

**IN THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FIFTH CIRCUIT**

United States Court of Appeals
Fifth Circuit

FILED

March 15, 2019

Lyle W. Cayce
Clerk

No. 18-31073
Summary Calendar

SHANTA G. PHILLIPS-BERRY,

Plaintiff - Appellant

v.

DONALD J. TRUMP, PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES;
DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE OF THE STATE OF LOUISIANA, Litigation
Division; UNITED STATES MILITARY; FACEBOOK; UBER; LYFT, L.L.C.;
ENTERPRISE LEASING COMPANY; ENTERGY OF LOUISIANA;
LOUISIANA DISCIPLINARY BOARD OFFICE OF DISCIPLINARY
COUNSEL; HOLLYWOOD PRODUCTIONS; DEPARTMENT OF
TRANSPORTATION; HEALTH AND HOSPITALS DEPARTMENT OF
LOUISIANA; OFFICE OF MOTOR VEHICLE LOUISIANA; SOCIAL
SECURITY OFFICE LOUISIANA; DEPARTMENT OF FAMILY SERVICES
LOUISIANA; HOUSING AUTHORITY LOUISIANA; DEPARTMENT OF
TRANSPORTATION DEPARTMENT; DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE OF
LOUISIANA; DEPARTMENT OF ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY, STATE
OF LOUISIANA; COMMUNICATION SERVICE OF LOUISIANA;
ENTERGY LOUISIANA, L.L.C.,

Defendants - Appellees

Appeal from the United States District Court
for the Eastern District of Louisiana
USDC No. 2:18-CV-7890

No. 18-31073

Before KING, SOUTHWICK, and ENGELHARDT, Circuit Judges.

PER CURIAM:*

Plaintiff-appellant Shanta Phillips-Berry appeals the district court’s dismissal of her claims against the defendants. Because the plaintiff’s complaint is frivolous, we AFFIRM.

The plaintiff filed four complaints in the district court, alleging claims against a range of parties, including the President of the United States, rideshare companies, a social media company, and an electricity utility, among others. The plaintiff’s primary claim centers on an alleged conspiracy among the myriad defendants to commit crimes against the defendant and the United States of America, which included an allegation that the defendants conspired to implant a device into her body that causes her pain and controls her mind.

The district court found the complaint and subsequent motions to be “incoherent and wholly lacking any legal basis.” The district court barred the plaintiff from filing future complaints or motions concerning her criminal conspiracy claims. The plaintiff appealed. Liberally construing her appeal, she argues that the district court abused its discretion when it dismissed her claims. *See Grant v. Cuellar*, 59 F.3d 523, 524 (5th Cir. 1995).

An *in forma pauperis* claim may properly be dismissed “whose factual contentions are clearly baseless,” including “claims describing fantastic or delusional scenarios.” *Denton v. Hernandez*, 504 U.S. 25, 32 (1992) (quoting *Neitzke v. Williams*, 490 U.S. 319, 327-28 (1989)); *see also* 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B)(i). We find no error in the district court’s decision to dismiss

* Pursuant to 5TH CIR. R. 47.5, the court has determined that this opinion should not be published and is not precedent except under the limited circumstances set forth in 5TH CIR. R. 47.5.4.

No. 18-31073

the plaintiff's claims, which we review for abuse of discretion. *Denton*, 504 U.S. at 33. AFFIRMED.