


homeless at the time.” Compl. at 1. When plaintiff reviewed the discharge papers, she objected to information suggesting that she is diabetic. *Id.* at 2. According to plaintiff, the incident was another of “all the conspiracies . . . going on around her.” *Id.* She allegedly “is the only lady in this society, who society is forever scrutinizing, conspiring, being falsely accused [sic] . . . , stalking, invasion of privacy, so forth, so on.” *Id.* at 3. Plaintiff has demanded “five hundred million dollars in punitive damages, tort, defamation of character, age, conspiracy, intent to harm (kill),” because she now has a “fear of going to see a physician[.]” *Id.*

The Court finds that the complaint, which appears to be grounded in tort law, fails to set forth allegations with respect to this Court’s federal jurisdiction, a claim showing plaintiff’s entitlement to relief, or a valid basis for an award of damages of \$500 million. The complaint, as drafted, does not comply with Rule 8(a), and the Court will dismiss it without prejudice.

An Order consistent with this Memorandum Opinion is issued separately.

DATE: 11/30/2017



United States District Judge