

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

ANGELA NAILS,)	
)	
Plaintiff,)	
)	
v.)	No. 4:15-CV-1269 CAS
)	
MASTERCARD DISPUTE,)	
)	
Defendant.)	

MEMORANDUM AND ORDER

Plaintiff moves for leave to proceed in forma pauperis. She has not provided the Court with her financial information, however. The motion is therefore denied. See 28 U.S.C. § 1915(a).

Additionally, plaintiff has not stated the basis for jurisdiction in this Court. She is suing MasterCard Dispute on the basis that it did not give her a refund she requested. She has not, however, alleged any coherent facts about the dispute.

“Federal courts are courts of limited jurisdiction. The requirement that jurisdiction be established as a threshold matter springs from the nature and limits of the judicial power of the United States and is inflexible and without exception.” Kessler v. National Enterprises, Inc., 347 F.3d 1076, 1081 (8th Cir. 2003) (quotation marks omitted); see Kuhl v. Hampton, 451 F.2d 340, 342 (8th Cir. 1971) (federal courts “were not established to mediate any and all types of complaints and alleged wrongs.”).

Plaintiff has not alleged either federal question or diversity jurisdiction. And the Court cannot envision any amendment to the complaint that would demonstrate that jurisdiction exists.

As a result, plaintiff must show cause why this case should not be dismissed. See Fed. R. Civ. P. 12(h)(3). Failure to show cause will result in the dismissal of this case.

Finally, it is worth noting that plaintiff frequently files frivolous lawsuits against businesses in the federal courts. E.g., Dothan Housing Authority v. Nails, No. 1:07-CV-834 MHT (M.D. Ala. September 18, 2007) (removal; noting that Nails is a frequent litigator before the court); Nails v. Progressive Insurance Co., No. 2:12-CV-324 MHT (M.D. Ala. April 13, 2012) (noting that Nails consistently refuses to disclose her financial information with her in forma pauperis applications, despite being ordered by the courts to do so).

Accordingly,

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

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that plaintiff must pay the \$400 filing fee to the Clerk of Court by **September 2, 2015**.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that plaintiff must show cause, by **September 2, 2015**, why this case should not be dismissed for lack of jurisdiction.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that if plaintiff fails to comply fully and timely with this Order, the Court will dismiss this action without further proceedings and without further notice to plaintiff.


CHARLES A. SHAW
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

Dated this 19th day of August, 2015.