

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF
OHIO, EASTERN DIVISION

Isaac Peterson Bey v. Daniel Starlett, et al.

No. 1:25 CV 2451 (N.D. Ohio 2026) · No. 1:25 CV 2451 · Decided January 9, 2026

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the Northern District of Ohio dismissed Isaac Peterson Bey’s pro se action against a Cuyahoga County Juvenile Court bailiff and Jobs and Family Services officers under 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e). The court concluded that the complaint failed to satisfy Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 8 because it contained no intelligible factual allegations, did not state plausible claims, and did not specify requested relief. The court also prohibited Bey from proceeding in forma pauperis in future actions and certified that an appeal could not be taken in good faith.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the Northern District of Ohio, Eastern Division
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Solomon Oliver, Jr.
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the Northern District of Ohio, Eastern Division
DECIDED	January 9, 2026
DOCKET	1:25 CV 2451
DISPOSITION	dismissed
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	Pro se plaintiff filed a civil action and an application to proceed in forma pauperis. The district court granted the application but dismissed the action under 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e) for failure to satisfy Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 8 and for failure to state a claim.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	The court liberally construes pro se pleadings but must dismiss an in forma pauperis action under 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e) when it fails to state a claim or lacks an arguable basis in law or fact. A complaint must satisfy Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 8 and contain sufficient factual matter to state a plausible claim for relief under Bell Atlantic Corp. v. Twombly and Ashcroft v. Iqbal.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	unpublished district court opinion

PARTIES

Isaac Peterson Bey v. Daniel Starlett, Two Jobs and Family Services officers

TOPICS

pleadings

motions to dismiss

civil procedure

PRACTICE AREAS

civil procedure

civil rights

constitutional law

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether the complaint satisfied the minimum pleading requirements of Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 8 and stated a plausible claim for relief.
2. Whether the action was subject to dismissal under 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e).
3. Whether Bey's repeated filing of frivolous lawsuits justified prohibiting him from proceeding in forma pauperis in future federal actions.

HOLDINGS

1. The complaint failed to satisfy Rule 8 because it did not provide fair notice of the legal claims, the factual grounds supporting them, or the relief sought, and its few allegations were incomprehensible.
2. The action was dismissed under 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e) because the complaint failed to state a claim and lacked an arguable basis in law or fact.
3. Because Bey repeatedly filed frivolous lawsuits, the court prohibited him from proceeding in forma pauperis in future actions in federal court and required payment of the entire filing fee at initiation.

KEY QUOTATIONS

“To meet the minimum notice pleading requirements of Rule 8, the Complaint must give the Defendants fair notice of what the Plaintiff’s legal claims are and the factual grounds upon which they rest.” (at 2)

“He is therefore prohibited from proceeding in forma pauperis in future actions. He must pay the entire filing fee to initiate a new action in this federal Court.” (at 4)

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

The complaint named a Cuyahoga County Juvenile Court bailiff and two Jobs and Family Services officers, but contained no intelligible factual allegations or identified relief. It referenced several constitutional amendments, the ADA, child-support-related matters, passports, and purported international treaties without explaining the factual or legal basis for those claims. The court also considered Bey's history of repeatedly filing frivolous, factually deficient actions in the Northern District of Ohio.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Bey filed an action on behalf of himself and his children against a juvenile court bailiff and two Jobs and Family Services officers. The complaint contained no intelligible factual allegations, did not clearly identify legal claims or requested relief, and relied on an unsupported jurisdictional reference. The court granted in forma pauperis status, dismissed the complaint, certified that an appeal could not be taken in good faith, and prohibited Bey from proceeding in forma pauperis in future federal actions.

DISPOSITION

dismissed

CASES CITED

- Boag v. MacDougall, 454 U.S. 364, 365 (1982) (per curiam)
- Haines v. Kerner, 404 U.S. 519, 520 (1972)
- Neitzke v. Williams, 490 U.S. 319, 324, 327 (1989)
- Lawler v. Marshall, 898 F.2d 1196 (6th Cir. 1990)
- Sistrunk v. City of Strongsville, 99 F.3d 194, 197 (6th Cir. 1996)
- Bell Atl. Corp. v. Twombly, 550 U.S. 544, 555, 564 (2007)
- Ashcroft v. Iqbal, 556 U.S. 662, 677-78 (2009)
- Bibbo v. Dean Witter Reynolds, Inc., 151 F.3d 559, 561 (6th Cir. 1998)
- Denton v. Hernandez, 504 U.S. 25, 32-33 (1992)
- In re McDonald, 489 U.S. 180, 184-85 (1989) (per curiam)
- In re Sindram, 498 U.S. 177, 179-80 (1991)
- Adkins v. E.I. DuPont de Nemours & Co., 335 U.S. 331, 342-43 (1948)
- Wilson v. Yaklich, 148 F.3d 596, 603 (6th Cir. 1998)
- Weaver v. Toombs, 948 F.2d 1004, 1008 (6th Cir. 1991)
- Marshall v. Beshear, No. 3:10CV-663-R, 2010 WL 5092713, at *3 (W.D. Ky. Dec. 7, 2010)
- Levy v. Macy's, Inc., No. 1:13-cv-148, 2014 WL 49188, at *4-5 (S.D. Ohio Jan. 7, 2014)
- Hopson v. Secret Service, No. 3:12CV-770-H, 2013 WL 1092915, at *1-3 (W.D. Ky. Mar. 15, 2013)
- Haddad v. Michigan Nat'l Bank, No. 1:09-cv-1023, 2010 WL 2384535, at *2-3 (W.D. Mich. June 10, 2010)
- Reneer v. Sewell, 975 F.2d 258, 260-61 (6th Cir. 1992)
- Filipas v. Lemons, 835 F.2d 1145, 1146 (6th Cir. 1987)