UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT WESTERN DISTRICT OF KENTUCKY AT LOUISVILLE

MARY ANN ISOM PLAINTIFF

V.

CIVIL ACTION NO. 3:12CV-3-S

INTERNATIONAL SCHOOL OF MINISTRY

DEFENDANT

MEMORANDUM OPINION

Unrepresented by counsel, Plaintiff Mary Ann Isom filed a complaint against the International School of Ministry. For the reasons that follow, the Court will dismiss this action.

I.

In the complaint, Plaintiff advises that she filed this action to "stop fraudulant life-threatning program called International School of Minstry." She states:

This case stems from another suit versus M.A.I & Associates Bd of Directors Mediation. This company works like a chamileon They pop up of [illegible] from a newpoint of cross-continental appeal lke on a Ufo-transmittal with me. It is not safe, impenges on invasion of privacy and other distortons of my very words & ideas. My person [and] property has been violated with use of telecommuncation.

Thy are also stalking me at Elizabethtown Ortheopedic Dr. Seddiqur Dr. [] Ahmed's and further into Louisville at St. Mary & Elz. Hospital as of Dec. 21st 2011. Wednesday There was notice of faint presence of knowing about my upcoming surgery. Agan privacy defrauded.

I will consider lowering this suit to 10,000,000.00 insead of 100,000,000.00 They are dangerous groups that reproduce [illegible] and alter folks identity – I suspect they are Taliban.

Joyce Myers Ministry is so affective, we have heard rumers she wants to make war against me. I will trun this over to Also FBI for Further criminal defray.

Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 8(a) requires, in pertinent part, that a complaint contain "a short and plain statement of the grounds for the court's jurisdiction," Fed. R. Civ. P. 8(a)(1), and "a short and plain statement of the claim showing that the pleader is entitled to relief." Fed. R. Civ. P. 8(a)(2).

In the instant case, Plaintiff's complaint is simply too sketchy and incoherent to meet this standard. She wholly fails to set forth any jurisdictional basis for filing this case in federal court, and her allegations fail to give Defendant "fair notice" of the claim(s) against it. *See Swierkiewicz v. Sorema N.A.*, 534 U.S. 506, 512 (2002) (indicating that the short and plain statement of claim must "give the defendant fair notice of what the plaintiff's claim is and the grounds upon which it rests") (quoting *Conley v. Gibson*, 355 U.S. 41, 47 (1957), *abrogated on other grounds by Bell Atlantic Corp. v. Twombly*, 550 U.S. 544 (2007)); *Scheid v. Fanny Farmer Candy Shops, Inc.*, 859 F.2d 434, 436 (6th Cir. 1988) (explaining that a complaint "must contain either direct or inferential allegations respecting all the material elements to sustain a recovery under some viable legal theory") (citations and internal quotation marks omitted)).

Although courts are to hold *pro se* pleadings "to less stringent standards than formal pleadings drafted by lawyers," *Haines v. Kerner*, 404 U.S. 519 (1972), "[o]ur duty to be 'less stringent' with pro se complaints does not require us to conjure up unpled allegations," *McDonald v. Hall*, 610 F.2d 16, 19 (1st Cir. 1979), or to create a claim for a plaintiff. *Clark v. Nat'l Travelers Life Ins. Co.*, 518 F.2d 1167, 1169 (6th Cir. 1975). To command otherwise would require courts "to explore exhaustively all potential claims of a *pro se* plaintiff, [and] would also transform the district court from its legitimate advisory role to the improper role of an

advocate seeking out the strongest arguments and most successful strategies for a party."

Beaudett v. City of Hampton, 775 F.2d 1274, 1278 (4th Cir. 1985).

For the foregoing reasons, the Court will enter a separate Order dismissing this action.

Date: July 25, 2012

Charles R. Simpson III, Judge United States District Court

cc: Plaintiff, *pro se*Defendant

4411.005