

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF OHIO
WESTERN DIVISION

Thomas S. Miller,

Case No. 3:14 CV 268

Plaintiff,

MEMORANDUM OPINION
AND ORDER

-vs-

JUDGE JACK ZOUHARY

Ruth Ann Franks, et al.,

Defendants.

Plaintiff's Motion to Proceed *in forma pauperis* (Doc. 2) is granted.

Though pro se filings are liberally construed, *Boag v. MacDougall*, 454 U.S. 364, 365 (1982) (per curiam), this Court must dismiss an *in forma pauperis* action under 28 U.S.C. §1915(e) if it lacks an arguable basis in law or fact. *See McGore v. Wrigglesworth*, 114 F.3d 601, 608–09 (6th Cir. 1997). Thus, Plaintiff Thomas Miller's "Civil COMPLAINT for Illegal Wrongful Imprisonment via Fraud & via Malice & Willful, violations of Plaintiff's U.S. Republic Constitutional Rights" (Doc. 1) must be dismissed.

No purpose would be served by reciting in detail the allegations contained in Plaintiff's Complaint. In short verse, Plaintiff sues various Ohio officials for deprivation of his federal constitutional rights, on the theory that the state officials involved in his conviction for various state-law criminal offenses participated in fraudulent proceedings. Plaintiff alleges, for example, an Ohio court that convicted him lacked subject-matter jurisdiction because "ALL LAWS, TODAY IN AMERICA, ARE COPYRIGHTED 'FOREIGN PROPERTY OF THE BRITISH'" -- apparently

making these laws the property of private British citizens and insufficient to support a criminal conviction in an Ohio court (Doc. 1 at 3, 5). These and other allegations contained in the Complaint are clearly baseless. *Neitzke v. Williams*, 490 U.S. 319, 327 (1989).

The Complaint (Doc. 1) is dismissed with prejudice, and an associated Motion is denied as moot (Doc. 3). This Court certifies, pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915(a)(3), that an appeal could not be taken from this Order of Dismissal in good faith.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

s/ Jack Zouhary
JACK ZOUHARY
U. S. DISTRICT JUDGE

May 9, 2014