

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

**EDWARD MCDOWELL,**

**Plaintiff**

**v.**

**PATRICIA MACK,**

**Defendant**

**CIVIL NO. JKB-11-2380**

\* \* \* \* \*

**MEMORANDUM**

Plaintiff Edward McDowell *pro se* filed this lawsuit alleging housing discrimination. (Compl., ECF No. 1.) Previously, the Court granted McDowell leave to proceed *in forma pauperis*, but noted the inadequacy of the complaint’s allegations and provided additional time during which he could file a supplemental complaint that included additional details as to his claimed mental disability and the actions taken by Defendant Patricia Mack in relation to his claimed disability. (ECF No. 3.) The Court specifically noted that McDowell’s criminal history was not a protected classification in the context of housing discrimination despite his claim that he was discriminated against on this basis. (*Id.*)

McDowell has now filed a supplemental complaint that alleges he has “a multiple personality mood disorder which lists [him] under 7 different personalities, some of which are violent in nature and [his] list of assault charges substantiates this fact.” (ECF No. 4.) Further, he says, “Now my name was dropped from the public housing waiting list based on ignorant assumption of continuous violence by Patricia Mack herself or her Baltimore City Housing Authority business associations.” (*Id.*) Finally, McDowell states, “Patricia Mack and her business associates of Housing Authority of Baltimore City had no justified reason to deny my

housing based upon assumption associated with what is printed on a medical record or background check.” (*Id.*)

These allegations fall short of the mark. McDowell’s additional allegations indicate that his name was dropped from the public housing waiting list, not based on any mental disability, but based on Defendant’s conclusion that he had a propensity for violence, which would not be an unreasonable reaction to his “list of assault charges.” He has, therefore, failed to allege that he was discriminated against based upon a protected classification.

Under 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2), the Court shall dismiss a case in which leave to proceed *in forma pauperis* is granted if, at any time, the Court determines that the action is frivolous or malicious, fails to state a claim on which relief may be granted, or seeks monetary relief against a defendant who is immune from such relief. In the present case, McDowell has failed to state a claim on which relief may be granted. Accordingly, a separate order will be entered dismissing the case without prejudice.

DATED this 9th day of September, 2011.

BY THE COURT:

\_\_\_\_\_  
/s/  
James K. Bredar  
United States District Judge