

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF CONNECTICUT

CHARLES FURTICK,
Plaintiff,

V.

LEO ARNONE, et al.,
Defendants.

:
:
:
:
:
:
:

PRISONER
CASE NO. 3:12-cv-835 (RNC)

INITIAL REVIEW ORDER

Plaintiff, currently incarcerated, has filed a complaint pro se under 42 U.S.C. § 1983. He names as defendants Commissioner of Correction Leo Arnone, Warden Whidden and Counselor Supervisor B. Griggs. Plaintiff alleges that he was denied due process in connection with his transfer to Northern Correctional Institution following an altercation.

Under 28 U.S.C. § 1915A, the court must review the complaint and dismiss any part of it that is frivolous or malicious, fails to state a claim upon which relief may be granted, or seeks monetary relief from a defendant who is immune from such relief.

Id. The Court must assume the truth of the allegations and interpret them liberally to "raise the strongest arguments [they] suggest[]." Abbas v. Dixon, 480 F.3d 636, 639 (2d Cir. 2007).

Although detailed allegations are not required, the complaint must include sufficient facts to afford the defendants fair notice of the claims and the grounds upon which they are based and to demonstrate a right to relief. Bell Atlantic v. Twombly, 550 U.S. 544, 555-56 (2007). Conclusory allegations are not

plaintiff shall file his amended complaint within **twenty (20)**
days from the date of this order. Failure to file an amended
complaint may result in the dismissal of this action without
further notice from the Court.

So ordered this 15th day of August 2012.

_____/s/_____
Robert N. Chatigny
United States District Judge