Wallace et al v. Leitch et al Doc. 6

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF ILLINOIS EASTERN DIVISION

LISA F. WALLACE, etc., et al., )

Plaintiffs, )

v. ) No. 10 C 6317

DEBORRAH LINDI LEITCH, et al., )

Defendants. )

## MEMORANDUM OPINION AND ORDER

This District Court's random assignment system has brought to this Court's calendar a sprawling and disjointed handwritten Complaint (coupled with bulky exhibits) that plainly has no business in the United States District Court for the Northern District of Illinois¹--a pleading that could be a poster child for the concept of frivolousness in the legal sense defined by Neitzke v. Williams, 490 U.S. 319, 325 (1989) and Denton v. Hernandez, 504 U.S. 25, 32-33 (1992), even apart from the fact that Complaint ¶5 states (unsurprisingly, given n.1) that all defendants reside in Tulsa County, Oklahoma. In this Circuit any plaintiff who seeks in forma pauperis status must not only make a showing of financial inability to pay the filing fee but a nonfrivolous claim for relief as well.

Accordingly this Court dismisses both the Complaint and this

Complaint  $\P1$ , which addresses "Jurisdiction and Venue," seeks to remove a Tulsa County, Oklahoma lawsuit to this District Court. That of course is beyond the scope of the federal removal statutes (28 U.S.C.  $\S\S1441$  ff.).

action sua sponte because the Dkt. 4 document that has accompanied the Complaint has shown an inability to pay any filing fee. In that respect, this Court informs plaintiffs that (1) if they were inclined to file another such lawsuit and were somehow able to pay the \$350 filing fee, this District Court's local rules would call for direct assignment of that case to this Court's calendar and (2) in this Court's view the likelihood of the case's survival would also be highly remote, so that payment of that costly fee could be a waste of money.

Milton I. Shadur

Senior United States District Judge

Date: October 4, 2010