

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

WILLIAM JONES,	)	
	)	
Plaintiff,	)	
	)	
v.	)	No. 4:15-CV-1524-RWS
	)	
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,	)	
	)	
Defendant.	)	

**MEMORANDUM AND ORDER**

This matter is before the Court on plaintiff’s motion for leave to commence this action without payment of the required filing fee [Doc. #2]. After reviewing plaintiff’s financial information, the Court will grant the motion and plaintiff will be assessed an initial partial filing fee of \$1.50, which is twenty percent of his six-month average monthly deposit. See 28 U.S.C. § 1915(b)(1). Furthermore, based upon a review of the complaint, the Court finds that this action should be dismissed for lack of subject matter jurisdiction.

**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 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).

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, an inmate at the South Central Correctional Center, brings this action for unspecified monetary damages against “US# Sates.” Plaintiff states that he is illegally being charged postage for a letter he wants to send to “the Governor [sic] office.”

### **Discussion**

At the outset, the Court will liberally construe this action as having been brought against the United States of America pursuant to *Bivens v. Six Unknown Named Agents of Fed. Bureau of Narcotics*, 403 U.S. 388 (1971).

“It is axiomatic that the United States may not be sued without its consent and that the existence of consent is a prerequisite for jurisdiction.” *United States v. Mitchell*, 463 U.S. 206, 212 (1983). The government’s waiver of sovereign immunity cannot be implied, but “must be unequivocally expressed in statutory text.” *Lane v. Pena*, 518 U.S. 187, 192 (1996). Plaintiff does not allege or reference any statute that purportedly waives sovereign immunity for his claim. As such, this action will be dismissed for lack of subject matter jurisdiction.

Accordingly,


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

**IT IS FURTHER ORDERED** that plaintiff shall pay an initial filing fee of \$1.50 within thirty (30) days of the date of this Order. Plaintiff is instructed to make his remittance payable to “Clerk, United States District Court,” and to include upon it: (1) his name; (2) his prison registration number; (3) the case number; and (4) that the remittance is for an original proceeding.

**IT IS FURTHER ORDERED** that the Clerk shall not issue process or cause process to issue, because subject matter jurisdiction is lacking.

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

Dated this 25th day of January, 2016.

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
**UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE**