

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF
MICHIGAN, SOUTHERN DIVISION

Tracey Vinson v. Dayanara Sanchez

Vinson · No. 2:25-cv-14010 · Decided December 17, 2025

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the Eastern District of Michigan granted Tracey Vinson’s application to proceed in forma pauperis but summarily dismissed her 42 U.S.C. § 1983 complaint against Dayanara Sanchez under 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B). The court held that the complaint lacked sufficient factual allegations to state a plausible claim involving alleged medical malpractice and fraud, and noted that revocation of a medical license was outside the court’s authority.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the Eastern District of Michigan, Southern Division
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Brandy R. McMillion
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the Eastern District of Michigan, Southern Division
DECIDED	December 17, 2025
DOCKET	2:25-cv-14010
DISPOSITION	dismissed
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	Pro se plaintiff filed a civil-rights action under 42 U.S.C. § 1983 and sought leave to proceed in forma pauperis. The district court granted in forma pauperis status but summarily dismissed the complaint under 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B) for failure to state a claim.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	The court reviewed the in forma pauperis complaint under 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B), accepting the allegations for purposes of screening and applying the pleading standards of Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 8 and <i>Bell Atlantic Corp. v. Twombly</i> and <i>Ashcroft v. Iqbal</i> . Because the plaintiff proceeded pro se, the court construed the pleadings liberally but did not supply missing facts or claims.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	unpublished, nonprecedential district-court opinion
PARTIES	Tracey Vinson v. Dayanara Sanchez

TOPICS

section 1983 pleadings civil procedure health law medical licensing

PRACTICE AREAS

civil rights federal civil procedure health law medical licensing

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether the complaint stated a plausible claim for relief under 42 U.S.C. § 1983.
2. Whether the complaint should be summarily dismissed under 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B) for failure to state a claim.
3. Whether the district court could revoke the defendant's Michigan medical license.

HOLDINGS

1. The complaint failed to state a plausible § 1983 claim because it did not allege sufficient facts showing that Sanchez, acting under color of state law, deprived Vinson of a right secured by the Constitution or federal law.
2. The court was required to summarily dismiss the in forma pauperis complaint because it failed to state a claim upon which relief could be granted.
3. The district court could not revoke Sanchez's medical license because that authority is reserved to Michigan's Board of Licensing and Regulatory Affairs.

KEY QUOTATIONS

“The mandated liberal construction . . . means that if a court can reasonably read the pleadings to state a valid claim on which the plaintiff could prevail, it should do so, but a district court may not rewrite a complaint to include claims that were never presented.” (Opinion and Order, screening standard)

“Accordingly, although the Court would GRANT Plaintiff’s request to proceed in forma pauperis (ECF No. 2), the Complaint is SUMMARILY DISMISSED for failure to state a claim upon which relief can be granted.” (Opinion and Order, conclusion)

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Vinson alleged that Sanchez violated Vinson's civil rights by committing medical malpractice and fraud. The complaint did not provide sufficient factual detail to identify what conduct Sanchez undertook, what legal rights were allegedly violated, or why Sanchez was liable under federal law. Vinson sought \$500,000,000 in damages and revocation of Sanchez's medical license.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Vinson filed a complaint alleging that Sanchez committed medical malpractice and fraud in violation of Vinson's civil rights, seeking \$500,000,000 in damages and revocation of Sanchez's medical license. The court granted Vinson's application to proceed without prepaying fees and costs, but dismissed the complaint sua sponte

because it lacked sufficient factual allegations to state a plausible claim and because the court lacked authority to revoke a Michigan medical license.

DISPOSITION

dismissed

CASES CITED

- Brooks v. Holstege, No. 16-12501, 2016 WL 3667961, at *1 (E.D. Mich. July 11, 2016)
- Denton v. Hernandez, 504 U.S. 25, 31 (1992)
- Neitzke v. Williams, 490 U.S. 319, 325, 327 (1989)
- Erickson v. Pardus, 551 U.S. 89, 94 (2007)
- Baccus v. Stirling, 2018 WL 8332581, at *1 (D.S.C. Oct. 15, 2018), report and recommendation adopted, No. 8:18-CV-1880-JFA-JDA, 2019 WL 978866 (D.S.C. Feb. 28, 2019), aff'd, 776 F. App'x 142 (4th Cir. 2019)
- Williams v. Hall, No. 21-5540, 2022 WL 2966395, at *2 (6th Cir. July 27, 2022)
- Perry v. United Parcel Servs., 90 F. App'x 860, 861 (4th Cir. 2004)
- Bell Atl. Corp. v. Twombly, 550 U.S. 544, 555, 570 (2007)
- Ashcroft v. Iqbal, 556 U.S. 662, 678 (2009)
- Flagg Bros., Inc. v. Brooks, 436 U.S. 149, 156 (1978)

OPINION

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT EASTERN DISTRICT OF MICHIGAN SOUTHERN DIVISION TRACEY VINSON, Case No. 2:25-cv-14010 Plaintiff, v. Hon. Brandy R. McMillion DAYANARA SANCHEZ, Defendant. OPINION AND ORDER OF SUMMARY DISMISSAL
This is a pro se civil rights case filed pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983 by Plaintiff Tracey Vinson (“Vinson” or “Plaintiff”) against Defendant Dayanara Sanchez (“Sanchez” or “Defendant”).

See generally ECF No. 1. Plaintiff has also filed an Application to Proceed in District Court Without the Prepayment of Fees or Costs. ECF No. 2. The Court finds Plaintiff to be indigent and therefore GRANTS the request to proceed in forma pauperis.

However, after reviewing the Complaint, the Court SUMMARILY DISMISSES Plaintiff’s claims pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B), finding that Plaintiff has failed to state a claim upon which relief can be granted. * * * Plaintiff has filed an Application to Proceed in District Court Without the Prepayment of Fees and Costs (in forma pauperis). ECF No. 2. Pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915, the Court is required to dismiss an in forma pauperis complaint if it determines that the action is frivolous, malicious, fails to state a claim upon which relief can be granted, or seeks monetary relief from a defendant immune from such relief.

See 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B); *Brooks v. Holstege*, No. 16-12501, 2016 WL 3667961, at *1 (E.D. Mich. July 11, 2016). A complaint is frivolous if it lacks an arguable basis in law or in fact. *Denton v. Hernandez*, 504 U.S. 25, 31 (1992); *Neitzke v. Williams*, 490 U.S. 319, 325 (1989).

The Court may dismiss a claim sua sponte under 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B) if it is based on a meritless legal theory. *Neitzke*, 490 U.S. at 327. Given that Plaintiff is proceeding pro se, the Court must construe her pleadings liberally. *Erickson v. Pardus*, 551 U.S. 89, 94 (2007).

However, even under this less stringent standard, pro se pleadings remain subject to summary dismissal. “The mandated liberal construction... means that if a court can reasonably read the pleadings to state a valid claim on which the plaintiff could prevail, it should do so, but a district court may not rewrite a complaint to include claims that were never presented....” *Baccus v. Stirling*, 2018 WL 8332581, at *1 (D.S.C.

Oct. 15, 2018), report and recommendation adopted, No. 8:18-CV-1880- JFA-JDA, 2019 WL 978866 (D.S.C. Feb. 28, 2019), *aff’d*, 776 F. App’x 142 (4th Cir. 2019)). Nor may the Court “conjure up unpleaded facts to support conclusory allegations.” *Williams v. Hall*, No. 21-5540, 2022 WL 2966395, at *2 (6th Cir. July 27, 2022) (quoting *Perry v. United Parcel Servs.*, 90 F. App’x 860, 861 (6th Cir.

2004)). A complaint doesn’t need detailed factual allegations, but it must include enough facts to suggest a plausible claim for relief. *Bell Atl. Corp. v. Twombly*, 550 U.S. 544, 555 (2007). Put differently, complaints must contain enough factual matter, taken as true, to suggest that the claim is plausible. *Iqbal*, 556 U.S. at 678 (quoting *Twombly*, 550 U.S. at 570).

A claim is plausible when the facts allow a court to reasonably infer that the defendant is responsible for the alleged misconduct. *Iqbal*, 556 U.S. at 678. To establish a federal civil rights claim, a plaintiff must show that they were deprived of a right, privilege, or immunity guaranteed by the federal Constitution or laws by someone acting under the color of state law.

Flagg Bros., Inc. v. Brooks, 436 U.S. 149, 156 (1978). From best the Court can discern, Plaintiff complains that Defendant has violated her civil rights by committing medical malpractice and fraud. See generally ECF No. 1. She seeks damages in the amount of \$500,000,000 and revocation of Defendant’s medical license.

As an initial matter, the Court does not have the ability to revoke Defendant’s medical license as that is a power reserved for the Board of Licensing and Regulatory Affairs with the State of Michigan. Nonetheless, as drafted, the Complaint lacks enough factual detail for the Court to discern what, if any, liability Defendant has and if Plaintiff’s rights have been violated.

Under Rule 8 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, “[a] pleading that states a claim for relief must contain... a short and plain statement of the claim showing that the pleader is entitled to

relief[.]”) Fed. R. Civ. P. 8 (emphasis added). Conclusory allegations that one’s rights have been violated are not enough to state a claim for relief. Even construing Vinson’s pro se Complaint liberally, the Court cannot “conjure up unpleaded facts to support conclusory allegations,” nor can the Court create a claim for relief.

See Williams, 2022 WL 2966395 at *2. Nothing contained in the Complaint is sufficient for the Court to find Vinson has alleged any plausible claim of relief. *Iqbal*, 556 U.S. at 678; *Twombly*, 550 U.S. at 555. The Complaint is lacking “facts” that would support that Sanchez is liable for any violation of law.

Moreover, the Complaint lacks sufficient “facts” for the Court to determine which of Vinson’s rights are alleged to have been violated. Accordingly, although the Court would GRANT Plaintiff’s request to proceed in forma pauperis (ECF No. 2), the Complaint is SUMMARILY DISMISSED for failure to state a claim upon which relief can be granted. 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2) (B).

IT IS SO ORDERED. Dated: December 17, 2025 s/Brandy R. McMillion HON. BRANDY R. MCMILLION U.S. District Judge