FILED

DEC 1 0 2012

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Clerk, U.S. District & Bankrupt Courts for the District of Colum

)		
)		
)	Civil Action No.	12 1975
)		
)		
)))))))))) () () () () () () () () () () () (

MEMORANDUM OPINION

This matter is before the Court on plaintiff's *pro se* complaint and application to proceed *in forma pauperis*. The Court will grant plaintiff's application and dismiss the complaint for lack of subject matter jurisdiction.

The subject matter jurisdiction of the federal district courts is limited and is set forth generally at 28 U.S.C. §§ 1331 and 1332. Under those statutes, federal jurisdiction is available only when a "federal question" is presented or the parties are of diverse citizenship and the amount in controversy exceeds \$75,000. A party seeking relief in the district court must at least plead facts that bring the suit within the court's jurisdiction. *See* Fed. R. Civ. P. 8(a). Failure to plead such facts warrants dismissal of the action. *See* Fed. R. Civ. P. 12(h)(3).

Plaintiff is a resident of District Heights, Maryland, suing a resident of the District of Columbia for allegedly interfering with her employment. Although plaintiff points to a right to sue letter issued by the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission ("EEOC"), she acknowledges that the named defendant "is a Third Party and not the Employer." Compl. at 1 (parenthesis omitted). Hence, the complaint does not present a federal question, namely, a claim

y ia

of employment discrimination under Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, 42 U.S.C. § 2000e *et seq.*. Furthermore, plaintiff has not pleaded an amount in controversy to bring this case within the Court's diversity jurisdiction. Hence, this case will be dismissed. A separate Order accompanies this Memorandum Opinion.

United States District Judge

DATE: November <u>کگ</u>, 2012