

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

DISTRICT OF NEVADA

\* \* \*

ROBIN M. LEE, an individual	
	Plaintiff,
v.	
DONALD TRUMP, an individual, and TRUMP CORPORATION, a New York Corporation,	
	Defendants.

Case No. 2:12-cv-00077-MMD-VCF

ORDER

(Def.'s Motion to Dismiss – dkt. no. 32)

Before the Court is Defendants Donald Trump and Trump Corporation's Motion to Dismiss. (Dkt. no. 32.) For the reasons discussed below, the Motion is granted.

Plaintiff's handwritten complaint is largely illegible and incoherent. From what the Court can best surmise, Plaintiff alleges that the actions of Mr. Trump, in concert with a number of other famous individuals not listed as defendants, precluded a lucrative investment opportunity. Plaintiff requests \$21.5 billion in damages and a presidential pardon.<sup>1</sup>


Defendants Donald Trump and Trump Corporation filed an impassioned and thorough – to say the least – motion to dismiss on a number of procedural and

<sup>1</sup>It also appears that Plaintiff may have pursued this case in the District of Hawaii, and instigated the instant action only when that case was dismissed as frivolous.

1 substantive grounds. Plaintiff did not file an opposition to the motion and consequently,  
2 dismissal is proper under Local Rule 7-2(d). Additionally, dismissal is warranted on the  
3 merits. Dismissal is proper when a complaint does not contain a short and plain  
4 statement of a claim to relief with sufficient factual matter to support its plausibility. *Bell*  
5 *Atlantic Corp. v. Twombly*, 550 U.S. 544, 570 (2007). After reading the complaint, the  
6 Court cannot ascertain what exactly the Plaintiff's claim is and finds that the disjointed  
7 facts do not rise to the level of plausibility. Therefore, the Motion is granted.

8 IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED that Defendants Donald Trump and Trump  
9 Corporation's Motion to Dismiss is GRANTED. The Clerk of the Court is ordered to  
10 close this case.

11 DATED THIS 25<sup>th</sup> day of October 2012.

12  
13  
14   
15 \_\_\_\_\_  
16 MIRANDA M. DU  
17 UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28