

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF OKLAHOMA**

Brud Rossmann,

Plaintiff,

v.

Anthony Scaramucci, John Does 1-3,

Defendants.

Case No. 16-CIV-412-RAW

---

**OPINION AND ORDER**

Before the court are Plaintiff's Complaint [Docket No. 2] and Motion for Leave to Proceed in Forma Pauperis ("IFP") [Docket No. 3]. The motion for IFP is granted. Plaintiff filed this lawsuit against the Defendants alleging Defendant Scaramucci defrauded Plaintiff.

The court construes Plaintiff's allegations liberally as he is pro se. See *Haines v. Kerner*, 404 U.S. 519 (1972). The Complaint, however, alleges that Plaintiff was an honors graduate from Harvard Law School and former decorated Trial Attorney of the U.S. Department of Justice [Complaint, Page 2]. Plaintiff's arguments, throughout the Complaint, are "completely lacking in legal merit and patently frivolous." *Lonsdale v. United States*, 919 F.2d 1440, 1448 (10<sup>th</sup> Cir. 1990).

**28 U.S.C. § 1915**

Section 1915 of the United States Code, Title 28, states as follows:

(2) Notwithstanding any filing fee, or any portion thereof, that may have

been paid, the court shall dismiss the case at any time if the court determines that–

**(B)** the action or appeal--

**(i)** is frivolous or malicious;

**(ii)** fails to state a claim on which relief may be granted; or

**(iii)** seeks monetary relief against a defendant who is immune from such relief.

28 U.S.C.A. § 1915(e)(2).

A complaint is frivolous “where it lacks an arguable basis either in law or in fact.” Further, the term frivolous “embraces not only the inarguable legal conclusion, but also the fanciful factual allegation.” *Neitzke v. Williams*, 490 U.S. 319, 325 (1989). A plaintiff is not required to make out a perfect case in their complaint. Rather, “It suffices for him to state claims that are rationally related to the existing law and the credible factual allegations.” *Lemmons v. Law Firm of Morris and Morris*, 39 F.3d 264 (10<sup>th</sup> Cir. 1994). In the instant case, the court finds there is no cognizable claim under the statutes cited by Plaintiff.

### **Sua Sponte Dismissal**

“Sua sponte dismissals are generally disfavored by the courts.” *Banks v. Vio Software*, 275 Fed.Appx. 800 (10<sup>th</sup> Circ. 2008). A court shall dismiss a case at any time, however, if the court determines that the action fails to state a claim on which relief may be granted, or seeks monetary relief against a defendant who is immune from such relief. 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B)(ii) and (iii).

Indeed, the Tenth Circuit Court of Appeals has stated that a district court is required to dismiss an IFP claim that is frivolous or malicious, fails to state a claim on which relief may be granted, or seeks monetary relief against a defendant who is immune from such relief. *Trujillo v. Williams*, 465 F.3d 1210, 1216 n.5 (10<sup>th</sup> Cir. 2006).

A complaint “must contain sufficient factual matter, accepted as true, to ‘state a claim to relief that is plausible on its face.’” *Ashcroft v. Iqbal*, 556 U.S. 662, 678 (2009) (quoting *Bell Atlantic Corp. v. Twombly*, 550 U.S. 544, 570 (2007)); see also *Hill v. Lappin*, 630 F.3d 468, 470-71 (“dismissal standard articulated in *Iqbal* and *Twombly* governs dismissals for failure to state a claim” under §§ 1915A(b)(1) and 1915(e)(2)(B)(ii). “A claim has facial plausibility when the plaintiff pleads factual content that allows the court to draw the reasonable inference that the defendant is liable for the misconduct alleged.” *Iqbal*, 556 U.S. at 678 (citing *Twombly*, 550 U.S. at 556). The court must accept all well-pleaded factual allegations as true, but need not “accept as true a legal conclusion couched as a factual allegation.” *Twombly*, 550 U.S. at 555 (quoting *Papasan v. Allain*, 478 U.S. 265, 286 (1986)). A complaint need not contain “detailed factual allegations,” but it must, however, provide “more than an unadorned, the-defendant-unlawfully-harmed-me accusation.” *Iqbal*, 556 U.S. at 678 (citing *Twombly*, 550 U.S. at 555). A pleading that offers “labels and conclusions” or “a formulaic recitation of the elements of a cause of action will not do.” *Twombly*, 550 U.S. at 555. It does not suffice if a complaint provides “naked assertion[s]” devoid of “further factual enhancement.” *Id.* at 557. The complaint must “give the defendant fair notice of what the ...

claim is and the grounds upon which it rests.” Erickson, 551 U.S. at 93 (citations omitted).

The court may sua sponte dismiss an action pursuant to § 1915 when “on the face of the complaint it clearly appears that the action is frivolous or malicious.” Hall v. Bellmon, 935 F.2d 1106, 1108 (10th Cir. 1991). “The term ‘frivolous’ refers to ‘the inarguable legal conclusion’ and ‘the fanciful factual allegation.’” *Id.* (citation omitted). Further, a “trial court may dismiss a claim sua sponte without notice where the claimant cannot possibly win relief.” McKinney v. State of Oklahoma, 925 F.2d 363, 364 (10<sup>th</sup> Cir. 1991).

### **Conclusion**

Plaintiff’s Motion for Leave to Proceed in Forma Pauperis [Docket No. 3] is granted.

The court finds that the allegations listed in the complaint do not create a claim upon which this lawsuit can proceed. The court finds that Plaintiff’s action is frivolous, and that Plaintiff fails to state a claim on which relief can be granted. This matter is dismissed with prejudice.

Dated this 3rd day of October, 2016.



---

HONORABLE RONALD A. WHITE  
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE  
EASTERN DISTRICT OF OKLAHOMA