

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF CONNECTICUT**

STANTON T. JOLLEY,
Plaintiff,

v.

**THE SECOND JUDICIAL CIRCUIT OF
THE UNITED STATES,**
Defendants.

:
:
:
:
:
:
:
:
:
:

No. 3:03CV1794 (DJS)

MEMORANDUM OF DECISION

_____The plaintiff, Stanton T. Jolley, brings the present action against the Second Judicial Circuit of the United States seeking unspecified relief from unspecified constitutional violations. The plaintiff met the requirements of 28 U.S.C. §1915(a) and was granted leave to proceed in forma pauperis. Pending before the court is the plaintiff’s motion to compel discovery [**doc. #6**]. The motion is **DENIED** and the complaint is **DISMISSED** for the following reasons.

This court has authority pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §1915(e) to screen complaints brought in forma pauperis to ensure that the claims meet certain minimal legal requirements. The court may dismiss such cases at any time if the action is: a) frivolous or malicious; b) fails to state a claim on which relief can be granted; or c) seeks monetary relief against a defendant who is immune from such relief. 28 U.S.C. §1915(e)(2)(B)(i)-(iii). The court will proceed cautiously under §1915(e), because a claim that the court perceives as likely unsuccessful is not necessarily frivolous. Neitzke v. Williams, 490 U.S. 319, 329 (1989). Pro se complaints are liberally construed. Haines v. Kerner, 404 U.S. 519, 520 (1972). “When an in forma pauperis plaintiff raises a cognizable claim, his complaint may not be dismissed sua sponte for frivolousness under section 1915(e)(2)(B)(I) even if the complaint fails to ‘flesh out all the required details.’”

