

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF MARYLAND

MARY AKU QUARTEY

*

v.

* CIVIL ACTION NO. RWT-11-0352

POST MASTER

*

MEMORANDUM OPINION

On February 7, 2011, Plaintiff, who lists an address in the District of Columbia as her residence, filed this action. The Complaint is not a model of clarity and the allegations speak for themselves:

“I request a [*sic*] order from the Court to Post Master of 12774 Wisteria Drive Germantown, Md. 20874. Tel. 301-428-0460/301-428-9794[.]

I have attached a Postal Service lite blue employee form which shows that I am presently employee of the Postal Service, printed in 2011 and a pay slip which shows my identity number 03567422.

I pray the Court will assist Mary Aku Quarthey to resume work.

I solemnly swear as Mary Aku Quarthey an employee for the Postal Service. I am the predictor and inventor found in 2005 at 10218 Millstream Drive Gaithersburg MD 20886. Whose brain cells were used to invent the internet communication, wild world communication by satellite, Human Communication, eye inventions and other first testing by the Postal Service Inspectors.

They involve billions of dollars for Mary Aku Quarthey. I was informed by Press and F.B.I. \$100 billion was issued for satellite communication. \$80 billion was issued for Human Communication. \$80 billion was issued for eye inventions. The wealth were [*sic*] transmitted to Capital Bank. Please find out from the FBI, Press and Labor. I have attached all inventions and testings to this oath.”

Attached to this missive is a listing of purported devices and inventions that underwent testing. (ECF No. 1 at Attachment). Plaintiff has moved for indigency status which shall be granted. ECF No. 2. This Court may preliminarily review the Complaint’s 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, 32-33 (1992); Cochran v. Morris, 73 F.3d 1310, 1315 (4th Cir. 1996); Nasim v. Warden, 64 F.3d 951, 956 (4th Cir. 1995). As explained by the Supreme Court in Neitzke: “Examples of [factually baseless lawsuits] are claims describing fantastic or delusional scenarios, claims 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, without service of process on Defendant.¹ A separate Order shall follow.

Date: February 14, 2011

/s/
ROGER W. TITUS
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

¹ Plaintiff has filed approximately twenty-six 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.