

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE DISTRICT OF DELAWARE

DARRY O. BARNES,

Plaintiff,

v.

DONALD L. SHORT,

Defendant.

:  
:  
:  
:  
:  
:  
:  
:  
:  
:

Civ. No. 12-629-RGA

---

Darry O. Barnes, Sussex Correctional Institution, Georgetown, Delaware. Pro Se Plaintiff.

**MEMORANDUM OPINION**

July 25, 2012  
Wilmington, Delaware

  
ANDREWS, U.S. District Judge:

Plaintiff Darry O. Barnes ("Plaintiff"), an inmate at the Sussex Correctional Institution, George, Delaware, filed this action pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983. He appears *pro se* and has been granted leave to proceed *in forma pauperis*. (D.I. 5.) He also requests counsel. (D.I. 7) The Court proceeds to review and screen the Complaint pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B) and § 1915A(b).

It appears that Plaintiff was employed by Defendant. Defendant is the owner, operator of Atwork Personnel Service located in Seaford, Delaware. From June through September 2011, Defendant withheld monies from Plaintiff's pay that Plaintiff owed for child support. Defendant, however, did not forward the funds to the Division of Child Support. Defendant was ordered to court to explain the situation, but he failed to appear. Consequently, Plaintiff was "locked-up," lost his place to stay, and paid the child support owed "out-of-pocket." Plaintiff seeks restitution and compensation for his pain and suffering. (D.I. 3.)

This Court must dismiss, at the earliest practicable time, certain *in forma pauperis* actions that are frivolous, malicious, fail to state a claim, or seek monetary relief from a defendant who is immune from such relief. See 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2) (*in forma pauperis* actions); 28 U.S.C. § 1915A (actions in which prisoner seeks redress from governmental defendant). The Court must accept all factual allegations in a complaint as true and take them in the light most favorable to a *pro se* plaintiff. See *Phillips v. County of Allegheny*, 515 F.3d 224, 229 (3d Cir. 2008). An action is frivolous if it "lacks an arguable basis either in law or in fact." *Neitzke v. Williams*, 490 U.S. 319, 325 (1989). Under 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B)(i) and § 1915A(b)(1), a court may dismiss

a complaint as frivolous if it is “based on an indisputably meritless legal theory” or a “clearly baseless” or “fantastic or delusional” factual scenario. *Neitzke*, 490 U.S. at 327-28.

The legal standard for dismissing a complaint for failure to state a claim pursuant to § 1915(e)(2)(B)(ii) and § 1915A(b)(1) is identical to the legal standard used when ruling on Rule 12(b)(6) motions. See *Tourscher v. McCullough*, 184 F.3d 236, 240 (3d Cir. 1999). However, before dismissing a complaint or claims for failure to state a claim upon which relief may be granted pursuant to the screening provisions of 28 U.S.C. §§ 1915 and 1915A, the Court must grant Plaintiff leave to amend his complaint, unless amendment would be inequitable or futile. See *Grayson v. Mayview State Hosp.*, 293 F.3d 103, 114 (3d Cir. 2002).

A well-pleaded complaint must contain more than mere labels and conclusions. See *Ashcroft v. Iqbal*, 556 U.S. 662 (2009); *Bell Atlantic Corp. v. Twombly*, 550 U.S. 544 (2007). The assumption of truth is inapplicable to legal conclusions or to “[t]hreadbare recitals of the elements of a cause of action supported by mere conclusory statements.” *Iqbal*, 556 U.S. at 678. When determining whether dismissal is appropriate, the court conducts a two-part analysis. *Fowler v. UPMC Shadyside*, 578 F.3d 203, 210 (3d Cir. 2009). First, the factual and legal elements of a claim are separated. *Id.* The Court must accept all of the complaint's well-pleaded facts as true, but may disregard any legal conclusions. *Id.* at 210-11.

Second, the Court must determine whether the facts alleged in the complaint are sufficient to show that the plaintiff has a “plausible claim for relief.” *Fowler*, 578 F.3d at

211. In other words, the complaint must do more than allege the plaintiff's entitlement to relief; rather, it must "show" such an entitlement with its facts. *Id.* A claim is facially plausible when its factual content allows the Court to draw a reasonable inference that the defendant is liable for the misconduct alleged. *See Iqbal*, 556 U.S. at 678. The plausibility standard "asks for more than a sheer possibility that a defendant has acted unlawfully." *Id.* "Where a complaint pleads facts that are 'merely consistent with' a defendant's liability, it 'stops short of the line between possibility and plausibility of 'entitlement to relief.'" *Id.* (quoting *Twombly*, 550 U.S. at 570).

Because Plaintiff proceeds *pro se*, his pleading is liberally construed and his Complaint, "however inartfully pleaded, must be held to less stringent standards than formal pleadings drafted by lawyers." *Erickson v. Pardus*, 551 U.S. 89, 94 (2007) (internal quotation marks omitted).

When bringing a § 1983 claim, a plaintiff must allege that some person has deprived him of a federal right, and that the person who caused the deprivation acted under color of state law. *West v. Atkins*, 487 U.S. 42, 48 (1988). To act under "color of state law" a defendant must be "clothed with the authority of state law." *Id.* at 49. Defendant is a private individual who owns the company that employed Plaintiff. It is evident from the pleadings that Defendant is not "clothed with the authority of state law." *See Reichley v. Pennsylvania Dep't of Agric.*, 427 F.3d 236, 244-45 (3d Cir. 2005); *Biener v. Calio*, 361 F.3d 206, 216-17 (3d Cir. 2004). Therefore, the claim against Defendant fails as a matter of law.

The Complaint contains allegations that have no arguable basis in law or in fact and it will be dismissed as frivolous pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B) and § 1915(A)(b)(1). Amendment of the federal claims is futile. The District Court declines to exercise supplemental jurisdiction to the extent Plaintiff attempts to raise a state law claim. See 28 U.S.C. § 1367(c)(3). The court will deny as moot the request for counsel. (D.I. 7)

An appropriate order will be entered.

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE DISTRICT OF DELAWARE

DARRY O. BARNES,

Plaintiff,

v.

DONALD L. SHORT,

Defendant.

Civ. No. 12-629-RGA


---

**ORDER**

At Wilmington this 25<sup>th</sup> day of July, 2012, consistent with the Memorandum

Opinion issued this date, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that:

1. Plaintiff's Request for Counsel is DENIED as moot. (D.I. 7)
2. The Complaint is DISMISSED as frivolous pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B)(i) and § 1915A(b)(2). Amendment of federal claims is futile.
3. The Court DECLINES to exercise supplemental jurisdiction.
4. The Clerk of Court is directed to CLOSE the case.

  
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE