

at 330 (internal quotation marks omitted). In such cases, a district court may dismiss the case sua sponte. *See id.*

Here, Plaintiff alleges that “he is the legal heir of [his brother] Zvika, who entered into an agreement with the federal government regarding the manufacture of an Israeli weapon sketched by him, of the type ‘Tavor,’” Compl. ¶ 1, and that “according to the agreement Zvika is the son of all future presidents,” *id.* ¶ 3. Plaintiff says he “will argue that the agreement provides that his brother would receive anything he wants,” *id.* ¶ 5, and as his brother’s legal heir, he is “entitled to benefits and to be recognized as a U.S. citizen,” *id.* ¶ 9 (emphasis omitted).

The court is mindful that complaints filed by pro se litigants are held to less stringent standards than those applied to formal pleadings drafted by lawyers. *See Haines v. Kerner*, 404 U.S. 519, 520 (1972). But Plaintiff’s claim is clearly fantastic, delusional, and “essentially fictitious.” *Best*, 39 F.3d at 330 (internal quotation marks omitted). Accordingly, the court dismisses the Complaint and this action for lack of subject matter jurisdiction.

A separate final, appealable order accompanies this Memorandum Opinion.

Dated: February 17, 2021


Amit P. Mehta
United States District Court Judge