


consists of an incoherent sentence referencing September 1989 and various music genres and unexplained, incoherent attachments.

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). Even if the Court were to exercise jurisdiction, the complaint is frivolous and, thus, subject to dismissal under 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e). *Neitzke v. Williams*, 490 U.S. 319, 325 (1989); *see Best v. Kelly*, 39 F.3d 328, 330-31 (D.C. Cir. 1994) (a court may dismiss claims that are “essentially fictitious”-- for example, where they suggest “bizarre conspiracy theories . . . [or] fantastic government manipulations of their will or mind”) (citations and internal quotation marks omitted); *Crisafi v. Holland*, 655 F.2d 1305, 1307-08 (D.C. Cir. 1981) (“A court may dismiss as frivolous complaints . . . postulating events and circumstances of a wholly fanciful kind.”). Hence, this case will be dismissed with prejudice. A separate order accompanies this Memorandum Opinion.

Date: July 22, 2015


United States District Judge