FILED

1:32 pm Nov 06 2018 Clerk U.S. District Court Northern District of Ohio

Cleveland

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT NORTHERN DISTRICT OF OHIO EASTERN DIVISION

ROBERT GRASSO,) CASE NO. 1:18 CV 1580
Plaintiff,) JUDGE DAN AARON POLSTER
VS.)
	MEMORANDUM OF OPINION
AMER. MED. ASSO.,	AND ORDER
)
Defendant.)

Pro se Plaintiff Robert Grasso filed this action against the "Amer. Med. Asso.," which presumably is the American Medical Association. Plaintiff's Complaint (Doc. # 1) is entirely incomprehensible. He seeks one million dollars in damages.

Plaintiff also filed an Application to Proceed *In Forma Pauperis* (Doc. #2). That Application is granted.

Although *pro se* pleadings are liberally construed, *Boag v. MacDougall*, 454 U.S. 364, 365 (1982) (per curiam); *Haines v. Kerner*, 404 U.S. 519, 520 (1972), the Court is required to dismiss an *in forma pauperis* action under 28 U.S.C. §1915(e) if it fails to state a claim upon which relief can be granted, or if it lacks an arguable basis in law or fact. *Neitzke v. Williams*, 490 U.S. 319 (1989); *Lawler v. Marshall*, 898 F.2d 1196 (6th Cir. 1990); *Sistrunk v. City of Strongsville*, 99 F.3d 194, 197 (6th Cir. 1996). An action has no arguable basis in law when a Defendant is immune from suit or when a Plaintiff claims a violation of a legal interest which

clearly does not exist. *Neitzke*, 490 U.S. at 327. An action has no arguable factual basis when the allegations are delusional or rise to the level of the irrational or "wholly incredible." *Denton* v. *Hernandez*, 504 U.S. 25, 32 (1992); *Lawler*, 898 F.2d at 1199.

When determining whether the Plaintiff has stated a claim upon which relief can be granted, the Court must construe the Complaint in the light most favorable to the Plaintiff, accept all factual allegations as true, and determine whether the Complaint contains "enough facts to state a claim to relief that is plausible on its face." *Bell Atl. Corp. v. Twombly*, 550 U.S. 544, 555 (2007); *Ashcroft v. Iqbal*, 556 U.S. 662, 677-78 (2009). The Plaintiff's obligation to provide the grounds for relief "requires more than labels and conclusions, and a formulaic recitation of the elements of a cause of action will not do." *Twombly*, 550 U.S. at 555.

Although a Complaint need not contain detailed factual allegations, its "factual allegations must be enough to raise a right to relief above the speculative level on the assumption that all the allegations in the Complaint are true." *Id.* The Court is "not bound to accept as true a legal conclusion couched as a factual allegation." *Papasan v. Allain*, 478 U.S. 265, 286 (1986).

Plaintiff's Complaint does not meet this minimum pleading standard. It does not contain discernable, coherent facts, nor does it provide any indication of a plausible legal claim Plaintiff may be attempting to assert. Plaintiff fails to state a claim upon which relief may be granted.

IV. CONCLUSION

Accordingly, this action is **DISMISSED** pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e). The Court certifies, pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915(a)(3), that an appeal from this decision could not be taken in good faith.¹

IT IS SO ORDERED.

s/Dan Aaron Polster 11/6/2018

DAN AARON POLSTER

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

An appeal may not be taken *in forma pauperis* if the trial court certifies that it is not taken in good faith.

¹ 28 U.S.C. § 1915(a)(3) provides: