Jackson v. Does Doc. 3

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

WARREN JACKSON PLAINTIFF

v. 4:19-cv-00696-BRW

DOES, et al. DEFENDANTS

ORDER

Plaintiff is suing "family/police, all of them" because they get government checks and don't want to see [him] do better"; have prevented him from getting his CDL; and have taken things out of his car. Plaintiff also asserts: "I believe in God and go to church."

A district court has the authority to dismiss a case *sua sponte* for failure to state a claim.³ Because Plaintiff's Complaint is nonsensical and states no cause of action against Defendants for which relief may be granted, this case is DISMISSED. The motion to proceed *in forma pauperis* (Doc. No. 1) is DENIED.

IT IS SO ORDERED this 7th day of October, 2019.

Billy Roy Wilson
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

¹Doc. No. 2.

 $^{^{2}}Id$.

³See *Smith v. Boyd*, 945 F.2d 1041 (8th Cir. 1991).