

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF DELAWARE

Jerome Collins v. CPL Clancy, et al.

C.A. No. 25-588 (JLH) · No. C.A. No. 25-588 (JLH) · Decided December 10, 2025

OPINION

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF DELAWARE
JEROME COLLINS,)) Plaintiff,)) v.) C.A. No. 25-588 (JLH)) CPL CLANCY, et al.,))
Defendants.) MEMORANDUM ORDER I. Introduction Plaintiff Jerome Collins, who is in pre-trial detention at the Sussex Correctional Institution (SCI) in Georgetown, Delaware, initiated this civil action pro se and was granted leave to proceed in forma pauperis.

(D.I. 1, 5.) The Court reviews and screens the complaint (D.I. 3) under 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(b). II. Background The complaint asserts claims under 42 U.S.C. § 1983. Plaintiff is in state pre-trial detention. (D.I. 3 at 1, 8, 10.) According to the complaint, a police officer involved in Plaintiff's arrest lied in a police report about the presence of a firearm near Plaintiff's shoe, and a Delaware Deputy Attorney General "allowed the case to go in front of a grand jury for indictment knowing that [the officer] falsified his report." (Id. at 5–7.)

In his complaint, Plaintiff requests monetary relief and that his "criminal charges [be] drop[ped]." (Id. at 8.) III. Legal Standard The Court shall dismiss a pro se complaint filed by an incarcerated plaintiff, or any plaintiff proceeding in forma pauperis, sua sponte upon a preliminary screening if the complaint is frivolous, malicious, fails to state a claim upon which relief may be granted, or seeks monetary relief from a defendant who is immune from such relief.

See 28 U.S.C. §§ 1915(e)(2)(B), 1915A(b). IV. Discussion There is "a strong federal policy against federal-court interference with pending state judicial proceedings absent extraordinary circumstances," *Middlesex Cnty. Ethics Comm. v. Garden State Bar Ass'n*, 457 U.S. 423, 431 (1982), referred to as the Younger abstention doctrine, see *Younger v. Harris*, 401 U.S. 37 (1971).

Younger abstention is appropriate when "(1) there are ongoing state proceedings that are judicial in nature; (2) the state proceedings implicate important state interests; and (3) the state proceedings afford an adequate opportunity to raise federal claims." *Schall v. Joyce*, 885 F.2d 101, 106 (3d Cir. 1989).

In this case, Plaintiff is awaiting trial on Delaware criminal charges. Plaintiff's request for an injunction to stop his state prosecution would plainly interfere with the state criminal proceeding. And Plaintiff can raise his concerns regarding the evidence against him and the legality of his prosecution in the state criminal proceeding.

V. Conclusion Based on the above, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that the Complaint (D.I. 3) is DISMISSED without prejudice under the Younger doctrine. IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that Plaintiff's motion to obtain body camera footage (D.I. 8) is DENIED as moot. IT IS FINALLY ORDERED that the Clerk of Court is directed to CLOSE this case. United St istrict Judge

Retrieved from lawtools.ai · <https://lawtools.ai/cases/federal/united-states-district-court-for-the-district-of-delaware/2025/jerome-collins-v-cpl-clancy-et-al-5818q8g7>