

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF SOUTH CAROLINA

Ronald Marshall Ferguson,)	C/A No. 3:10-2641-CMC-JRM
)	
Plaintiff,)	
)	
vs.)	
)	Report and Recommendation
)	
Betty Mabry;)	
John Durst,)	
)	
Defendants.)	
_____)	

This is a civil action filed *pro se*. Plaintiff has filed an Application to Proceed *In Forma Pauperis* in this case. (ECF No. 2). The case is presently before the undersigned magistrate judge for report and recommendation following pre-service review. Pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §636(b)(1), and D.S.C. Civ. R. 73.02(B)(2)(e), this magistrate judge is authorized to review all pretrial matters in such *pro se* cases and to submit findings and recommendations to the District Court. *See* 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B); *In Re Prison Litigation Reform Act*, 105 F.3d 1131, 1134 (6th Cir. 1997)(pleadings by non-prisoners should also be screened).

Plaintiff, a private individual appearing in this case *pro se*, claims that his copyright on a “scale graphic architectural rendering” has been violated since 1998 by two SC state departments: Department of Transportation and the Department of Parks & Tourism. He also claims that the Department of Transportation racially discriminated against him in a 1990 employment decision.

The only Defendants listed on his Complaint and, thus, the only Defendants named in this case, are “Betty Mabry” and “John Durst.” Other than being listed in the caption of the Complaint, neither of these individuals is discussed anywhere in the body of the Complaint. There are no

allegations indicating that either of these individuals have done anything wrongful to Plaintiff, nor are there any allegations showing any personal involvement by either of the Defendants with the alleged improper use of Plaintiff's "scale graphic architectural rendering." Plaintiff asks this Court to "enforce the copyright protection law by recovering all revenues made in the illegal use of [his] property and return it to [him]." Alternatively, he asks the Court to "prosecute the violators to the full extend of the law." Compl. 5 (ECF No. 1).

Under established local procedure in this judicial district, a careful review has been made of the *pro se* Complaint filed by Plaintiff in this case. The review was conducted pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915 (as amended), and other provisions in the Prison Litigation Reform Act. The 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 (1989); *Haines v. Kerner*, 404 U.S. 519, 520-21 (1972); *Nasim v. Warden, Maryland House of Correction*, 64 F.3d 951 (4th Cir. 1995); *Todd v. Baskerville*, 712 F.2d 70 (4th Cir. 1983); *Boyce v. Alizaduh*, 595 F.2d 948 (4th Cir. 1979).

This Court is required to construe *pro se* complaints liberally. Such *pro se* complaints are held to a less stringent standard than those drafted by attorneys, *Gordon v. Leeke*, 574 F.2d 1147, 1151 (4th Cir. 1978), and a federal district court is charged with liberally construing a complaint filed by a *pro se* litigant to allow the development of a potentially meritorious case. *Erickson v. Pardus*, 551 U.S. 89 (2007); *Hughes v. Rowe*, 449 U.S. 5, 9 (1980); *Cruz v. Beto*, 405 U.S. 319 (1972). When a federal court is evaluating a *pro se* complaint, the plaintiff's allegations are assumed to be true. *Fine v. City of New York*, 529 F.2d 70, 74 (2d Cir. 1975). The requirement of liberal construction, however, does not mean that the court can ignore a clear failure in the pleading to allege facts which set forth a claim cognizable in a federal district court. *See Weller v. Department*

of Social Servs., 901 F.2d 387 (4th Cir. 1990).¹ Even under this less stringent standard, the Complaint filed in this case is subject to summary dismissal pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B).

The Complaint submitted by Plaintiff is subject to summary dismissal because it is in violation of the directive in Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 8(a) that pleadings shall contain “short and plain statement[s]” of the basis for the court’s jurisdiction and of the basis for Plaintiff’s claims against Defendants. As stated above, Plaintiff names two Defendants and broadly claims that two state agencies, not made parties to this case, violated his copyright at some time or times between 1998 and the present day. Plaintiff does not allege any kind of factual background for his claim. He does not state that he applied for and obtained a copyright of his work prior to the time that it came into the possession of the state agencies, nor does he state how his copyrighted property was placed into a position to be used by the agencies. Although Plaintiff does broadly claim that his property was used by the agencies, he does not specify how there were used or in what medium they were used by the agencies; he does not state when, where, or how many times the property was used by the agencies; and he does not say how, if at all, the two named Defendants have any responsibility for what the state agencies allegedly did with Plaintiff’s property. As a result, it is impossible to determine which, if any, allegations of wrongdoing are made with respect to each Defendant.

While the “liberal pleading requirements” of Rule 8(a) only require a “short and

¹The 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 pleading to include claims that were never presented, *Barnett v. Hargett*, 174 F.3d 1128 (10th Cir. 1999), or construct Plaintiff’s legal arguments for him, *Small v. Endicott*, 998 F.2d 411 (7th Cir. 1993), or “conjure up questions never squarely presented” to the court, *Beaudett v. City of Hampton*, 775 F.2d 1274, 1278 (4th Cir. 1985).

plain”statement of the claim, the plaintiff must “offer more detail . . . than the bald statement that he has a valid claim of some type against the defendant.” *Trulock v. Freeh*, 275 F.3d 391, 405 (4th Cir. 2001) (internal citations omitted). It is true that we are bound to liberally construe Plaintiff's *pro se* Complaint, but Plaintiff must do more than make mere conclusory statements to support his claim. *Brown v. Zavaras*, 63 F.3d 967 (10th Cir. 1995); *see Adams v. Rice*, 40 F.3d 72 (4th Cir. 1994)(affirming district court's dismissal of plaintiff's suit as frivolous where allegation was conclusory and nonsensical on its face); *White v. White*, 886 F.2d 721, 723 (4th Cir. 1989)(same, where plaintiff's complaint “failed to contain any factual allegations tending to support his bare assertion”). Due to the lack of factual allegations of specific wrongdoing attributable to either or the named Defendants, the Complaint is both frivolous and fails to state a claim on which relief may be granted. *See Cochran v. Morris*, 73 F.2d 1310 (4th Cir. 1996)(statute allowing dismissal of *in forma pauperis* claims encompasses complaints that are either legally or factually baseless); *Weller v. Dep't of Soc. Servs.*, 901 F.2d at 389 (dismissal proper where there were no allegations against defendants); *see also Inmates v. Owens*, 561 F.2d 560, 562-63 (4th Cir. 1977)(dismissing a *pro se* complaint for improper pleading); *Holsey v. Collins*, 90 F.R.D. 122, 128 (D. Md. 1981). In absence of substantive allegations of wrongdoing against the named Defendants, there is nothing from which this Court can liberally construe any type of viable cause of action arising from the Complaint. It is well settled that federal courts performing their duties of construing *pro se* pleadings are not required to be "mind readers" or “advocates” for *pro se* litigants. *See Beaudett v. City of Hampton*, 775 F.2d at 1278; *Gordon v. Leeke*, 574 F.2d at 1151.

Moreover, to the extent that Plaintiff requests relief from this Court that includes “prosecution to the fullest extent of the law,” the Complaint fails to state a viable claim because this

Court cannot direct that any individual, whether a named Defendant or not, be criminally prosecuted, and because the Plaintiff does not have any constitutional right to, or, in fact, any judicially cognizable interest in, the prosecution or non-prosecution of another person. *Linda R.S. v. Richard D.*, 410 U.S. 614, 619 (1973); *see Diamond v. Charles*, 476 U.S. 54, 64-65 (1986)(*applying Linda R.S. v. Richard D.* and collecting cases); *Doyle v. Ok. State Bar Ass'n*, 998 F.2d 1559, 1566-67 (10th Cir. 1993); *Lane v. Correll*, 434 F.2d 598, 600 (5th Cir. 1970).

RECOMMENDATION

Accordingly, it is recommended that the District Court dismiss the Complaint in this case *without prejudice* and without issuance and service of process. *See United Mine Workers v. Gibbs*, 383 U.S. 715 (1966); *see also Neitzke v. Williams*, 490 U.S. 319, 324-25 (1989); *Haines v. Kerner*, 404 U.S. 519 (1972). Plaintiff's attention is directed to the important notice on the next page.



Joseph R. McCrorey
United States Magistrate Judge

November 23, 2010
Columbia, 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 Judge. Objections must specifically identify the portions of the Report and Recommendation to which objections are made and the basis for such objections. “[I]n 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 (4th Cir. 2005) (quoting Fed. R. Civ. P. 72 advisory committee’s note).

Specific written objections must be filed within fourteen (14) days of the date of service of this Report and Recommendation. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1); Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(b); *see* Fed. R. Civ. P. 6(a), (d). Filing by mail pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 5 may be accomplished by mailing objections to:

Larry W. Propes, Clerk
United States District Court
901 Richland Street
Columbia, South Carolina 29201

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); *Wright v. Collins*, 766 F.2d 841 (4th Cir. 1985); *United States v. Schronce*, 727 F.2d 91 (4th Cir. 1984).