

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Jason Earl Jones,

Plaintiff,

v.

United States of America *et al.*,

Defendants.

:
:
:
:
:
:
:
:
:
:
:
:

Civil Action No. 09-849 (UNA)

FILED

JUN 26 2009

CLERK, U.S. DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

MEMORANDUM OPINION

Before the court is the plaintiff's application to proceed in forma pauperis and a first amended pro se complaint. The application will be granted and the first amended complaint, allowed as of right, dismissed as frivolous.

This case was provisionally opened while awaiting submission of the certified trust fund account statement from the plaintiff, a prisoner. The trust fund account has been submitted and the court finds the plaintiff eligible to proceed in forma pauperis.

The lengthy first amended complaint, allowed as of right, identifies two plaintiffs: the Jason Earl Jones Trust and Jason Earl Jones, the former being a "self governing dominion under trusteeship" that "maintains a maritime lien over the natural body of the sovereign/defendant Jason Earl Jones." Compl. at 1 (punctuation omitted). Relying on a theory "pursuant to the domestic common law of California holding that any judgment entered against a non-consenting sovereign is VOID," the complaint asserts that the individual plaintiff is a sovereign who has not consented to his incarceration or to the seizure of his property. *Id.* at 3 (emphasis in the original). As relief, among other things, the complaint seeks a "preliminary injunction" deeming that "any

(N)

interest in the sovereign's natural body" to be a "proceed of racketeering activity and thus forfeited." *Id.* at 27. The complaint also, inconsistently, asserts that it is not a challenge to the plaintiff's criminal conviction. *Id.* at 3.

Because our system of law does not consider individual persons to be sovereigns shielded from suit except by consent, and this complaint states no discernible claim upon which relief may be granted, it will be dismissed pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915A(b)(1). A separate order accompanies this memorandum opinion.

Date:

6/25/09


United States District Judge