

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

FILED

FEB 19 2021

Clerk, U.S. District & Bankruptcy
Court for the District of Columbia

PATRICK CHRISTIAN,)	
)	
Plaintiff,)	
)	
v.)	Civil Action No. 21-0080 (UNA)
)	
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, <i>et al.</i> ,)	
)	
Defendants.)	

MEMORANDUM OPINION

This matter is before the Court on its initial review of the Plaintiff’s *pro se* complaint, Dkt. 1, and his application for leave to proceed *in forma pauperis*, Dkt. 2. Generally, Plaintiff alleges that assorted governments, government and elected officials, courts, judges, public figures and other individuals have conspired to violate his constitutional rights. Dkt. 1.

Under the statute governing *in forma pauperis* proceedings, the Court is required to dismiss a case “at any time” it determines that the action is frivolous, malicious, or fails to state a claim upon which relief may be granted. 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2). Here, having reviewed the complaint carefully, the Court concludes that it cannot discern what claim or claims Plaintiff intends to bring. Because Plaintiff’s complaint lacks coherence and fails to state a claim upon which relief may be granted, the Court is required to dismiss Plaintiff’s complaint under 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2); *see also Gwinnell-Kennedy v. U.S. Gov’t Judiciary*, No. 09-cv-737, 2009 WL 1089543, at *1 (D.D.C. Apr. 22, 2009) (summarily dismissing complaint under § 1915(e)(2) because it was “incoherent”); *McGuire v. U.S. Dist. Court*, No. 10-cv-696, 2010 WL 1855858, at *1 (D.D.C. May 4, 2010) (summarily dismissing complaint under § 1915(e)(2) because it was “largely incoherent and nonsensical”); *cf. Neitzke v. Williams*, 490 U.S. 319, 325 (1989) (“[A]

complaint, containing . . . factual allegations and legal conclusions . . . lack[ing] an arguable basis either in law or in fact” shall be dismissed).

Accordingly, the Court will grant Plaintiff’s application to proceed *in forma pauperis* and will dismiss the complaint for failure to state a claim. *See* 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2). An Order consistent with this Memorandum Opinion is issued separately.

/s/
RANDOLPH D. MOSS
United States District Judge

DATE: February 19, 2021