

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF
KENTUCKY

Ronnie Clark v. Jeremy Ball et al.

No. 3:25CV-P482-JHM, United States District Court for the Western District of Kentucky (December 2, 2025)

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the Western District of Kentucky dismissed Ronnie Clark’s pro se 42 U.S.C. § 1983 action against employees of the Kentucky State Reformatory. Applying 28 U.S.C. § 1915A and Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 12(b)(1), the court concluded that the allegations concerning electromagnetic systems and related abuse were frivolous, delusional, and insufficient to establish a cognizable claim or subject-matter jurisdiction.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the Western District of Kentucky
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Joseph H. McKinley, Jr.
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the Western District of Kentucky
DECIDED	December 2, 2025
DOCKET	3:25CV-P482-JHM
DISPOSITION	dismissed
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	Initial review of a pro se prisoner civil-rights complaint under 28 U.S.C. § 1915A.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	On screening under 28 U.S.C. § 1915A, the court dismisses a prisoner complaint that is frivolous, malicious, fails to state a claim, or seeks monetary relief from an immune defendant. A claim is frivolous when it lacks an arguable basis in law or fact; factual allegations that are fantastic, delusional, irrational, or wholly incredible need not be accepted as true. The court may also sua sponte dismiss under Rule 12(b)(1) when allegations are totally implausible, attenuated, unsubstantial, frivolous, or devoid of merit.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	unpublished district court memorandum opinion

TOPICS

- section 1983
- prisoners rights
- motions to dismiss
- subject matter jurisdiction
- civil procedure

PRACTICE AREAS

prisoner civil rights

federal civil procedure

subject-matter jurisdiction

frivolous litigation

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether the complaint should be dismissed as frivolous under 28 U.S.C. § 1915A because its factual allegations were delusional, fantastic, or wholly incredible.
2. Whether the complaint should be dismissed sua sponte for lack of subject-matter jurisdiction under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 12(b)(1) because its allegations were totally implausible and unsubstantial.

HOLDINGS

1. The complaint was frivolous because its allegations concerning governmental use of electrical, electromagnetic, neurological, and crystal-based technology to abuse and manipulate the plaintiff were clearly baseless and lacked an arguable factual basis.
2. The complaint also warranted sua sponte dismissal under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 12(b)(1) because its allegations were totally implausible, attenuated, unsubstantial, frivolous, and devoid of merit.

KEY QUOTATIONS

“A claim is legally frivolous when it lacks an arguable basis either in law or in fact.” (Analysis)

“The Court concludes that the complaint meets the standard for dismissal under Fed. R. Civ. P. 12(b)(1), as well.” (Analysis)

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Clark, a convicted inmate at Kentucky State Reformatory, sued numerous prison employees and other alleged participants under § 1983. His complaint alleged that prison electrical, lighting, camera, and security systems had been converted into a technological system using piezoelectricity, electromagnetic radiation, neurological transmitters, and crystal devices to abuse, monitor, communicate with, and sexually manipulate inmates. He also alleged that the system caused burns to his penis and that officials denied him medical attention, and he asserted violations of the First, Fourth, and Eighth Amendments.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Ronnie Clark filed a 42 U.S.C. § 1983 action against employees of Kentucky State Reformatory, seeking compensatory and punitive damages and injunctive relief. The district court conducted the required screening review under 28 U.S.C. § 1915A and concluded that the allegations were frivolous and that the complaint also warranted dismissal for lack of subject-matter jurisdiction under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 12(b)(1). The court stated that the action would be dismissed by separate order.

DISPOSITION

dismissed

CASES CITED

- McGore v. Wigglesworth, 114 F.3d 601, 604 (6th Cir. 1997)
- Jones v. Bock, 549 U.S. 199 (2007)
- Neitzke v. Williams, 490 U.S. 319, 325, 327-28 (1989)
- Denton v. Hernandez, 504 U.S. 25, 33 (1992)
- Lawler v. Marshall, 898 F.2d 1196, 1199 (6th Cir. 1990)
- Hill v. Lappin, 630 F.3d 468, 471 (6th Cir. 2010)
- Dunn v. Kemp, No. 5:24-cv-473-MTT, 2025 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 87795, at *4, *6 (M.D. Ga. May 8, 2025)
- Hecker v. Central Intelligence Agency, No. 21-CV-2701, 2022 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 11079, at *5 (E.D. Pa. Jan. 20, 2022)
- Tedder v. Lafayette Police Department, No. 4:21-CV-51-TLS-JPK, 2021 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 173147, at *3 (N.D. Ind. Sept. 10, 2021)
- Hernandez v. Doe, No. 5:19CV00136-KGB-JTR, 2019 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 184191, at *2 (E.D. Ark. June 20, 2019)
- Hernandez v. Doe, 2019 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 183543 (E.D. Ark. Oct. 22, 2019)
- Apple v. Glenn, 183 F.3d 477, 479 (6th Cir. 1999)
- Selvy v. Department of Housing & Urban Development, 371 F. Supp. 2d 905, 908 (E.D. Mich. May 31, 2005)
- Tennessee ex rel. David Francis Fair v. Commissioner, No. 3:04-cv-494, 2004 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 26677 (E.D. Tenn. Nov. 4, 2004)
- Terry v. United States, No. ED CV 14-1881-VBF(E), 2014 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 145530, at *5 (C.D. Cal. Sept. 16, 2014)
- Terry v. United States, 2014 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 145536 (C.D. Cal. Oct. 10, 2014)