

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA**

JOHN JERMAINE JACKSON,)	
)	
Plaintiff,)	
)	2:18-cv-00766
v.)	
)	
DUNKEN DONUTS, et al.,)	
)	
Defendants.)	

MEMORANDUM OPINION

Mark R. Hornak, United States District Judge

The Plaintiff seeks *in forma pauperis* status, and has filed a Complaint against a Dunkin' Donuts shop located in this District. The Plaintiff lives in Wisconsin. The papers filed by the Plaintiff are out of the ordinary, are replete mostly with Biblical references, and don't clearly demonstrate a factual basis for *in forma pauperis* status. Nonetheless, the Court will give the Plaintiff the benefit of the doubt on that issue, and such status is granted.

Pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §§ 1915, 1915A, the Court is obligated to do a "screening" review of the Complaint, and is to dismiss the action if the Complaint does not plausibly state a claim for relief, giving due account for the pro se status of the Plaintiff. The Court has done so.

Even giving the Plaintiff the most generous benefit of the doubt in applying that standard, the Court is compelled to conclude that the Complaint cannot get over that bar. The Complaint makes multiple references to the application of "God's Law", and the tension between that "Law" and the "law of man". It also makes a very, very generalized reference to some sort of images appearing on YouTube, without any attribution to any Defendant, or anyone in particular. The long and the short of it is that the Complaint does not remotely plausibly state any claim for relief under the law, nor does it provide any basis for the Court to conclude that any effort to amend would not

be futile. Thus, there is no basis to grant leave to amend, and since this case does not appear to be based on the violation of any sort of civil rights law, there is no basis to stretch that principal even further to permit such an amendment even in such circumstances. *See Grayson v. Mayview State Hosp.*, 293 F. 3d 103 (3d Cir. 2002).

Based on the Court's review of the Complaint, the Court concludes that it does not state a plausible claim for relief, and that any effort at amendment would be futile. The action is dismissed with prejudice. The Clerk shall close the case.



Mark R. Hornak
United States District Judge

Dated: June 12, 2018

cc: All counsel of record