

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
EASTERN DISTRICT OF TENNESSEE
AT KNOXVILLE

JEROME NCHIYALEO DOOLEY,)	
)	
Plaintiff,)	
)	
v.)	No. 3:23-CV-00265-JRG-DCP
)	
KNOX COUNTY, TENNESSEE, et al.,)	
)	
Defendants.)	

MEMORANDUM OPINION AND ORDER

Plaintiff, a pro se prisoner housed in the Knox County Detention Facility, has filed a Complaint under 42 U.S.C. § 1983 [Doc. 1] and motion for leave to proceed *in forma pauperis* [Doc. 2]. For the reasons set forth below, the Court will grant Plaintiff’s motion to proceed *in forma pauperis*, dismiss certain claims and Defendants, and order Plaintiff to file an amended complaint.

I. MOTION TO PROCEED *IN FORMA PAUPERIS*

It appears from Plaintiff’s motion [Doc. 2] that he lacks the financial resources to pay the filing fee in a lump sum. Accordingly, pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915, this motion will be **GRANTED**.

Plaintiff will be **ASSESSED** the civil filing fee of \$350.00. The custodian of Plaintiff’s inmate trust account will be **DIRECTED** to submit to the Clerk, U.S. District Court, 800 Market Street, Suite 130, Knoxville, Tennessee 37902 as an initial partial payment, whichever is the greater of: (a) twenty percent (20%) of the average monthly deposits to Plaintiff’s inmate trust account; or (b) twenty percent (20%) of the average monthly balance in his inmate trust account for the six-month period preceding the filing of the Complaint. 28 U.S.C. § 1915(b)(1)(A) and (B). Thereafter, the custodian of Plaintiff’s inmate trust account shall submit twenty percent (20%)

of Plaintiff's preceding monthly income (or income credited to Plaintiff's trust account for the preceding month), but only when such monthly income exceeds ten dollars (\$10.00), until the full filing fee of three hundred fifty dollars (\$350.00) as authorized under 28 U.S.C. § 1914(a) has been paid to the Clerk. 28 U.S.C. § 1915(b)(2).

To ensure compliance with this fee-collection procedure, the Clerk will be **DIRECTED** to mail a copy of this Memorandum and Order to the custodian of inmate accounts at the institution where Plaintiff is now confined. The Clerk will also be **DIRECTED** to furnish a copy of this Memorandum and Order to the Court's financial deputy. This Memorandum and Order shall be placed in Plaintiff's prison file and follow him if he is transferred to another correctional institution.

II. SCREENING STANDARD

Under the Prison Litigation Reform Act ("PLRA"), district courts must screen prisoner complaints and *sua sponte* dismiss any claims that are frivolous or malicious, fail to state a claim for relief, or are against a defendant who is immune. *See, e.g.*, 28 U.S.C. §§ 1915(e)(2)(B) and 1915A; *Benson v. O'Brian*, 179 F.3d 1014 (6th Cir. 1999). The dismissal standard articulated by the Supreme Court in *Ashcroft v. Iqbal*, 556 U.S. 662 (2009) and *Bell Atl. Corp. v. Twombly*, 550 U.S. 544 (2007) "governs dismissals for failure state a claim under [28 U.S.C. §§ 1915(e)(2)(B) and 1915A] because the relevant statutory language tracks the language in Rule 12(b)(6)" of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure. *Hill v. Lappin*, 630 F.3d 468, 470-71 (6th Cir. 2010). Thus, to survive an initial review under the PLRA, a complaint "must contain sufficient factual matter, accepted as true, to 'state a claim to relief that is plausible on its face.'" *Iqbal*, 556 U.S. at 678 (quoting *Twombly*, 550 U.S. at 570).

Formulaic and conclusory recitations of the elements of a claim do not state a plausible claim for relief. *Id.* at 681. Likewise, an allegation that does not raise a plaintiff's right to relief

“above a speculative level” fails to state a plausible claim. *Twombly*, 550 U.S. at 570. However, courts liberally construe pro se pleadings and hold them to a less stringent standard than lawyer-drafted pleadings. *Haines v. Kerner*, 404 U.S. 519, 520 (1972).

A claim under 42 U.S.C. § 1983 requires a plaintiff to establish that a person acting under color of state law deprived him a federal right. 42 U.S.C. § 1983.

III. ANALYSIS

Plaintiff’s Complaint includes sets of claims unrelated to each other and against different Defendants [*See* Doc. 1]. Specifically, Plaintiff alleges that a number of Knox County Detention Facility staff members violated his constitutional rights at that facility, but he also raises a variety of claims against a separate group of Defendants related to his Knox County criminal prosecution [*Id.*].

Plaintiff’s claims against Defendants associated with his treatment at the Knox County Detention Facility are not properly joined in this action under Rule 20(a)(2) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure. Specifically, while a plaintiff may join as many claims as he has against an opposing party under Rule 18(a) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, Rule 20(a)(2) allows a plaintiff to sue multiple defendants only where “(A) any right to relief is asserted against them jointly, severally, or in the alternative with respect to or arising out of the same transaction, occurrence, or series of transactions or occurrences; and (B) any question of law or fact common to all defendants will arise in the action.” Fed. R. Civ. P. 20(a)(2). Therefore, Rule 20 does not permit a plaintiff to join unrelated claims against different defendants in one lawsuit. *See, e.g., George v. Smith*, 507 F.3d 605, 607 (7th Cir. 2007) (“A buckshot complaint that would be rejected if filed by a free person—say, a suit complaining that A defrauded the plaintiff, B defamed him, C punched him, D failed to pay a debt, and E infringed his copyright, all in different transactions—

should be rejected if filed by a prisoner.”); *Smith v. Lavender*, No. 2:22-CV-1875, 2022 WL 4121929, at *6 (S.D. Ohio, Sept. 9, 2022) (severing unrelated claims a prisoner plaintiff filed in the same complaint against different defendants) (citations omitted); *White v. Newcomb*, 2022 WL 2763305, at *4-5 (W.D. Mich. July 15, 2022) (providing that a plaintiff cannot join claims against multiple defendants in one lawsuit ““unless one claim against each additional defendant is transactionally related to the claim against the first defendant and involves a common question of law or fact”” (quoting *Proctor v Applegate*, 661 F. Supp. 2d 743, 778 (E.D. Mich. 2009) and collecting cases standing for the proposition that prisoners cannot join unrelated claims against different defendants in a single lawsuit)).

Moreover, Plaintiff has filed a separate civil action regarding his treatment at the Knox County Detention Facility. *See Dooley v. Knox Cnty. Sheriff’s Dept.*, No. 3:23-CV-266-KAC-JEM (E.D. Tenn.). Therefore, his allegations against those Defendants in this action are also duplicative, and courts attempt to avoid duplicative litigation. *Colorado River Water Conservation Dist. v. United States*, 424 U.S. 800, 817 (1976).

Because Plaintiff’s allegations concerning his treatment at the Knox County Detention Facility are improperly joined in this action and duplicative, all claims and Defendants related to Plaintiff’s treatment at the Knox County Detention Facility—Knox County Sheriff, Anderson, Cordova, Perry, Thornburry, Martinez, Harvey, Hocker, and Nurse Trent—will be **DISMISSED**. This action will address only Plaintiff’s claims related to his criminal prosecution. The Complaint before the Court is replete with information concerning Plaintiff’s treatment at the Knox County Detention Facility, and it is otherwise filled with legal conclusions and assessments that contravene the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure’s requirement that a complaint contain “a short and plain

statement of the claim” supported by allegations that are “simple, concise, and direct.” Fed. R. Civ. P. 8(a), (d).

Therefore, Plaintiff will be permitted twenty-one (21) days from the date of entry of this Order to file an amended complaint. Plaintiff should avoid making legal arguments or statements of fact related to his treatment at the Knox County Detention Facility in his amended complaint. Rather, concerning Plaintiff’s claims relating to his criminal prosecution, he should list (1) his specific allegations of wrongdoing, (2) the constitutional claim he is asserting because of that alleged wrongdoing, (3) the individual(s) responsible, and (4) any injury that resulted. Also, Plaintiff is **NOTIFIED** that the Court will summarily **DISMISS** any other misjoined claims without prejudice.

Plaintiff is **NOTIFIED** that the Court will only address the merits of Plaintiff’s claims that relate to his original complaint. Accordingly, Plaintiff **SHALL NOT** attempt to set forth in his amended complaint any additional claims that do not relate to his original complaint, and he is advised that any such claims will be **DISMISSED**. Further, Plaintiff is **NOTIFIED** that this amended complaint will be the sole operative complaint that the Court considers, and therefore, it **must** be complete in and of itself and must not refer to any previously filed allegations or pleadings.

Finally, Plaintiff is **NOTIFIED** that the Court **WILL NOT** consider any other kind of motion for relief until after the Court has screened the amended complaint pursuant to the PLRA, which the Court will do as soon as practicable. Accordingly, the Court will automatically deny any motions filed before the Court has completed this screening.

IV. CONCLUSION

For the reasons set forth above:

1. Plaintiff's motion for leave to proceed *in forma pauperis* [Doc. 2] is **GRANTED**;
2. The custodian of Plaintiff's inmate trust account is **DIRECTED** to submit the filing fee to the Clerk in the manner set forth above;
3. The Clerk is **DIRECTED** to mail a copy of this Memorandum and Order to the custodian of inmate accounts at the institution where Plaintiff is now confined and the Court's financial deputy;
4. All claims and Defendants related to Plaintiff's treatment at the Knox County Detention Facility (Knox County Sheriff, Anderson, Cordova, Perry, Thornburry, Martinez, Harvey, Hocker, and Nurse Trent) are **DISMISSED**;
5. Plaintiff shall have twenty-one (21) days from entry of this Order to submit an amended complaint in accordance with the directives above. The Clerk is **DIRECTED** to send Plaintiff a § 1983 form for this purpose;
6. If Plaintiff fails to timely submit an amended complaint, this action will be dismissed for failure to prosecute and comply with an Order of the Court; and
7. Plaintiff must immediately inform the Court and Defendants or their counsel of record of any address changes in writing. Pursuant to Local Rule 83.13, it is the duty of a pro se party to promptly notify the Clerk and the other parties to the proceedings of any change in his address, to monitor the progress of the case, and to prosecute or defend the action diligently. E.D. Tenn. L.R. 83.13. Failure to provide a correct address to this Court within fourteen (14) days of any change in address may result in the dismissal of this action.

So ordered.

ENTER:

s/J. RONNIE GREER

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE