

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

FILED MAR 11 2021

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

PATRICK CHRISTIAN,)
Plaintiff,)
v.)
JOSEPH BIDEN,)
Defendant.)

Civil Action No. 21-547 (UNA)

MEMORANDUM OPINION

Plaintiff, appearing pro se, has filed a "Civil Rights Complaint" against President Joe Biden [Dkt. # 1] and an application to proceed in forma pauperis [Dkt. # 2]. The court will grant the application and dismiss this action pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B)(i) (requiring dismissal of a case upon a determination that the complaint is frivolous).

Plaintiff brings this action "to determine the extent of the role Defendant plays in this 42 U.S.C. §1985 Conspiracy to interfere with Patrick Christian's Civil Rights (2) & (3)." Compl. at 1. He seeks "the sum of \$10.7 Billion." Id. at 6. Plaintiff alleges that after he "voted for the first time for Obama and Biden in 2009, this Conspiracy has been actively depriving him of his inalienable rights." Id. at 1. He poses three "legal questions" as follows:

[F]irst, is he in fact of the "Protected Class" described in the United States Constitution? Second, does Defendant have the Power and Authority to abridge and/or deprive him of this right by ensuing, supporting, contributing, and condoning said conspiracy? Thirdly, does this condoning, ensuing, supporting, and contributing Authority reinforces Ricki Lake, Sarah Palin, Cheryl Christian, and Francine Williams, as well as, Barak [sic] Obama (who went from a President to a Stalker) roles as principals in this 42 U.S.C. §1985(2)&(3) Conspiracy to deprive Patrick

Christian a Citizen of his Civil Rights as described in the United States Constitution?

Compl. at 1-2. The complaint continues in this incoherent manner.

Complaints premised on fantastic or delusional scenarios or supported wholly by allegations lacking “an arguable basis either in law or in fact” are subject to dismissal as frivolous. *Neitzke v. Williams*, 490 U.S. 319, 325 (1989); *see Denton v. Hernandez*, 504 U.S. 25, 33 (1992) (“[A] finding of factual frivolousness is appropriate when the facts alleged rise to the level of the irrational or the wholly incredible[.]”); *Best v. Kelly*, 39 F.3d 328, 330-31 (D.C. Cir. 1994) (a court may dismiss claims that are “essentially fictitious”-- for example, where they suggest “bizarre conspiracy theories . . . [or] fantastic government manipulations of their will or mind”) (citations and internal quotation marks omitted); *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.”). The instant complaint satisfies this standard and therefore will be dismissed. A separate order accompanies this Memorandum Opinion.

Date: March 11, 2021

/s/
AMIT P. MEHTA
United States District Judge