

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF MARYLAND

MARY AKU QUARTEY (ASARE) *
Predictor, evangelist, and inventor

*

v.

* CIVIL ACTION NO. RWT-10-1460

PRESIDENT BARAK OBAMA *
JOHN E. POTTER (POST OFFICE)

JOPPY SHEAYL *

VERONICA AGEDAYO *

J.D. JACKSON (JOSEPH MARLEY) *

MEMORANDUM OPINION

On June 3, 2010, Plaintiff, a resident of Silver Spring, Maryland, filed this *pro se* action claiming that “I was plotted to be assassinated by the above defendants in order to obtain my wealth in billions.” The Complaint is not a model of clarity and reads as follows:

“Information received by Mary Aku Quarthey from a jailer through the satellite on 6/1/2010 11:30 p.m. Again I received the second information from satellite at [unintelligible] on 6/3/2010 by a female jailer and one of the members from the Senate.

Miss Joppy Sheayl actual name Miss Veronica Ageybo, I learned from her from before the above information she took a bus to the White House to submit a check to the President on two occasions. First 80 million and the second time was 50 million. Miss Veronica was the same woman who signed my check in my name Mary Aku Quarthey.

Please verify if the above information is truth.”

(Paper No. 1 at 2).

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 for the failure to state a claim and without service of process on Defendant.¹ A separate order shall follow.

Date: June 15, 2010

/s/
ROGER W. TITUS
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

¹ Plaintiff has filed approximately twenty 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.