

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF
MISSISSIPPI, SOUTHERN DIVISION

Jarvious Brooks v. Katie Shireman, et al.

Brooks v. Shireman, Cause No. 1:24-cv-00221-LG-RPM (S.D. Miss. Mar. 31, 2026) · No. 1:24-cv-00221-LG-RPM · Decided March 31, 2026

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the Southern District of Mississippi dismissed Jarvious Brooks’s federal civil-rights claims against police, appointed defense counsel, a public defender’s office, and a state circuit court. The court held that the claims were barred by Heck v. Humphrey and also identified independent deficiencies, including the lack of state action by defense counsel and the circuit court’s non-person status under 42 U.S.C. § 1983. The court dismissed the federal claims with prejudice and declined supplemental jurisdiction over any state-law claims, dismissing those claims without prejudice.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the Southern District of Mississippi, Southern Division
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Louis Guirola, Jr.
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the Southern District of Mississippi, Southern Division
DECIDED	March 31, 2026
DOCKET	1:24-cv-00221-LG-RPM
DISPOSITION	dismissed
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	Sua sponte screening and dismissal of a pro se prisoner's 42 U.S.C. § 1983 complaint filed in forma pauperis under the Prison Litigation Reform Act.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	Under 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B), the court must dismiss an in forma pauperis action that is frivolous, fails to state a claim, or seeks monetary relief from an immune defendant. The court liberally construed the pleadings and considered whether the allegations had an arguable basis in law or fact and whether Plaintiff had pleaded his best case.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	Unpublished district-court order; persuasive value only.

PARTIES

Jabzous Brooks v. Katie Shireman, Amanda Galle, Jackson County Public Defender's Office, Jackson County Circuit Court, Singing River Hospital Campus Police

TOPICS

section 1983 prisoners rights civil rights post-conviction relief civil procedure

PRACTICE AREAS

civil rights litigation prisoner litigation federal civil procedure criminal procedure
supplemental jurisdiction

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether Brooks's § 1983 claims challenging his arrest, counsel's performance, and the state court's handling of a preliminary hearing were barred by *Heck v. Humphrey* because success would necessarily imply the invalidity of his revocation proceedings, conviction, or sentence.
2. Whether Brooks stated a § 1983 claim against his appointed defense attorneys and the county public defender's office when he did not allege action under color of state law.
3. Whether Brooks could maintain a § 1983 claim against the Jackson County Circuit Court, which is not a person subject to suit under § 1983.
4. Whether the court should exercise supplemental jurisdiction over the remaining state-law claims after dismissing all federal claims.

HOLDINGS

1. All of Brooks's federal claims were barred by *Heck* because a judgment in his favor would necessarily imply the invalidity of his post-release-supervision revocation, subsequent conviction, or resulting sentences, none of which had been invalidated. The claims were therefore dismissed with prejudice as legally frivolous and for failure to state a claim under 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B)(i)-(ii), subject to their possible assertion if the *Heck* conditions are later met.
2. Brooks failed to state a § 1983 claim against his appointed defense attorneys or the Jackson County Public Defender's Office because he alleged no facts showing that they acted under color of state law or conspired with the prosecution; allegations of professional malpractice by defense counsel are insufficient for § 1983 liability.
3. The Jackson County Circuit Court is not a person within the meaning of § 1983 and therefore cannot be held liable under that statute.
4. The court declined to exercise supplemental jurisdiction over any remaining state-law claims after dismissing all claims within its original jurisdiction and dismissed those state-law claims without prejudice.

KEY QUOTATIONS

“Heck requires the district court to consider whether a judgment in favor of the plaintiff would necessarily imply the invalidity of his conviction or sentence; if it would, the complaint must be dismissed unless the plaintiff can demonstrate that the conviction or sentence has already been invalidated.” (at 4)

“To maintain a civil action pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983, Plaintiff must allege that a person acting under color of state law deprived him of a right secured by the Constitution or other law of the United States.” (at 6)

“Since the Court will dismiss every claim over which it had original jurisdiction, it will decline to exercise supplemental jurisdiction over any ancillary state-law claims.” (at 9)

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Brooks was convicted of burglary in Mississippi state court in 2014 and received a ten-year sentence, including post-release supervision. After his April 2024 arrest for possessing a controlled substance, his post-release supervision was revoked and he was ordered to serve the remainder of his original sentence; he later pleaded guilty to the controlled-substance offense and received a consecutive sentence. He alleged that hospital campus police illegally arrested and searched him and failed to give Miranda warnings, that appointed attorneys Shireman and Galle provided ineffective assistance, and that the state circuit court denied him a preliminary hearing. None of the revocation, conviction, or sentences had been reversed, expunged, invalidated, or otherwise called into question.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Brooks filed a § 1983 complaint while incarcerated, alleging an illegal arrest, failure to provide Miranda warnings, ineffective assistance of appointed counsel, denial of a preliminary hearing, and related state-law claims. The court screened the complaint before service under 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B), determined that the federal claims were barred by *Heck v. Humphrey* and independently defective, and declined supplemental jurisdiction over the state-law claims. No defendant had been served, and there had been no discovery or dispositive motions.

DISPOSITION

dismissed

CASES CITED

- *State of Miss. v. Brooks*, No. 30CI1:13-cr-10551-KJ (Jackson County Cir. Court, Aug. 29, 2014)
- *State of Miss. v. Brooks*, No. 30CI1:24-cr-10773-KJ-1 (Jackson County Cir. Ct., Dec. 27, 2024)
- *Ruiz v. Brennan*, 851 F.3d 464, 468 (5th Cir. 2017)
- *Fountain v. Rupert*, 819 F. App'x 215, 218 (5th Cir. 2020)
- *Denton v. Hernandez*, 504 U.S. 25, 32 (1992)
- *Ali v. Higgs*, 892 F.2d 438, 440 (5th Cir. 1990)
- *Brewster v. Dretke*, 587 F.3d 764, 768 (5th Cir. 2009)
- *Eason v. Thaler*, 14 F.3d 8, 9 (5th Cir. 1994)

- Heck v. Humphrey, 512 U.S. 477, 486-87 (1994)
- Jones v. McMillin, No. 3:12-cv-00865-CWR-FKB, 2013 WL 1633336, at *2 (S.D. Miss. Apr. 16, 2013)
- Magee v. Reed, 912 F.3d 820, 822 (5th Cir. 2019)
- Ballard v. Burton, 444 F.3d 391, 396 (5th Cir. 2006)
- Adongo v. Texas, 124 F. App'x 230, 232 (5th Cir. 2005)
- Jackson v. Vannoy, 49 F.3d 175, 177 (5th Cir. 1995)
- Roberts v. Jack, No. 3:14-cv-00826-FKB, 2016 WL 4136490, at *2 (S.D. Miss. Aug. 3, 2016)
- Claiborne v. Pickard, No. 5:14-cv-00028-DCB-MTP, 2014 WL 2207992, at *2 (S.D. Miss. May 28, 2014)
- Curry v. Miss. Dep't of Corr., No. 3:13-cv-00076-DPJ-FKB, 2013 WL 2469630, at *4-5 (S.D. Miss. June 7, 2013)
- Johnson v. McElveen, 101 F.3d 423, 424 (5th Cir. 1996)
- Patrick v. Taylor, No. 5:21-cv-00076-DCB-FKB, 2022 WL 1055432, at *2 (S.D. Miss. Feb. 25, 2022)
- Polk County v. Dodson, 454 U.S. 312, 318 (1981)
- Bell v. McKenzie, No. 2:15-cv-00115-KS-MTP, 2016 WL 335877, at *3 (S.D. Miss. Jan. 27, 2016)
- Searcy v. Trochesset, No. 21-40500, 2022 WL 3096849, at *2 (5th Cir. Aug. 3, 2022)
- Kimble v. Jefferson Parish Sheriff's Office, No. 22-30078, 2023 WL 1793876, at *3 (5th Cir. Feb. 7, 2023)
- Flores v. Matthews & Branscomb, 246 F. App'x 259, 259 (5th Cir. 2007)
- Davis v. City of Vicksburg, Miss., No. 3:13-cv-00886-DCB-MTP, 2015 WL 4251034, at *3 (S.D. Miss. Apr. 27, 2015)
- Sampay v. Terrebonne Parish 32nd Judicial Court, No. CV-22-1173, 2022 WL 2712873, at *3 (E.D. La. June 9, 2022)
- Putnam v. Williams, 652 F.2d 497, 502 (5th Cir. 1981)
- Alphonse v. Arch Bay Holdings, L.L.C., 618 F. App'x 765, 769 (5th Cir. 2015)
- Brookshire Bros. Holding, Inc. v. Dayco Prods., Inc., 554 F.3d 595, 602 (5th Cir. 2009)
- Ellsberry v. Stewart, No. 1:21-cv-00385-BWR, 2023 WL 2386706, at *8 (S.D. Miss. Mar. 6, 2023)
- Bass v. Parkwood Hosp., 180 F.3d 234, 246 (5th Cir. 1999)
- Miranda v. Arizona, 384 U.S. 436, 444 (1966)