

STATES DISTRICT COURT

DISTRICT OF MAINE

DR. KAMAL KK ROY,	)	
	)	
Plaintiff	)	
	)	
v.	)	
	)	Civ. No. 07-129-P-S
WORLD RELIGION SCHOOL OF	)	
GOD, et al.,	)	
	)	
Defendants	)	

**DECISION GRANTING MOTION TO PROCEED IN FORMA PAUPERIS AND RECOMMENDING DISMISSAL OF COMPLAINT**

Dr. Kamal K K Roy has filed a complaint in this court that consists of a thick sheath of papers, listing multiple defendants, the first being the World Religion School of God. Roy's complaint is page after page of both type-written and hand-written notations (most of which is indecipherable and incoherent). He has also filed an application to proceed in forma pauperis (which is also indecipherable and incoherent).

I am conditionally granting Roy's application to proceed without payment of the filing fee (Docket No. 2), assuming that Roy could file a comprehensible amended application.

However, I recommend that the court dismiss this action pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B). This court is not the first federal district court to receive a similar complaint by Roy and/or his entity "Jungle Democracy." A search of the National Party Case Index brings up over twenty civil suits that are presented in a similar vein with overlapping defendants. This court need not expand upon the recent 28 U.S.C. § 1915

screening order of the United States District Court Judge for the District of Delaware, Kamal Karna Roy a.k.a. Jungle Democracy v. United States of America, et al., Civ. Action No. 06-685-SLR, Docket No. 14 (D. Del. Apr. 13, 2007), dismissing Roy's complaint pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B),<sup>1</sup> which collects the citations to many of Roy's nation-wide suits and which explains that it is not possible to discern from his complaint style what Roy is claiming which defendants did what to violate which federally protected rights. I have attached District Court Judge Robinson's memorandum order to this recommended decision as Exhibit A.

Accordingly, I recommend that the Court dismiss this action pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B) because, at the very least, it fails to state a claim.

#### NOTICE

A party may file objections to those specified portions of a magistrate judge's report or proposed findings or recommended decisions entered pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(B) for which *de novo* review by the district court is sought, together with a supporting memorandum, within ten (10) days of being served with a copy thereof. A responsive memorandum shall be filed within ten (10) days after the filing of the objection.

Failure to file a timely objection shall constitute a waiver of the right to *de novo* review by the district court and to appeal the district court's order.

July 27, 2007.

/s/Margaret J. Kravchuk  
U.S. Magistrate Judge

---

<sup>1</sup> This order also indicates that the dismissal would be appropriate under 28 U.S.C. § 1915A, a section applicable to prisoner suits. However, it is not apparent from Roy's filings in this court that he is incarcerated; his application to proceed in forma pauperis indicates that he is a mobile clergy and lists two addresses that do not appear to be that of correctional institutions.