

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF MARYLAND

FRANCIS AKINRO

*

Plaintiff,

v.

*

CIVIL ACTION NO. RDB-10-1452

HECIDA HOTEL, et al.

*

Defendants.

MEMORANDUM OPINION

Plaintiff, a resident of Baltimore, Maryland who holds himself out as a “Professor,” “Assistant Attorney General” for the State of Maryland,” “U.S. Solicitor General” and Department of Justice employee, filed this 28 U.S.C. § 1332 action on June 1, 2010, naming the Hecida Hotel, Inglewood Police Department, and the UCLA Harbor Medical Center in California. His statement of facts alleges that “Defendant open gun fire on me in my hotel room. I am lucky to be alive.”

Paper No. 1 at 2.

In his relief request, Plaintiff seeks the award of \$497,000,000,000,000.00 and court order to stop the gun fire. He further asks that life imprisonment and the death penalty be imposed on the named Defendants.¹ Although Plaintiff’s indigency application contains information the court finds questionable, he shall be granted leave to proceed *in forma pauperis*.²


¹ Also attached is an arrest warrant for over 80 individuals from Maryland, Texas, California, and Nigeria, including government officials from Maryland, police officers from California and a Maryland federal court judge. Paper No.3 at Attachments. Plaintiff claims that a number of those individuals have been using police officers to open fire on him at various hotels since October 1, 2009 *Id.*

² Plaintiff claims that he receives \$3,063.00 in monthly retirement income; has been employed by the U.S. Department of Justice since July of 2009; and has \$200,000.00 accumulated at four separate banks. Paper No. 2.

This Court may preliminarily review the Complaint allegations before service of process and dismiss them *sua sponte* if satisfied that the Complaint has no factual or legal basis. See *Neitzke v. Williams*, 490 U.S. 319, 324 (1989); see also *Denton v. Hernandez*, 504 U.S. 25, 33 (1992); *Cochran v. Morris*, 73 F.3d 1310, 1314 (4th Cir. 1996); *Nasim v. Warden*, 64 F.3d 951 (4th Cir. 1995). As explained by the Supreme Court in *Neitzke*: "Examples of [factually baseless lawsuits] are claims describing fantastic or delusional scenarios, with which federal district judges are all too familiar." *Neitzke v. Williams*, 490 U.S. at 328.

Even when affording the *pro se* Complaint and accompanying materials a generous construction, the Court finds no basis to allow the action to go forward or to require supplementation. The Complaint allegations are incredible. The matter shall be summarily dismissed under 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e). A separate Order follows.

Date: June 7, 2010



RICHARD D. BENNETT
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE