

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF MARYLAND

MARY AKU QUARTEY

*

v.

* CIVIL ACTION NO. RWT-10-804

HUMAN RESOURCES

*

MEMORANDUM OPINION

On March 30, 2010, Plaintiff, a resident of Silver Spring, Maryland, filed this pro se action using an employment discrimination complaint form. The Complaint is not a model of clarity. It appears that Plaintiff is claiming that in November of 2006, she was promoted as a manager while working for the U.S. Postal Service at a suburban post office. She seemingly contends that she was “used” by the Postal Service management, terminated from employment, and “wants to be assigned [back] to work.” (Paper No. 1). Plaintiff provides no grounds for filing the employment discrimination Complaint, nor does she set out the facts of her Complaint, discuss how she has timely exhausted her administrative remedies before filing this case, or provide a relief request. Her attachments shed no light on the omitted information. Indeed, those documents are nonsensical as they are comprised of randomly chosen court forms which reference the amount of \$154,000,000.00 and include Plaintiff’s request to seek out a death warrant on an individual.

Plaintiff has filed neither the civil filing fee nor moved for indigency status. She shall not be required to cure this deficiency. This Court may preliminarily review the Complaint allegations before service of process and dismiss them 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.

Plaintiff's Complaint provides no jurisdictional or factual basis for its filing. Her attachments are replete with fanciful illusions. The action shall be dismissed without prejudice for the failure to state a claim and without service of process on Defendant.¹ A separate order shall follow.

Date: April 8, 2010

/s/

ROGER W. TITUS
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

¹ Plaintiff has filed approximately twelve cases in this Court since December 2, 2009. Given the frivolous nature of her filings, the Court concludes that affording Plaintiff the opportunity to amend her Complaint would be an exercise in futility.