

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF
VIRGINIA**

Ronnie Keith Brooking v. Central Virginia Regional Jail, et al.

Brooking · No. 7:25-cv-00048 · Decided January 28, 2026

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the Western District of Virginia dismissed Ronnie Keith Brooking’s 42 U.S.C. § 1983 action under 28 U.S.C. § 1915A(b)(1). The court held that the complaint failed to state a claim against the jail and other defendants and dismissed the action after Brooking failed to file an amended complaint addressing previously identified deficiencies.

OPINION

CLERK'S OFFICE U.S. DIST. COURT AT ROANOKE, VA FILED IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT □□□□ FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF VIRGINIA py. (A.B ROANOKE DIVISION OEPUTY CLERK RONNIE KEITH BROOKING,)) Plaintiff,) Case No. 7:25-cv-00048) v.) MEMORANDUM OPINION } CENTRAL VIRGINIA REGIONAL _) By: | Hon. Thomas T. Cullen JAIL, et al,) United States District Judge) Defendants.) Plaintiff Ronnie Keith Brooking, proceeding pro se, filed a ctvil-rights action under 42 U.S.C. § 1983 against Defendants Central Virginia Regional Jail (‘CVRJ’), CVRJ Authority, Administrative Staff of CVRJ, and three individual officers at CVRJ.

(See Compl. [ECF No. 1].) On December 18, 2025, the court advised Plaintiff that a jail is not a “person” subject to suit under § 1983, see *Perdue v. Penalosa*, 38 F.3d 1213, 1213 (4th Cir. 1994), that liability under § 1983 is personal and requires factual detail about each defendant’s personal involvement, and that his complaint failed to state a claim for which relief could be granted.

(See Order, Dec. 18, 2025 [ECF No. 13].) The court ordered Plaintiff to file an amended complaint within 30 days that corrected the deficiencies identified and cautioned Plaintiff that failure to amend could result in dismissal of his complaint. (*Id.* at 3.) More than 30 days have elapsed, and Plaintiff has not filed an amended complaint.

Under 28 U.S.C. § 1915A, the court has an obligation to screen prisoner filings and dismiss any complaint that “fails to state a claim upon which relief may be granted.” 28 U.S.C. § 1915A(b)(1). As noted above, Plaintiff may not pursue a § 1983 claim against a jail because a jail is not a “person” within the meaning of the statute. See *Perdue*, 38 F.3d at 1213.

Additionally, Plaintiff’s complaint fails to state plausible claims against each of the other Defendants because he has not identified what each Defendant did to violate his rights. See

Trulock v. Freeh, 275 F.3d 391, 402 (4th Cir. 2001); Wilcox v. Brown, 877 F.3d 161, 170 (4th Cir. 2017).

Accordingly, Plaintiff has not stated a claim for relief against any Defendant. Because Plaintiff's original complaint fails to state a claim for which relief may be granted and because Plaintiff did not file an amended complaint correcting this deficiency, the court will dismiss this action under 28 U.S.C. § 1915A(b)(1).

The Clerk is directed to forward a copy of this Memorandum Opinion and accompanying Order to Plaintiff. ENTERED this 28th day of January, 2026. /s/ Thomas T. Cullen_____

HON. THOMAS T. CULLEN UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE