




notice of the claim being asserted so that they can prepare a responsive answer and an adequate defense and determine whether the doctrine of *res judicata* applies. *Brown v. Califano*, 75 F.R.D. 497, 498 (D.D.C. 1977). “[A] complaint that is excessively long, rambling, disjointed, incoherent, or full of irrelevant and confusing material does not meet [Rule 8’s] liberal pleading requirement.” *T.M. v. D.C.*, 961 F. Supp. 2d 169, 174 (D.D.C. 2013).

Plaintiff has submitted a complaint against the United States, the White House Office, “Congress Merchants,” and other non-federal defendants in Massachusetts. Plaintiff begins: “Now comes the Plaintiff . . . , my son . . . and Guillermina Nova filing a brief motion and appendix and moves this Honorable Court to appeal all pending cases.” Compl. at 2. The 10-page complaint continues in this largely incomprehensible manner and includes more than 200 pages of various attachments. No discernible claim has been stated. In addition, federal district courts, such as this, lack jurisdiction to review the decisions of other courts. *Prentice v. U.S. Dist. Court for E. Dist. of Michigan, S. Div.*, 307 Fed. App’x 460, 460 (D.C. Cir. 2008) (per curiam); *see id.* (noting that “a challenge to a state court action must proceed through that state’s system of appellate review rather than through a federal district court”) (citing *Johnson v. De Grandy*, 512 U.S. 997, 1006 (1994) (other citations omitted)); *United States v. Choi*, 818 F. Supp. 2d 79, 85 (D.D.C. 2011) (district courts “generally lack[] appellate jurisdiction over other judicial bodies, and cannot exercise appellate mandamus over other courts.”) (citing *Lewis v. Green*, 629 F. Supp. 546, 553 (D.D.C.1986)); *Fleming v. United States*, 847 F. Supp. 170, 172 (D.D.C. 1994), *cert. denied* 513 U.S. 1150 (1995) (noting that “[b]y filing a complaint in this Court against . . . judges who have done nothing more than their duty . . . Fleming has instituted a meritless action”) (applying *District of Columbia Court of Appeals v. Feldman*, 460 U.S. 462,

482 (1983); *Rooker v. Fidelity Trust Co.*, 263 U.S. 413, 415, 416 (1923)). Consequently, this case will be dismissed. A separate Order accompanies this Memorandum Opinion.

Date: April 24, 2018



---

United States District Judge