

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
EASTERN DISTRICT OF MISSOURI  
EASTERN DIVISION**

LARRY COFFMAN,	)	
	)	
Plaintiff,	)	
	)	
v.	)	No. 4:07CV874 CDP
	)	
ALAN BLAKE, et al.,	)	
	)	
Defendants.	)	

**MEMORANDUM AND ORDER**

This matter is before the Court upon the application of Larry Coffman for leave to commence this action without prepayment of the filing fee pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915. The Court has reviewed the complaint pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B), and this case will be dismissed because it is frivolous and malicious.

**28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)**

Pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B), the Court may dismiss a complaint filed in forma pauperis if the action is frivolous, malicious, fails to state a claim upon which relief can be granted, or seeks monetary relief against a defendant who is immune from such relief. An action is frivolous if “it lacks an arguable basis in either law or in fact.” Neitzke v. Williams, 490 U.S. 319, 328 (1989). An action fails to state a claim upon which relief can be granted if it appears beyond doubt that the

plaintiff can prove no set of facts in support of his claim which would entitle him to relief. Conley v. Gibson, 355 U.S. 41, 45-46 (1957).

In reviewing a pro se complaint under § 1915(e)(2)(B), the Court must give the complaint the benefit of a liberal construction. Haines v. Kerner, 404 U.S. 519, 520 (1972). The Court must also weigh all factual allegations in favor of the plaintiff, unless the facts alleged are clearly baseless. Denton v. Hernandez, 504 U.S. 25, 32-33 (1992).

### **The Complaint**

Coffman, a civilly committed resident at the Missouri Sexual Offender Treatment Center, has filed this action under 42 U.S.C. § 1983. Coffman is a frequent filer of frivolous and malicious lawsuits in this Court. The Court has reviewed the complaint, and the Court finds that it is both frivolous and malicious. It is frivolous because it does not allege any facts that would entitle Coffman to relief and because it is duplicative of previous suits that have been dismissed pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B). E.g., Coffman v. Blake, 4:07CV800 SNL (E.D. Mo., dism'd May 1, 2007). It is malicious because the tone of the complaint and the sheer number of frivolous lawsuits Coffman has filed against these defendants indicate that his intent is to vex and harass these defendants rather than to pursue a legitimate civil rights

action. As a consequence, this action will be dismissed pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B).

Accordingly,

**IT IS HEREBY ORDERED** that plaintiff's motion to proceed in forma pauperis [Doc. #2] is **DENIED** as moot.

**IT IS FURTHER ORDERED** that the Clerk shall not issue process or cause process to issue upon the complaint because the complaint is frivolous and malicious.

**IT IS FURTHER ORDERED** that all other pending motions are **DENIED**.

An appropriate order of dismissal shall accompany this Memorandum and Order.

Dated this 7th day of May, 2007.

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
CATHERINE D. PERRY  
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE