

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

**FILED**

SEP 15 2014

Clerk, U.S. District and  
Bankruptcy Courts

\_\_\_\_\_  
Alexander Otis Matthews,

Plaintiff,

v.

Charles E. Samuels, Jr. *et al.*,


Defendants.  
\_\_\_\_\_

Civ. Action No.

14-1565

MEMORANDUM OPINION

Plaintiff, proceeding *pro se*, seeks to bring a *qui tam* suit, *see* Compl. Caption, and moves to proceed *in forma pauperis*. “A *pro se* plaintiff may not file a *qui tam* action pursuant to the False Claims Act, 31 U.S.C. § 3729 *et seq.*” *Jones v. Jindal*, 409 Fed. Appx. 356 (D.C. Cir. 2011) (*per curiam*). Plaintiff, a federal prisoner incarcerated in Berlin, New Hampshire, acknowledges this barrier and requests that counsel be appointed “should the United States choose not to intervene.” Compl. ¶ 2. But an appointment from the Court’s Civil Pro Bono Panel is made at the discretion of “the judge to whom the case is assigned.” LCvR 83.11(b)(3). The dismissal of this case prior to assignment disqualifies plaintiff from consideration of a Panel appointment, and the factors for appointing counsel weigh heavily against an appointment of counsel in any event. *See id.* Hence, this action will be dismissed. A separate Order accompanies this Memorandum Opinion.

  
United States District Judge

DATE: September 11, 2014

N

4