

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

REV. CALVIN WARREN,	)	
	)	
Plaintiff,	)	
	)	
v.	)	No. 4:13-CV-1634-HEA
	)	
FEDERAL GOVERNMENT, et al.,	)	
	)	
Defendants.	)	

**OPINION, MEMORANDUM AND ORDER**

This matter is before the Court on the motion of Rev. Calvin Warren for leave to commence this action without prepayment of the filing fee pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915 [Doc. #2]. The Court will grant plaintiff in forma pauperis status. For the reasons stated below, the Court will dismiss this action pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B).

**28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)**

Pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B), the Court must 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 from a defendant who is immune from such relief. An action is frivolous if it "lacks an arguable basis in either law or fact." *Neitzke v. Williams*, 490 U.S. 319, 328 (1989). An action is malicious if it is undertaken for the purpose of harassing the named defendants and not for the purpose

of vindicating a cognizable right. *Spencer v. Rhodes*, 656 F. Supp. 458, 461-63 (E.D.N.C. 1987), *aff'd* 826 F.2d 1059 (4th Cir. 1987). An action fails to state a claim upon which relief can be granted if it does not plead “enough facts to state a claim to relief that is plausible on its face.” *Bell Atlantic Corp. v. Twombly*, 550 U.S. 544,570 (2007).

To determine whether an action fails to state a claim upon which relief can be granted, the Court must engage in a two-step inquiry. First, the Court must identify the allegations in the complaint that are not entitled to the assumption of truth. *Ashcroft v. Iqbal*, 129 S. Ct. 1937, 1950-51 (2009). These include "legal conclusions" and "[t]hreadbare recitals of the elements of a cause of action [that are] supported by mere conclusory statements." *Id.* at 1949. Second, the Court must determine whether the complaint states a plausible claim for relief. *Id.* at 1950-51. This is a "context-specific task that requires the reviewing court to draw on its judicial experience and common sense." *Id.* at 1950. The plaintiff is required to plead facts that show more than the "mere possibility of misconduct." *Id.* The Court must review the factual allegations in the complaint "to determine if they plausibly suggest an entitlement to relief." *Id.* at 1951. When faced with alternative explanations for the alleged misconduct, the Court may exercise its judgment in

determining whether plaintiff's conclusion is the most plausible or whether it is more likely that no misconduct occurred. *Id.* at 1950, 51-52.

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**

Plaintiff seeks nine hundred trillion dollars in this action brought for the violation of his constitutional rights. The named defendants are the Federal Government, President Barack Obama and his entire Administration, “Marshell Obama,” Jessie Jackson, Jr., “the whole prejudice black race,” “the whole prejudice white race,” Joyce Rogers, James Williams, “the Nation of Islam,” Unknown Faracon, Dr. Elijah Mahumet, Ned Graham, and Franklin Graham.

Plaintiff alleges that defendants are plotting to murder his brother, Rev. John Warren, while he is in intensive care in a hospital in Little Rock, Arkansas. In addition, plaintiff claims that the Obama Administration is “using racism, terrorism, and satanism against [his] brother,” and defendants have assaulted plaintiff’s brother with brass knuckles.

Although a pro se complaint is to be liberally construed, the complaint must contain a short and plain summary of facts sufficient to give fair notice of the claim asserted. *Means v. Wilson*, 522 F.2d 833, 840 (8th Cir. 1975). The Court will not supply additional facts or construct a legal theory for plaintiff that assumes facts that have not been pleaded. Having carefully reviewed the complaint, the Court concludes that plaintiff's factual allegations are delusional and fail to state a claim or cause of action under 42 U.S.C. § 1983 or *Bivens v. Six Unknown Named Agents of Fed. Bureau of Narcotics*, 403 U.S. 388 (1971). For these reasons, the complaint will be dismissed, without prejudice.

Accordingly,

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

**IT IS FURTHER ORDERED** that the Clerk shall not issue process or cause process to issue upon the complaint, because it is legally frivolous and fails to state a claim upon which relief can be granted. *See* 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B).

A separate Order of Dismissal shall accompany this Memorandum and Order.

Dated this 27th day of August, 2013.



---

HENRY EDWARD AUTREY  
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE