

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF CONNECTICUT**

STANTON T. JOLLEY,
Plaintiff,

v.

UNITED STATES ATTORNEY,
Defendant.

CIVIL ACTION NO.
3:04cv2151 (SRU)

RULING

Stanton T. Jolley sued the District of Connecticut United States Attorney’s Office for violating his civil rights “by the denial of the filing of three criminal lawsuits on behalf of the Plaintiff.” Jolley brings his suit *pro se* and *in forma pauperis*. He seeks nine hundred trillion dollars in damages.

Section 1915(e) of Title 28 of the United State Code mandates that “the court shall dismiss the case at any time if the court determines that . . . (B) the action or appeal – (i) is frivolous or malicious; (ii) fails to state a claim on which relief may be granted; or (iii) seeks monetary relief against a defendant who is immune from such relief.” 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2). Jolley’s complaint, even construed liberally, fails to set forth any facts indicating a violation of Jolley’s civil rights and, in any event, is barred by the doctrine of prosecutorial immunity. *See Schloss v. Bouse*, 876 F.2d 287, 289 (2d Cir. 1989) (“Among the acts for which a prosecutor is absolutely immune is initiation of a prosecution.”). Consequently, the lawsuit is frivolous, fails to state a claim, and is against a defendant who is immune from the requested relief.

The complaint (doc. # 6) is dismissed. It is certified that any appeal *in forma pauperis* from the dismissal would not be taken in good faith. 28 U.S.C. § 1915(a)(3).

The clerk shall close the file.

It is so ordered.

Dated at Bridgeport, Connecticut, this 22nd day of April 2005.

/s/ Stefan R. Underhill

Stefan R. Underhill
United States District Judge