

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

	*	
RAAJ AMEXEM MOOR RAFA EL,	*	
Plaintiff	*	
v.	*	CIVIL NO. JKB-11-2639
CITY OF BALTIMORE <i>et al.</i>,	*	
Defendants	*	
* * * * *		

MEMORANDUM

Plaintiff Raaj Amexem Moor Rafa El has sued the City of Baltimore and the city circuit court clerk, Frank M. Conaway. (ECF No. 1.) His complaint purports to raise a federal question. He complains that he asked for a copy of various officials’ sworn oaths and that all he has received is a blank oath. He asks the defendants be “punished” for various alleged crimes.

Rafa El has not paid a filing fee. He has filed an additional paper entitled, in part, “Motion to Proceed in Propria Persona” and says it should not be construed as a motion for leave to proceed *in forma pauperis* (“IFP”) since he is not a pauper. (ECF No. 2.) Notwithstanding the fact that the attached affidavit has not been completed or signed, the motion shall be provisionally granted. The complaint has been reviewed and shall be summarily dismissed.

This Court may preliminarily review the claims in a plaintiff’s complaint and dismiss the complaint pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e) prior to service if it is satisfied that it has no factual or legal basis and it is frivolous on its face. *See Neitzke v. Williams*, 490 U.S. 319, 328 (1989); *see also Denton v. Hernandez*, 504 U.S. 25, 33 (1992); *Cochran v. Morris*, 73 F.3d 1310, 1314 (4th Cir. 1996). As explained by the Supreme Court in *Neitzke*: “Examples of [factually baseless

lawsuits] are claims describing fanciful or delusional scenarios, with which federal district judges are all too familiar.” *Neitzke v. Williams*, 490 U.S. at 328. Under these standards, the Court concludes Rafa-El’s complaint is frivolous. Accordingly, the complaint will be dismissed by separate order.

DATED this 27th day of September, 2011.

BY THE COURT:

/s/
James K. Bredar
United States District Judge