

APR - 2 2019

JULIA C. DUDLEY, CLERK  
BY: *[Signature]*  
DEPUTY CLERK

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF VIRGINIA  
ABINGDON DIVISION

**WILLIAM LEE GRANT II,**

Plaintiff,

v.

**JOINT CHIEFS OF STAFF,**

Defendant.

Case No. 1:19CV 13

**WILLIAM LEE GRANT II,**

Plaintiff,

v.

**GREGORY K. HARRIS, ET AL.,**

Defendants.

Case No. 1:19CV 14

**WILLIAM LEE GRANT II,**

Plaintiff,

v.

**GREGORY K. HARRIS, ET AL.,**

Defendants.

Case No. 1:19CV 15

## OPINION AND ORDER

*William Lee Grant II, Springfield, Virginia, Pro Se Plaintiff.*

The plaintiff has submitted applications to proceed in forma pauperis in order to file three separate civil actions. I will grant the applications but dismiss the complaints sua sponte as frivolous under 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B).

While I must consider pro se filings liberally, the present complaints state no recognizable causes of action and instead “describ[e] fantastic or delusional scenarios, claims with which federal district judges are all too familiar.” *Neitzke v. Williams*, 490 U.S. 319, 328 (1989). To quote one recent federal court decision: “Plaintiff is a serial filer of frivolous litigation in various federal courts across the country, . . . . the vast majority of [P]laintiff’s cases [of which the Court is aware] have been dismissed as frivolous under 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e).” *Grant v. U.S. Dep’t of Transp.*, No. 4:18-CV-00444-ALM-CAN, 2019 WL 1009408, at \*1 (E.D. Tex. Jan. 28, 2019), *R. & R. adopted*, No. 4:18-CV-444, 2019 WL 1003641 (E.D. Tex. Mar. 1, 2019) (quoting *Grant v. U.S. Dep’t of Transp.*, No. 1:18-cv-00457-TSE-TCB (E.D. Va. May 1, 2018), *appeal dismissed as frivolous*, *Grant v. U.S. Dep’t of Transp.*, 740 F. App’x 333 (4th Cir. 2018) (unpublished).

Accordingly, it is **ORDERED** that the motions to proceed in forma pauperis are GRANTED, and the Complaints are DISMISSED.

The Clerk shall close the cases.

ENTER: April 2, 2019

/s/ James P. Jones

United States District Judge