

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF MARYLAND

MARY AKU QUARTEY

*

v.

* CIVIL ACTION NO. PJM-10-1331

POST OFFICE H/R (MR. SERVICE)

*

MEMORANDUM OPINION

On May 19, 2010, Plaintiff, a resident of Silver Spring, Maryland, filed this *pro se* action using an employment discrimination complaint form. The Complaint sets out no claim statement. Rather, Plaintiff claims that “I have been delayed from been released to work form March 2010. Evidence are attached to the form.” Paper No. 1 at 2. She seeks back pay. Attached to the Complaint are pay statements and a document containing the names of individuals who Plaintiff claims are “involved in my murder.” *Id.* Because she appears indigent, Plaintiff’s Motion for Leave to Proceed *In Forma Pauperis* shall be granted.

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.

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 deficient. 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.

May 27, 2010

/s/
PETER J. MESSITTE
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

¹ Plaintiff has filed approximately thirteen 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.