

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF MARYLAND

MARY AKU QUARTEY,
Plaintiff,

v.

MR. COLEMAN,
Defendant.

*
*
*
* CIVIL ACTION NO. RWT-11-1662
*
*
*

MEMORANDUM OPINION

Plaintiff, a resident of Washington, D.C., filed this self-represented Complaint on June 16, 2011. ECF No. 1. The Complaint is not a model of clarity. It appears that Plaintiff is claiming that in 2008, deposits to her Postal Service Federal Credit Union account were transferred to Wachovia Bank and then “seized and transferred to federal district court Baltimore—deposited in a safe at the bank.” *Id.* She further alleges that Defendant instructed her to “request some of [her] total wealth” and “had already informed the chief judge about the issue.” *Id.* Plaintiff’s attachments shed no light on why she has filed an action in this Court. Indeed, those documents are nonsensical as they refer to Plaintiff’s efforts to have the FBI assist her in her efforts to return to work, and refer to her as “the Predictor and Inventor.” *Id.*

Plaintiff has filed for indigency status. ECF No. 2. The motion shall be granted. However, the Complaint will be dismissed.

This Court may preliminarily review the allegations in a Complaint before service of process and dismiss the Complaint 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 follows.

Date: August 2, 2011

/s/
ROGER W. TITUS
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

¹ Plaintiff has filed approximately twenty-five 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.