

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA**

_____	)	
<b>MONIQUE WHITE,</b>	)	
	)	
<b>Plaintiff,</b>	)	
	)	
<b>v.</b>	)	<b>Case No. 19-cv-00900 (APM)</b>
	)	
<b>SECRET SERVICE,</b>	)	
	)	
<b>Defendant.</b>	)	
_____	)	

**MEMORANDUM OPINION**


Defendant Secret Service removed this matter to this court from the Superior Court of the District of Columbia. See Notice of Removal, ECF No. 1. For the reasons stated below, the court dismisses the Complaint and this action sua sponte.

It is well-settled that “federal courts are without power to entertain claims otherwise within their jurisdiction if they are so attenuated and unsubstantial as to be absolutely devoid of merit, wholly insubstantial, [or] obviously frivolous.” *Hagans v. Lavine*, 415 U.S. 528, 536–37 (1974) (cleaned up). A complaint will be dismissed pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 12(b)(1) when it is “‘patently insubstantial,’ presenting no federal question suitable for decision.” *Best v. Kelly*, 39 F.3d 328, 330 (D.C. Cir. 1994) (quoting *Neitzke v. Williams*, 490 U.S. 319, 327 n.6 (1989)). Claims are patently insubstantial if they are “essentially fictitious,” for example, advancing “bizarre conspiracy theories,” “fantastic government manipulations of [one’s] will or mind,” or some type of “supernatural intervention.” *Id.* at 330. In such cases, a district court may dismiss the case sua sponte. See *Lewis v. Bayh*, 577 F. Supp. 2d 47, 54 (D.D.C. 2008) (quoting *Brown v. Dist. Unemployment Comp. Bd.*, 411 F. Supp. 1001, 1001–02 (D.D.C. 1975) (noting that “a district court has the power to dismiss a case sua sponte if it is frivolous”)).

Here, Plaintiff's Complaint rests on the kind of fantastic and delusional claims that warrant dismissal sua sponte. Specifically, Plaintiff alleges that there was a "[m]icrochip place inside of [her] and [she] didn't ask for it," that the "Secret Service has been trying to kill [her] with 'CANCER' and killed a lot of [her] family members," and that "[t]he Russians have been and is still poisoning [her]." See Notice of Removal, Complaint, ECF No. 1-1 at 1. The court is permitted to dismiss a complaint containing such allegations. See *Neitzke*, 490 U.S. at 325; see also *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."). Accordingly, upon sua sponte review, this action is dismissed.

A separate final, appealable order accompanies this Memorandum Opinion.

Dated: April 2, 2019

  
Amit P. Mehta  
United States District Judge