Plaintiff's Constitutional rights. Plaintiff seeks monetary damages and a complete copy of his file from the Defendant.

Discussion

In order to state a cause of action under 42 U.S.C. § 1983, a plaintiff must allege that: (1) "some person has deprived him of a federal right", and (2) "the person who has deprived him of that right acted under color of state or territorial law." *Gomez v. Toledo*, 446 U.S. 635, 640 (1980). See also 42 U.S.C. § 1983; *Monroe v. Pape*, 365 U.S. 167, 171 (1961).

It is well settled that only "persons" may act under color of state law, therefore, a defendant in a section 1983 action must qualify as a "person." For example, several courts have held that inanimate objects such as buildings, facilities, and grounds do not act under color of state law. See *Allison v. California Adult Auth.*, 419 F.2d 822, 823 (9th Cir. 1969) (California Adult Authority and San Quentin Prison not "persons" subject to suit under 42 U.S.C. § 1983); *Preval v. Reno*, 57 F.Supp.2d 307, 310 (E.D. Va. 1999) ("[T]he Piedmont Regional Jail is not a 'person,' and therefore not amenable to suit under 42 U.S.C. § 1983"); *Brooks v. Pembroke City Jail*, 722 F. Supp. 1294, 1301 (E.D. N.C. 1989) ("Claims under § 1983 are directed at 'persons' and the jail is not a person amenable to suit"). Additionally, use of the term "staff" or the

equivalent as a name for alleged defendants, without the naming of specific staff members, is not adequate to state a claim against a "person" as required in § 1983 actions. *See Martin v. UConn Health Care*, No. 3:99CV2158 (DJS), 2000 WL 303262, \*1 (D. Conn., Feb. 9, 2000); *Ferguson v. Morgan*, No. 90 Civ. 6318 (JSM), 1991 WL 115759 (S.D. N.Y. Jun. 20, 1991).

In the instant complaint, Plaintiff seeks relief against the York County Public Defender's Office. It is unclear whether Plaintiff uses the term "York County Public Defender's Office" in an attempt to name the building in which the public defenders work or to name the public defender's "staff" as a whole. In either instance, such an entity is not a "person" amenable to suit under the statute.<sup>3</sup> Thus, to the extent Plaintiff seeks relief against the York County Public Defender's Office pursuant to § 1983, his claim is subject to summary dismissal.

Plaintiff also seeks relief against the York County Public Defender's Office pursuant to the Federal Freedom of Information Act (FOIA), codified at 5 U.S.C. § 552 et seq. However, the Federal FOIA is applicable to agencies or departments of the Government of the United States, and is not applicable to agencies


---

<sup>3</sup> It is noted that an attorney, whether retained, court-appointed, or a public defender, does not act under "color of state law" when performing traditional functions as counsel. *See Polk County v. Dodson*, 454 U.S. 312, 317-324 & nn. 8-16 (1981). Therefore, even had Plaintiff named a specific public defender as a defendant in this action, any claim pursuant to § 1983 regarding that attorney's legal services would still be subject to summary dismissal.

or departments of a state. See 5 U.S.C. § 551(1). See also, *Grand Cent. Partnership, Inc. v. Cuomo*, 166 F.3d 473, 484 (2d Cir. 1999) ("it is beyond question that FOIA applies only to federal and not to state agencies"); *Philip Morris, Inc., v. Harshbarger*, 122 F.3d 58, 83 (1st Cir. 1997) ("FOIA . . . applies only to federal executive branch agencies"); *St. Michael's Convalescent Hosp. v. California*, 643 F.2d 1369, 1373 (9th Cir. 1981) (definition of "agency" under FOIA "does not encompass state agencies or bodies"); *Johnson v. Wells*, 566 F.2d 1016, 1018 (5th Cir. 1978) (state board of parole not agency within meaning of FOIA). As the Federal FOIA is not applicable to state or local governmental entities and agencies, Plaintiffs Federal FOIA claim against the York County Public Defender's Office is subject to dismissal.

Recommendation

Accordingly, it is recommended that the District Court dismiss the complaint in the above-captioned case *without prejudice* and *without issuance of service of process*. See *Denton v. Hernandez*, 504 U.S. at 31; *Neitzke v. Williams*, 490 U.S. at 324-25; *Todd v. Baskerville* 712 F.2d at 74. Plaintiff's attention is directed to the important notice on the next page.

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Robert S. Carr  
United States Magistrate Judge

December 3, 2008  
Charleston, South Carolina

**Notice of Right to File Objections to Report and Recommendation**

The parties are advised that they may file specific written objections to this Report and Recommendation with the District Court Judge. Objections must specifically identify the portions of the Report and Recommendation to which objections are made and the basis for such objections. In the absence of a timely filed objection, a district court need not conduct a de novo review, but instead must "only satisfy itself that there is no clear error on the face of the record in order to accept the recommendation." *Diamond v. Colonial Life & Acc. Ins. Co.*, 416 F.3d 310 (4<sup>th</sup> Cir. 2005).

Specific written objections must be filed within ten (10) days of the date of service of this Report and Recommendation. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1); Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(b). The time calculation of this ten-day period excludes weekends and holidays and provides for an additional three (3) days for filing by mail. Fed. R. Civ. P. 6(a) & (e). Filing by mail pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 5 may be accomplished by mailing objections to:

Larry W. Propes, Clerk  
United States District Court  
P. O. Box 835  
Charleston, South Carolina 29402

Failure to timely file specific written objections to this Report and Recommendation will result in waiver of the right to appeal from a judgment of the District Court based upon such Recommendation. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1); *Thomas v. Arn*, 474 U.S. 140 (1985); *United States v. Schronce*, 727 F.2d 91 (4th Cir. 1984); *Wright v. Collins*, 766 F.2d 841 (4th Cir. 1985).