

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF MARYLAND**

EMMANUEL EDOKOBI

*
*
*
*
*
*
*

v.

Civil No. – JFM-13-288

GREENPOINT MORTGAGE FUNDING,
ET AL.

MEMORANDUM

Plaintiff has instituted this action against various financial institutions. Several of the defendants have filed a motion to dismiss. Plaintiff, who is appearing *pro se*, has responded to the motions. The motions will be granted. Moreover, because the grounds cited in the motion apply equally to the defendants who have not yet entered an appearance, this case will be dismissed in its entirety.¹

Plaintiff’s complaint has 488 pages. That fact, in and of itself, reflects that plaintiff has failed to set forth “a short and plain statement of . . . [his] claim[s]” as required by Fed. R. Civ. P. 8(a). If that were the only problem, however, I would grant plaintiff leave to file an amended complaint. I will not do so because it is clear from the complaint and plaintiff’s responsive memoranda that he has no viable claim against any of the defendants.

The two main focuses of plaintiff’s claims appear to be that (1) the mortgage on the house that he owns located at 2005 Stratton Drive, Potomac, Maryland, was unlawfully

¹ Plaintiff has also filed a motion to disqualify the undersigned. There is no basis for the motion. The fact that I have ruled against plaintiff in another action does not reflect that I have any bias against him. If I have erred, the proper course for plaintiff to follow is to appeal my rulings. If the rulings are reversed, I will, of course, decide any remaining issues with complete impartiality.

