

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF MAINE

Wade-Scott Campbell v. Acadia Hospital et al.

Campbell · No. 1:26-cv-00262-JAW · Decided May 21, 2026

SUMMARY

A United States magistrate judge recommends dismissing Wade-Scott Campbell’s in forma pauperis complaint under 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B). The recommendation concludes that the complaint’s sole factual allegation is insufficient to state a plausible claim for relief and provides notice of the procedure for filing objections.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the District of Maine
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Karen Frink Wolf
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the District of Maine
DECIDED	May 21, 2026
DOCKET	1:26-cv-00262-JAW
DISPOSITION	other
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	After granting Campbell leave to proceed in forma pauperis, the magistrate judge conducted preliminary review of his complaint under 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B) and issued a recommended decision that the complaint be dismissed for failure to state a plausible claim.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	On preliminary review under 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B), the court accepts well-pleaded facts as true, draws reasonable inferences in the plaintiff's favor, liberally construes a pro se complaint, and determines whether the complaint states a plausible claim for relief.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	nonprecedential
PARTIES	Wade-Scott Campbell v. Acadia Hospital et al.

TOPICS

- motions to dismiss
- pleadings
- civil procedure

PRACTICE AREAS

- civil procedure
- civil rights

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether Campbell's complaint alleged sufficient facts to state a plausible claim for relief under the pleading standard.
2. Whether the complaint should be dismissed during preliminary in forma pauperis review under 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B).

HOLDINGS

1. A complaint that alleges no facts, and therefore does not provide the crucial details necessary to identify the defendants' conduct or the grounds for relief, fails to state a plausible claim and must be dismissed.
2. When a party proceeds in forma pauperis, the court must dismiss an action at any time if it is frivolous or malicious, fails to state a claim, or seeks monetary relief from an immune defendant.

KEY QUOTATIONS

“When a party proceeds in forma pauperis, however, a court must “dismiss the case at any time if” it determines that the action “is frivolous or malicious[,] . . . fails to state a claim on which relief may be granted,” or “seeks monetary relief against a defendant who is immune from such relief.””

“A complaint fails to state a claim when it does not plead “enough facts to state a claim to relief that is plausible on its face.””

“Because Campbell’s complaint does not allege any facts, let alone ones that plausibly state a claim for relief, I recommend that the Court DISMISS the complaint pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B).”

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Campbell alleged only that, after moving to Bangor in 1995, his life timeline had been affected in ways that could not be reversed. The complaint contained no additional factual allegations identifying what the defendants did, when or where they acted, or how their conduct violated a legal right.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Campbell filed a civil rights complaint and an application to proceed in forma pauperis. After the application was granted, the complaint was referred for preliminary review under the in forma pauperis statute. The magistrate judge recommended dismissal, subject to the parties' right to object and obtain de novo review by the district court.

DISPOSITION

other

CASES CITED

- Neitzke v. Williams, 490 U.S. 319, 324 (1989)
- Ocasio-Hernández v. Fortuño-Burset, 640 F.3d 1, 12 (1st Cir. 2011)

- Bell Atl. Corp. v. Twombly, 550 U.S. 544, 570 (2007)
- Donovan v. Maine, 276 F.3d 87, 94 (1st Cir. 2002)
- Byrne v. Maryland, No. 1:20-cv-00036-GZS, 2020 WL 1317731, at *5 (D. Me. Mar. 20, 2020) (rec. dec.), aff'd, 2020 WL 2202441 (D. Me. May 6, 2020)
- Ashcroft v. Iqbal, 556 U.S. 662, 678-680 (2009)

Retrieved from lawtools.ai · <https://lawtools.ai/cases/federal/united-states-district-court-for-the-district-of-maine/2026/wade-scott-campbell-v-acadia-hospital-et-al-46mull80>