

would be liable to the claimant in accordance with the law of the place where the act or omission occurred.” *Id.*, § 1346(b)(1). To the extent that the complaint presents a potential claim under the FTCA, jurisdiction is wanting because plaintiff has not indicated that he has exhausted his administrative remedies by "first present[ing] the claim to the appropriate Federal agency. . . .” 28 U.S.C. § 2675, and this exhaustion requirement is jurisdictional. *See Abdurrahman v. Engstrom*, 168 Fed.Appx. 445, 445 (D.C. Cir. 2005) (per curiam) (affirming the district court’s dismissal of unexhausted FTCA claim “for lack of subject matter jurisdiction”); *accord Simpkins v. District of Columbia Gov’t*, 108 F.3d 366, 371 (D.C. Cir. 2007). Hence, this case will be dismissed. A separate Order accompanies this Memorandum Opinion.


United States District Judge

DATE: January 30th, 2015