# IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF VIRGINIA Richmond Division

LEONARD W. NAJACQUE,

Plaintiff,

v.

Civil Action No. 3:24CV104 (RCY)

JAMES L. GRANDFIELD, et al.,

Defendants.

## **MEMORANDUM OPINION**

Leonard W. NaJacque, a Virginia inmate proceeding *pro se* and *in forma pauperis*, filed this 42 U.S.C. § 1983 action.<sup>1</sup> The matter is before the Court for evaluation of the Particularized Complaint (ECF No. 1) pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §§ 1915(e)(2) and 1915A. For the reasons set forth below, the action will be DISMISSED for failure to state a claim and because it is legally frivolous.

## I. PRELIMINARY REVIEW

Pursuant to the Prison Litigation Reform Act ("PLRA") this Court must dismiss any action filed by a prisoner if the Court determines the action (1) "is frivolous" or (2) "fails to state a claim on which relief may be granted." 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2); see 28 U.S.C. § 1915A. The first standard includes claims based upon "an indisputably meritless legal theory," or claims where the "factual contentions are clearly baseless." *Clay v. Yates*, 809 F. Supp. 417, 427 (E.D. Va. 1992)

42 U.S.C. § 1983.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> The statute provides, in pertinent part:

Every person who, under color of any statute . . . of any State . . . subjects, or causes to be subjected, any citizen of the United States or other person within the jurisdiction thereof to the deprivation of any rights, privileges, or immunities secured by the Constitution and laws, shall be liable to the party injured in an action at law . . . .

(quoting *Neitzke v. Williams*, 490 U.S. 319, 327 (1989)). The second standard is the familiar standard for a motion to dismiss under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 12(b)(6).

"A motion to dismiss under Rule 12(b)(6) tests the sufficiency of a complaint; importantly, it does not resolve contests surrounding the facts, the merits of a claim, or the applicability of defenses." *Republican Party of N.C. v. Martin*, 980 F.2d 943, 952 (4th Cir. 1992) (citing 5A Charles A. Wright & Arthur R. Miller, *Federal Practice and Procedure* § 1356 (1990)). In considering a motion to dismiss for failure to state a claim, a plaintiff's well-pleaded allegations are taken as true and the complaint is viewed in the light most favorable to the plaintiff. *Mylan Labs., Inc. v. Matkari*, 7 F.3d 1130, 1134 (4th Cir. 1993); *see also Martin*, 980 F.2d at 952. This principle applies only to factual allegations, however, and "a court considering a motion to dismiss can choose to begin by identifying pleadings that, because they are no more than conclusions, are not entitled to the assumption of truth." *Ashcroft v. Iqbal*, 556 U.S. 662, 679 (2009).

The Federal Rules of Civil Procedure "require[] only 'a short and plain statement of the claim showing that the pleader is entitled to relief,' in order to 'give the defendant fair notice of what the . . . claim is and the grounds upon which it rests." *Bell Atl. Corp. v. Twombly*, 550 U.S. 544, 555 (2007) (second alteration in original) (quoting *Conley v. Gibson*, 355 U.S. 41, 47 (1957)). Plaintiffs cannot satisfy this standard with complaints containing only "labels and conclusions" or a "formulaic recitation of the elements of a cause of action." *Id.* (citations omitted). Instead, a plaintiff must allege facts sufficient "to raise a right to relief above the speculative level," *id.* (citation omitted), stating a claim that is "plausible on its face," *id.* at 570, rather than merely "conceivable." *Id.* "A claim has facial plausibility when the plaintiff pleads factual content that allows the court to draw the reasonable inference that the defendant is liable for the misconduct alleged." *Iqbal*, 556 U.S. at 678 (citing *Bell Atl. Corp.*, 550 U.S. at 556). For a claim or complaint

to survive dismissal for failure to state a claim, therefore, the plaintiff must "allege facts sufficient to state all the elements of [his] claim." *Bass v. E.I. DuPont de Nemours & Co.*, 324 F.3d 761, 765 (4th Cir. 2003) (citing *Dickson v. Microsoft Corp.*, 309 F.3d 193, 213 (4th Cir. 2002); *Iodice v. United States*, 289 F.3d 270, 281 (4th Cir. 2002)). Lastly, while the Court liberally construes *pro se* complaints, *Gordon v. Leeke*, 574 F.2d 1147, 1151 (4th Cir. 1978), it does not act as the inmate's advocate, *sua sponte* developing statutory and constitutional claims the inmate failed to clearly raise on the face of his complaint. *See Brock v. Carroll*, 107 F.3d 241, 243 (4th Cir. 1997) (Luttig, J., concurring); *Beaudett v. City of Hampton*, 775 F.2d 1274, 1278 (4th Cir. 1985).

## II. ALLEGATIONS

NaJacque has been charged in Hampton, Virginia and in Suffolk, Virginia for various offenses against children. (ECF No. 1, at 7–14.) The Commonwealth was represented by Defendants Lily I. Wilder and Kylene M. Lovell, and Defendant James L. Grandfield, from the Office of the Public Defender in Suffolk represented NaJacque. (*Id.* at 8.) NaJacque faults all three Defendants for "borrow[ing] 24 criminal charges from City of Hampton for jury trial in Suffolk 8/19/2022." (*Id.* at 1.) Apparently, NaJacque was found not guilty on certain charges but the "court continues without end over 2 yrs for retrial in Hampton." (*Id.*) NaJacque does not identify what relief he seeks.

### III. ANALYSIS

It is both unnecessary and inappropriate to engage in an extended discussion of the lack of merit of NaJacque's theories for relief. *See Cochran v. Morris*, 73 F.3d 1310, 1315 (4th Cir. 1996) (emphasizing that "abbreviated treatment" is consistent with Congress's vision for the disposition of frivolous or "insubstantial claims" (citing *Neitzke v. Williams*, 490 U.S. 319, 324 (1989))).

NaJacque's Particularized Complaint will be dismissed for failing to state a claim under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 12(b)(6) and as legally frivolous and malicious.

### A. Prosecutors are Immune From Suit

Prosecutorial immunity bars NaJacque's claims for monetary damages against Defendants Wilder and Lovell. See Imbler v. Pachtman, 424 U.S. 409, 430 (1976). Prosecutorial immunity extends to actions taken while performing "the traditional functions of an advocate," Kalina v. Fletcher, 522 U.S. 118, 131 (1997) (citations omitted), as well as functions that are "intimately associated with the judicial phase of the criminal process." *Imbler*, 424 U.S. at 430. To ascertain whether a specific action falls within the ambit of protected conduct, courts employ a functional approach, distinguishing acts of advocacy from administrative duties and investigative tasks unrelated "to an advocate's preparation for the initiation of a prosecution or for judicial proceedings." Buckley v. Fitzsimmons, 509 U.S. 259, 273 (1993) (citation omitted); Carter v. Burch, 34 F.3d 257, 261–63 (4th Cir. 1994). Absolute immunity protects those "acts undertaken by a prosecutor in preparing for the initiation of judicial proceedings or for trial, and which occur in the course of his role as an advocate for the State." Buckley, 509 U.S. at 273. NaJacque does not allege that any actions taken by Defendants Wilder and Lovell in his pending criminal proceedings were actions taken outside of their roles as advocates for the Commonwealth. See Imbler, 424 U.S. at 430 (holding that prosecutorial immunity extends to prosecutor's actions "in initiating a prosecution and in presenting the State's case"). Accordingly, the claims against Defendants Wilder and Lovell will be DISMISSED as frivolous and for failure to state a claim.<sup>2</sup>

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> Although NaJacque did not identify the relief he seeks against Defendants Wilder and Lovell, given the frivolous nature of his claims, NaJacque states no basis for injunctive relief against these two Defendants. *See* 28 U.S.C. § 1915A(b)(1).

B. Defense Attorneys are Not Amenable to Suit

NaJacque faults Defendant Grandfield, his defense attorney in his criminal case in Suffolk,

Virginia, for various perceived errors in his criminal proceedings. In order to state a viable claim

under 42 U.S.C. § 1983, a plaintiff must allege that a person acting under color of state law

deprived him or her of either a constitutional right or a right conferred by a law of the United

States. See Dowe v. Total Action Against Poverty in Roanoke Valley, 145 F.3d 653, 658 (4th Cir.

1998) (citing 42 U.S.C. § 1983). Private attorneys and public defenders do not act under color of

state or federal authority when they represent defendants in criminal proceedings. See, e.g., Polk

Cnty. v. Dodson, 454 U.S. 312, 325 (1981) ("[A] public defender does not act under color of state

law when performing a lawyer's traditional functions as counsel to a defendant in a criminal

proceeding."); Cox v. Hellerstein, 685 F.2d 1098, 1099 (9th Cir. 1982) (holding that private

attorneys do not act under color of state or federal law when representing clients). Therefore,

NaJacque's claims against Defendant Grandfield will be DISMISSED as frivolous and for failure

to state a claim upon which relief may be granted.

IV. CONCLUSION

For the foregoing reasons, NaJacque's claims and the action will be DISMISSED WITH

PREJUDICE for failure to state a claim, and as legally frivolous. The Clerk will be DIRECTED

to note the disposition of the action for purposes of 28 U.S.C. § 1915(g).

An appropriate Order will accompany this Memorandum Opinion.

Roderick C. Young

United States District Judge

Date: June 4, 2024 Richmond, Virginia

5