

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

MICHAEL PACK	:	
Plaintiff	:	
v.	:	Civil Action No. RDB-12-131
MTA OFFICER ANJANETTE JONES	:	
Respondent	:	
	:	o0o

**MEMORANDUM OPINION**

Michael Pack has filed another complaint alleging that he was unlawfully arrested without a warrant by Officer Anjanette Jones. Pack requests damages of \$100 million in damages. The matter shall be dismissed in accordance with the Court's Order of June 20, 2011. *See Pack v. MTA Officer Anjanette Jones, et al*, Civil Action No. RDB-11-1576.

Pack is a frequent self-represented litigator who has filed dozens of cases in this court concerning the incidents identical or related to those alleged in this complaint.<sup>1</sup> These cases were considered and either determined to lack merit or dismissed outright. Pack was repeatedly warned that if he continued his pattern of multiple, vexatious filings, burdening this Court, his pleadings would be subject to a pre-filing injunction. *See e.g. Pack v. Baltimore City Police Department*, Civil Action No. WDQ-09-1484 (D. Md); *Pack v. Officer Anjanette Jones*, Civil Action No. ELH-11-837; *Pack v. MTA Officer Anjanette Jones*, Civil Action No. WNM-11-1181; *Pack v. MTA Officer Anjanette Jones, et al.*, Civil Action No. RDB-11-1576; *Pack v. MTA Officer Anjanette Jones*, Civil Action No. RDB-11- 1739; *see also Cromer v. Kraft Foods N. Am., Inc.*, 390 F.3d 812,

---

<sup>1</sup> *See e.g. Pack v. MTA Officer Anjanette Jones*, Civil Action No. WMN-11-1985; *Pack v. Officer Anjanette Jones*, Civil Action No. RDB-11-3469; *Civil Action No Pack v. Officer Anjanette Jones*, Civil Action No. WMN-11-1181; *Pack v. Officer Anjanette Jones*, ELH-11-837 (D. Md); *Pack v. Officer Anjanette Jones*, RDB-11-657 (D. Md); *Pack v. Officer Anjanette Jones, et al*, WDQ-11-325; *Pack v. MTA Officer Anjanette Jones*, L-11-18 (D. Md); *Pack v MTA Officer Anjanette Jones*, WMN-11-522 (D. Md); *Pack v. Public Safety & Correctional Services Department, et al*, Civil Action No. CCB-09-2911 (D. Md.); *Pack v. O'Malley*, Civil Action No. WDQ-09-2912 (D. Md); *Pack v. State of Maryland*, Civil Action No. L-09-2400; *Pack v. Baltimore City Police Department*, WDQ-09-2223 (D. Md); *Pack v. State of Maryland*, RDB-09-1018 (D. Md.), *Pack v. Baltimore City Police*, AMD-09-518 (D. Md.), *Pack v. Weidefield*, JFM-09-208 (D. Md.); *Pack v. Maryland Transit Administration*, AMD-08-3097 (D. Md); *Pack v. Commissioner Frederick Bealefield*, CCB-08-2625 (D. Md); and *Pack v. Commissioner Frederick Bealefield*, WMN-08-3067

814 (4<sup>th</sup> Cir. 2004) (while a court is to impose a pre-filing injunction “sparingly,” a pre-filing injunction may be warranted under “exigent circumstances, such as a litigant’s continuous abuse of the judicial process by filing meritless and repetitive actions.”)

Pack’s continuing barrage of vexatious complaints, despite warnings to desist, compelled this court to exercise its authority under the All Writs Act, 28 U.S.C § 1651 to limit Pack’s repetitive filings. By order dated June 20, 2011, Pack was ordered to show cause order why subsequent filings containing repetitive claims concerning MTA Officer Anjanette Jones’ issuance of a citation in 2003, Pack’s citations from Baltimore City Police in 2008 concerning his public urination or failure pay a public transportation fare, or the alleged detention of another individual by the name of Michael Lawrence Poole by Baltimore City Police, should not be returned to him without docketing or further review. Pack was cautioned that in the event he failed to submit a timely or responsive reply, the pre-filing injunction would take effect. *See Pack v. MTA Officer Anjanette Jones*, Civil Action No. RDB-11-1576; *see also Pack v. MTA Officer Anjanette Jones, et al.*, Civil Action No. WMN-11-1985, dismissed, CA4 NO. 11-1798 (August 10, 2011) (appellant enjoined from filing appeals in the Fourth Circuit unless the district court certifies the petition or appeal is not frivolous). Pack failed to respond to the Order to Show Cause and the pre-filing injunction went into effect thereafter. All future papers filed by Pack will be reviewed, and if they raise claims covered by the pre-filing injunction, they will be returned to him without instituting a new case. A separate Order dismissing the instant complaint on this basis follows.

February 16, 2012  
Date

\_\_\_\_\_/s/\_\_\_\_\_  
RICHARD D. BENNETT  
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE