

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF MARYLAND**

TANIA BAKER

*

Plaintiff

*

v

*

Civil Action No. RDB-11-1986

BALTIMORE CITY POLICE DEPARTMENT *

Defendant

*

MEMORANDUM OPINION

The above-captioned complaint was filed on July 19, 2011, together with a Motion to Proceed in Forma Pauperis. Because she appears indigent, Plaintiff's motion shall be granted.

The complaint seeks to institute a class action lawsuit against the Baltimore City Police Department. Plaintiff claims police have tapped her phones and constantly harassed her despite the fact she has no criminal record. She states she has reported the conduct to her cell-phone customer's service line. ECF No. 1.

The complaint does not contain a clear and concise statement of a cognizable federal claim as required by Fed. Rule of Civ. Proc. 8(a)(2). A court is not obliged to ferret through a complaint, searching for viable claims. *See Holsey v. Collins*, 90 F.R.D. 122 (D.Md.1981) Plaintiff's legal conclusion that she is being harassed without a detailed description of specific instances of behavior by police officers does nothing to illuminate the nature of the claim allowing defendants to respond in a meaningful way to her allegations. *See Swirkiewicz v. Sorema N.A.*, 534 U.S. 506, 512 (2002). Although district courts have a duty to construe pro se pleadings liberally, a pro se plaintiff must nevertheless allege facts that state a cause of action. *See Beaudett v. City of Hampton*, 775 F.2d 1274, 1278 (4th Cir.1985) (adding that the duty to construe pro se complaints liberally "does not require [district] courts to conjure up questions

never squarely presented to them,” and that “[d]istrict judges are not mind readers”). The Complaint does not provide Defendants “fair notice” of the claims or the facts upon which they are based, therefore it shall be dismissed without prejudice by separate Order which follows.

July 29, 2011
Date

R.D. Bennett
RICHARD D. BENNETT
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE