

1 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
2 DISTRICT OF NEVADA

3
4 Grace Albanese,
5 Plaintiff

6 v.

7 Las Vegas Metropolitan Police Department,
8 Defendant

2:17-cv-01520-JAD-CWH

**Order Sustaining Objection to Report and
Recommendation**

[ECF Nos. 6, 7]

9
10 Since March 9, 2016, pro se plaintiff Grace Albanese has filed 45 civil cases in this court
11 against a myriad of government and law-enforcement agencies including the Las Vegas Police
12 Department,¹ Las Vegas Metropolitan Police Department,² “Homeland Security,”³ Federal
13 Bureau of Investigations,⁴ Department of Homeland Security,⁵ “Las Vegas Metro Police Dept,”⁶
14 Regional Transportation Commision [sic] of Southern Nevada,⁷ “Homeland Security of the
15 United States, Las Vegas, NV,”⁸ and the Transportation Security Administration.⁹ In this
16 particular case, Ms. Albanese sues the Las Vegas Metropolitan Police Department for
17 “[o]bstruction of justice and denying [her] equal protection.” She alleges that when she “call

18
19 ¹ See, e.g., 2:17-cv-01972-JAD-NJK.

20 ² See, e.g., 2:17-cv-01973-RFB-PAL.

21 ³ See, e.g., 2:17-cv-01874-RFB-VCF.

22 ⁴ See, e.g., 2:17-cv-01871-JAD-VCF.

23 ⁵ See 2:17-cv-01287-JCM-PAL.

24 ⁶ See 2:17-cv-00577-GMN-PAL.

25 ⁷ See 2:16-cv-01882-APG-PAL.

26 ⁸ See 2:16-cv-00531-RFB-VCF.

27 ⁹ See 2:16-cv-00530-GMN-CWH.
28

1 [sic] 311 [sic] for help, Sgt. Johnson cancelled [her] call” and told her that her neighbors in
2 apartments 3 and 9 were not watching her, and that he would not allow officers to respond to her
3 call.¹⁰ She demands \$500,000.

4 On June 8, 2017, Magistrate Judge Hoffman denied Albanese’s application to proceed *in*
5 *forma pauperis* because it was incomplete, and he ordered her to file a new, completed pauper
6 application.¹¹ Four days later, Albanese filed another application, but it had the same
7 deficiencies as the first, so Judge Hoffman denied it, too.¹² He gave her one more chance to file a
8 completed pauper application or pay the full \$400 filing and warned her that failure to do so by
9 July 17, 2017, would result in his recommendation that this case be dismissed.¹³

10 That deadline came and went, and Albanese did not file another pauper application—let
11 alone a completed one.¹⁴ True to his word, Judge Hoffman recommends that I dismiss this
12 case.¹⁵ Ms. Albanese objects to the recommendation, arguing that “a [sic] empty envelope
13 arrived at [her] address from [this court] about 3 months ago” and she had “sent it to the F.B.I.
14 for finger print [sic] analysis.”¹⁶ She believes that the allegedly empty envelope was supposed to
15 contain her pauper application. Accepting Albanese’s story as true, I will give her one final
16 opportunity to file a completed pauper application.

17 Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that Albanese’s objection [ECF No. 7] to
18 Magistrate Judge Hoffman’s report and recommendation [ECF No. 6] is **SUSTAINED and the**
19 **report and recommendation is REJECTED.**

20
21 ¹⁰ ECF No. 1-1.

22 ¹¹ ECF No. 3.

23 ¹² ECF No. 5.

24 ¹³ *Id.*

25 ¹⁴ *See generally* docket report case no. 2:17-cv-01520-JAD-CWH.

26 ¹⁵ ECF No. 6.

27 ¹⁶ ECF No. 7.

