




*Williams*, 490 U.S. 319, 328 (1989), warranting dismissal under 28 U.S.C. §§ 1915(e)(2)(B)(i), 1915A(b)(1). Furthermore, it “is patently insubstantial, presenting no federal question suitable for decision.” *Caldwell v. Kagan*, 777 F. Supp. 2d 177, 178 (D.D.C. 2011) (quoting *Tooley v. Napolitano*, 586 F.3d 1006, 1009 (D.C. Cir. 2009)), *aff’d per curiam*, 455 F. App’x 1 (D.C. Cir. 2011), *cert. denied*, 133 S. Ct. 279 (2012). No defendant should “be forced to spend time and energy in attempting to decipher plaintiff’s utterly confusing and lengthy pleading.” *Hamrick v. United States*, No. 08-1698, 2009 WL 8747880, at \*1 (D.D.C. Jan. 30, 2009) (footnote omitted).

The Court will dismiss the complaint and this civil action as frivolous. An Order consistent with this Memorandum Opinion is issued separately.

DATE:

10/15/2014

  
United States District Judge