

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

In re: Tyrone Julius,

Plaintiff.


)
)
)
)
)

Civil Action No. **11 2293**

MEMORANDUM OPINION

This matter is before the Court on its initial review of plaintiff's *pro se* complaint and application for leave to proceed *in forma pauperis*. Pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e), the Court is required to dismiss a complaint upon a determination that it, among other grounds, is frivolous. 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B)(i).

Plaintiff, a resident of the District of Columbia, has submitted a wholly incomprehensible complaint against an indecipherable defendant or defendants. The only clear thing in the complaint is plaintiff's demand for \$999,999,999 in damages. Plaintiff's outlandish and baseless demand warrants dismissal of the complaint under § 1915(e)(2) as frivolous. *See Neitzke v. Williams*, 490 U.S. 319, 325 (1989); *Best v. Kelly*, 39 F.3d 328, 330-31 (D.C. Cir. 1994). Furthermore, the complaint is so "patently insubstantial" as to deprive the Court of subject matter jurisdiction. *Tooley v. Napolitano*, 586 F.3d 1006, 1010 (D.C. Cir. 2009); *see Caldwell v. Kagan*, 777 F. Supp.2d 177, 178 (D.D.C. 2011) ("A district court lacks subject matter jurisdiction when the complaint 'is patently insubstantial, presenting no federal question suitable for decision.'") (quoting *Tooley*, 586 F.3d at 1009). A separate Order of dismissal accompanies this Memorandum Opinion.


United States District Judge

Date: December 20, 2011