

Appendix E,

**UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE EIGHTH CIRCUIT**

No: 20-2169

Edward Jones

Plaintiff - Appellant

v.

William Aaron Traylor, Traylor farm; Clarence Jones; Jesse B. Daggett, PLLC; Michael Traylor;
Wayne Traylor

Defendants - Appellees

Appeal from U.S. District Court for the Eastern District of Arkansas - Delta
(2:20-cv-00116-JM)

JUDGMENT

Before LOKEN, GRUENDER, and GRASZ, Circuit Judges.

This court has reviewed the original file of the United States District Court. It is ordered by the court that the judgment of the district court is summarily affirmed. See Eighth Circuit Rule 47A(a).

September 21, 2020

Order Entered at the Direction of the Court:
Clerk, U.S. Court of Appeals, Eighth Circuit.

/s/ Michael E. Gans

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
EASTERN DISTRICT OF ARKANSAS
DELTA DIVISION

EDWARD JONES

PLAINTIFF

V.

2:20CV00116 JM

WILLIAM AARON TRAYLOR;
CLARENCE JONES; JESSE B
DAGGETT; WAYNE TRAYLOR;
and MICHEAL TRAYLOR

DEFENDANTS

ORDER

Plaintiff Edward Jones's motion to proceed *in forma pauperis* (Doc. No. 1) is granted. *See Martin-Trigona v. Stewart*, 691 F.2d 856, 857 (8th Cir. 1982) (*per curiam*) (complaint can be filed if plaintiff qualifies by economic status under 28 U.S.C. § 1915(a)).


The Court must screen his complaint. 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2). Plaintiff's claims echo those made in a case dismissed last month. *Jones v. Traylor*, No. 2:20-cv-86-BSM, Doc. 2, 3, & 4. The case was dismissed under § 1915(e)(2)(B), because it "describ[ed] fantastic or delusional scenarios," and had no rational basis in the law. *Id.* (citing *Neitzke v. Williams*, 490 U.S. 319, 327–28 (1989)). Plaintiff has refiled the claims attempting to better state his position.

As he did previously, Plaintiff explains that he sued the Traylor and Clarence Jones in Lee County Circuit Court in 2017. (Doc. No. 2 at 2). Previously, Plaintiff claimed that Daggett, an attorney who represented the Defendants, allowed an imposter to impersonate Clarence Jones in a pretrial-state hearing. *Jones v. Traylor*, No. 2:20-cv-86-BSM (Doc. 2 at 2). Mr. Jones again claims that the Clarence Jones who appeared at the hearing was an imposter, and he asks this Court to compel the production a video of the August 29, 2017 hearing to prove the Defendants intentionally mislead the state circuit court. (Doc. 2 at 3).

“A *pro se* plaintiff must set forth enough factual allegations to ‘nudge [] their claims across the line from conceivable to plausible,’ or ‘their complaint must be dismissed’ for failing to state a claim upon which relief can be granted.” *Bell Atlantic Corp. v. Twombly*, 550 U.S. 544, 569-70 (2007); *see also Aschcroft v. Iqbal*, 556 U.S. 662, 678 (2009) (“A claim has facial plausibility when the plaintiff pleads factual content that allows the court to draw the reasonable inference that the defendant is liable for the misconduct alleged.”). Regardless of whether a plaintiff is represented or is appearing *pro se*, the plaintiff’s complaint must allege specific facts sufficient to state a claim. *See Martin v. Sargent*, 780 F.2d 1334, 1337 (8th Cir. 1985) After reviewing Plaintiff’s *pro se* complaint, the Court finds that the complaint should be, and hereby is dismissed *sua sponte*. Nothing in the complaint resembles a cause of action.

As stated, the Court grants Plaintiff’s motion to proceed IFP. (Doc. No. 1). The Court further finds that Plaintiff’s complaint fails to state a claim for relief and, therefore, the complaint (Doc. No. 2) is dismissed without prejudice. The Clerk is directed to close the case.

IT IS SO ORDERED this 4th day of June, 2020.


UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE EIGHTH CIRCUIT

No: 20-2169

Edward Jones

Appellant

v.

William Aaron Traylor, Traylor farm, et al.

Appellees

Appeal from U.S. District Court for the Eastern District of Arkansas - Delta
(2:20-cv-00116-JM)

ORDER

If the original file of the United States District Court is available for review in electronic format, the court will rely on the electronic version of the record in its review. The appendices required by Eighth Circuit Rule 30A shall not be required. In accordance with Eighth Circuit Local Rule 30A(a)(2), the Clerk of the United States District Court is requested to forward to this Court forthwith any portions of the original record which are not available in an electronic format through PACER, including any documents maintained in paper format or filed under seal, exhibits, CDs, videos, administrative records and state court files. These documents should be submitted within 10 days.

June 11, 2020

Order Entered Under Rule 27A(a):
Clerk, U.S. Court of Appeals, Eighth Circuit.

/s/ Michael E. Gans

**Additional material
from this filing is
available in the
Clerk's Office.**