

Plaintiff's Motion to Correct Case Name [Doc. 5] and Motion to Admit New Related Cases [Doc. 6].²

Under 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e), a court must *sua sponte* dismiss an indigent plaintiff's complaint or any portion thereof which (1) is frivolous or malicious; (2) fails to state a claim on which relief may be granted; or (3) seeks monetary relief against a defendant who is immune from such relief.³ A complaint is "frivolous" if "it lacks an arguable basis either in law or in fact."⁴ Dismissals on this ground should only be ordered when legal theories are "indisputably meritless,"⁵ or when the claims rely on factual allegations that are "clearly baseless."⁶ "Clearly baseless" factual allegations include those that are "fanciful," "fantastic," and "delusional."⁷

From the Complaint and supporting documents, Plaintiff's claims are clearly frivolous. Plaintiff provides no factual basis whatsoever in support of his claims for espionage and conspiracy to commit espionage, which are patently absurd and unsupported by any colorable legal theory. Furthermore, Plaintiff has failed to establish that venue is even proper in this Court.⁸ Indeed, this case appears to be part of

² In his Motion to Correct Case Name, Plaintiff requests the Court change "United States of America" to "United States of America Secret Service" in this case's caption. In his Motion to Admit New Related Cases, Plaintiff requests the Court take note of certain cases, including unspecified Grand Jury proceedings against United States House Minority Leader Nancy Pelosi and United States Senators Barbara Boxer and Dianne Feinstein.

³ 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B).

⁴ *Neitzke v. Williams*, 490 U.S. 319, 327 (1989).

⁵ *Id.*

⁶ *Denton v. Hernandez*, 504 U.S. 25, 31 (1992).

⁷ *Id.* at 32-33 (quoting *Neitzke*, 490 U.S. at 325, 327).

⁸ 28 U.S.C. § 1391(b)(2).

a pattern of abusive litigation practices Plaintiff has engaged in since 2009.⁹ Thus, the Court finds Plaintiff's Complaint is frivolous and fails to state viable legal claims.

Accordingly, the Court **GRANTS** Plaintiff's Motion to Proceed IFP [Doc. 2]. However, pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B), the Court **DISMISSES with prejudice** Plaintiff's Complaint [Doc. 1]. The Court also **DENIES as MOOT** Plaintiff's Motion to Correct Case Name [Doc. 5] and Motion to Admit New Related Cases [Doc. 6].

SO ORDERED, this 17th day of July, 2017.

S/ C. Ashley Royal
C. ASHLEY ROYAL, SENIOR JUDGE
UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

⁹ Since 2009, Plaintiff has filed no fewer than 84 federal lawsuits in 36 different states, many of which have been dismissed *sua sponte* as frivolous. *See, e.g., Perales v. U.S. House of Representatives, et al.*, No. 1:12-cv-00140-JD, Doc. 8 (D.N.H. Aug. 8, 2013) (dismissing Plaintiff's suit against "the chairpersons or directors of fifteen federal legislative committees and executive agencies; ten California agencies, judges, mayors, and/or other state or local officials; [and] the chief executives of a number of private corporations"); *Perales v. United States of America*, No. 2:12-cv-11160-PDB-PJK, Doc. 3 (E.D. Mich. March 21, 2012) (dismissing Plaintiff's suit against "a collection of politicians, judges, and entertainment personalities, including President Obama, Hillary Clinton, Oprah Winfrey, and Steve Jobs"); *Perales v. United States*, No. 1:11-cv-00091-CCM, Doc. 3 (Ct. Cl. Feb. 17, 2011) (dismissing Plaintiff's allegations "that a traffic light camera constitutes a weapon of mass destruction").