

United States District Court, Northern District of Illinois

Name of Assigned Judge or Magistrate Judge	Samuel Der-Yeghiayan	Sitting Judge if Other than Assigned Judge	
CASE NUMBER	11 C 9117	DATE	1/17/2012
CASE TITLE	Angela Marie Smith vs. Board Of Education Of The City Of Chicago		

DOCKET ENTRY TEXT

For the reasons stated below, the instant action is hereby ordered dismissed. Plaintiff's motions for leave to proceed in forma pauperis [4] and for appointment of counsel are denied as moot. Civil case terminated.

■ [For further details see text below.]

Docketing to mail notices.

STATEMENT

This matter is before the court on Angela Marie Smith's (Smith) *pro se* motion for leave to proceed *in forma pauperis* and motion for appointment of counsel. Pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e) (Section 1915(e)), "[n]otwithstanding any filing fee, or any portion thereof, that may have been paid, the court shall dismiss the case at any time if the court determines that . . . the action . . . is frivolous or malicious . . . [or] fails to state a claim on which relief may be granted. . . ." *Id.* Smith has filed a complaint *pro se*, and thus the court construes the complaint liberally. *McCormick v. City of Chicago*, 230 F.3d 319, 325 (7th Cir. 2000)(stating that "*pro se* complaints are to be liberally construed and not held to the stringent standards expected of pleadings drafted by lawyers").

Smith entitles her *pro se* complaint "Emergency Petition to Enforce Order." (Compl. 1). Smith attaches to the complaint an order and various filings from a charge that she apparently filed before the Illinois Department of Human Rights. Smith indicates that she is bringing this action pursuant to certain state court rules and rules of professional conduct. (Compl. 1). Smith also makes general references to fraud and "immoral and unethical behavior" that "has brought shame to the legal profession." (Compl. 1). Smith also asserts that "[a]ttorneys have a duty to courts and the courts have the corresponding authority to discipline

STATEMENT

attorneys who practice before them.” (Compl. 1). Smith indicates that she is bringing this action “[i]n support for an investigation.” (Compl. 1). Even when liberally construing the allegations in the complaint, Smith has failed to plausibly suggest a federal cause of action. To the extent that Smith seeks to bring a charge against an attorney for a violation of the professional rules of conduct, this court is not the proper forum in which to make such a charge. Therefore, since Smith has not plausibly suggested any valid federal claim for relief, this action is dismissed. The motion for leave to proceed *in forma pauperis* and the motion for appointment of counsel are denied as moot.