FILED

## JUL 2 5 2013

## UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Clerk, U.S. District & Bankruptcy Courts for the District of Columbia

SUSAN ANN CARROLL,	)	of Columbi
Plaintiff, v.	. )	
	)	13 1131 Civil Action No.
	)	Civil Action No.
DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE,	)	
	)	
Defendant.	)	

## **MEMORANDUM OPINION**

This matter comes before the court on review of the plaintiff's application to proceed *in* forma pauperis and pro se civil complaint. The court will grant the application, and dismiss the complaint.

The plaintiff purports to set forth examples of "obstruction of justice" which have "left [her] stripped of [her] civil, constitutional, and human rights as an American citizen." Compl. at 2 (page numbers designated by the Court). She alleges that she has been the victim of violent crimes over the last 10 years, *see id.* at 3, and that these "crimes are still ongoing as of 7/2/13." *Id.* at 4. According to the plaintiff, she is the victim of kidnapping, sexual abuse, assault, terrorism and identity theft, among other offenses. *Id.* She demands injunctive relief "so that the medical obstructers can be ordered to remove . . . non-human objects from [her] body cavity immediately." *Id.* at 7.

The Court must dismiss a complaint if it is frivolous, malicious, or fails to state a claim upon which relief can be granted. 28 U.S.C. §§ 1915(e)(1)(B), 1915A(b)(1). In *Neitzke v*.



Williams, 490 U.S. 319 (1989), the Supreme Court states that the trial court has the authority to dismiss not only claims based on an indisputably meritless legal theory, but also claims whose factual contentions are clearly baseless. Claims describing fantastic or delusional scenarios fall into the category of cases whose factual contentions are clearly baseless. *Id.* at 328. The trial court has the discretion to decide whether a complaint is frivolous, and such finding is appropriate when the facts alleged are irrational or wholly incredible. *Denton v. Hernandez*, 504 U.S. 25, 33 (1992).

The Court is mindful that complaints filed by *pro se* litigants are held to less stringent standards than those applied to formal pleadings drafted by lawyers. *See Haines v. Kerner*, 404 U.S. 519, 520 (1972). Having reviewed the plaintiff's complaint, the Court concludes that what factual contentions are identifiable are baseless and wholly incredible. The complaint is frivolous and it must be dismissed. *See* 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(1)(B).

An Order consistent with this Memorandum Opinion is issued separately.

United States District Judge

DATE:

1/20/13