

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF VIRGINIA  
ROANOKE DIVISION**

**JAMAINE C. TALFORD,**  
**Plaintiff,**

**v.**

**BRISTOL CITY JAIL,**  
**Defendant.**

)  
)  
)  
)  
)  
)  
)

**Civil Action No. 7:13-cv-00411**

**MEMORANDUM OPINION**

**By: Hon. Michael F. Urbanski**  
**United States District Judge**

Jamaine C. Talford, a Virginia inmate proceeding pro se, filed a Complaint pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983 with jurisdiction vested in 28 U.S.C. §§ 1331 and 1343. Plaintiff names the Bristol City Jail (“Jail”) as the sole defendant and complains about a breach of his private information and the medical care he received at the Jail.

The court must dismiss the Complaint because Plaintiff fails to name a person acting under color of state law as a defendant. See, e.g., West v. Atkins, 487 U.S. 42, 48 (1988). Plaintiff names only the Jail as a defendant, which is not amenable to suit via § 1983. See 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.”), aff’d in part and rev’d in part, 203 F.3d 821 (4th Cir. 2000), reported in full-text format at 2000 U.S. App. LEXIS 465, at \*3, 2000 WL 20591, at \*1 (“The court also properly determined that the Piedmont Regional Jail is not a ‘person’ and is therefore not amenable to suit under § 1983[.]”). Accordingly, Plaintiff presently fails to state a claim upon which relief may be granted, and the court dismisses the Complaint without prejudice, pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915A(b)(1).

The Clerk is directed to send copies of this Memorandum Opinion and the accompanying Order to Plaintiff.

Entered: October 7, 2013

*/s/ Michael F. Urbanski*

Michael F. Urbanski  
United States District Judge