

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF INDIANA**

RICHARD ALAN STARR,)	
)	
vs.)	No. 1:11-cv-0598-TWP-MJD
)	
STEVEN B. GELLER,)	
)	
Defendant.)	

Entry and Order Directing Dismissal of Action

I.

The plaintiff's request to proceed *in forma pauperis* (dkt 2) is **granted**.

II.

Because the plaintiff has been granted leave to proceed *in forma pauperis*, his complaint is subject to dismissal pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B). This statute requires that the complaint be dismissed if it fails to state a claim upon which relief can be granted. *Id.* Pursuant to this statute, "[a] complaint is subject to dismissal for failure to state a claim if the allegations, taken as true, show that plaintiff is not entitled to relief." *Jones v. Bock*, 127 S. Ct. 910, 921 (2007).

Plaintiff Richard Starr seeks compensatory and punitive damages and unspecified injunctive relief from defendant Steven B. Geller. Starr alleges:

[P]laintiff's vindication of his Civil Rights that have left him (male victim) unvindicated for violations of gender bias motivated crimes of violence.

...

A class based invidiously discriminatory animus is behind the conspirators [sic] action as the court records reflect. That the actions were clearly a product of bias and prejudice of the court.

Starr then lists without elaboration various docket numbers and states: These Judges through their private conduct in conspiracy with lawyer defendants caused the court to effectuate Plaintiff to compulsory involuntary servitude.=

The sufficiency of a complaint is governed by Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 8(a). *Rodriguez v. Plymouth Ambulance Serv.*, 577 F.3d 816, 821 (7th Cir. 2009). "A complaint must always . . . allege 'enough facts to state a claim to relief that is plausible on its face.'" *Limestone Development Corp. v. Village of Lemont, Ill.*, 520 F.3d 797, 803 (7th Cir. 2008)(quoting *Bell Atlantic Corp. v. Twombly*, 550 U.S. 544, 570 (2007)).

It has been noted that "dismissal of a complaint on the ground that it is unintelligible is unexceptionable." *Davis v. Ruby Foods, Inc.*, 269 F.3d 818, 820 (7th Cir. 2001). Starr's complaint is unintelligible, rendering it subject to dismissal pursuant to 28 U.S.C. 1915(e)(2)(B).

III.

Judgment consistent with this Entry shall now issue.


IT IS SO ORDERED.

06/17/2011

Date: _____

Distribution:

Richard Alan Starr
P.O. Box 538
Frankton, IN 46044



Hon. Tanya Walton Pratt, Judge
United States District Court
Southern District of Indiana