

1 HONORABLE RICHARD A. JONES  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6

7 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
8 WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON  
9 AT SEATTLE

10 MEREDITH MCGLOWN,

11 Plaintiff,

12 v.

13 ANN LEWIS, et al.,

14 Defendants.  
15

CASE NO. C17-924 RAJ

ORDER

16 This matter comes before the Court on Plaintiff's motion to appoint counsel, motion for a  
17 petition showing severity of crimes, and motion for sealed health care records. Dkt. ## 5, 10, 11.  
18 For the reasons that follow, the Court **DISMISSES** this case with prejudice, thereby terminating  
19 the pending motions.

20 On June 16, 2017, Plaintiff filed this action against two superior court judges whom  
21 Plaintiff believes to have engaged in terrorism, printing U.S. currency, child sex slave rings, drug  
22 trafficking, fraud, identity theft, and murder. Dkt. # 4 (Complaint). In doing so, Plaintiff  
23 submitted an application to proceed *in forma pauperis*. Dkt. # 1. The Honorable James P.  
24 Donohue granted the application. Dkt. # 3.


25 The Court's authority to grant *in forma pauperis* status derives from 28 U.S.C. § 1915.  
26 The Court is required to dismiss an *in forma pauperis* plaintiff's case if the Court determines that  
27

1 “the action . . . (i) is frivolous or malicious; (ii) fails to state a claim on which relief may be  
2 granted; or (iii) seeks monetary relief against a defendant who is immune from such relief.” 28  
3 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B); *see also See Lopez v. Smith*, 203 F.3d 1122, 1129 (9th Cir. 2000)  
4 (“[S]ection 1915(e) applies to all in forma pauperis complaints, not just those filed by  
5 prisoners.”). A complaint is frivolous if it lacks a basis in law or fact. *Andrews v. King*, 398  
6 F.3d 1113, 1121 (9th Cir. 2005). A complaint fails to state a claim if it does not “state a claim to  
7 relief that is plausible on its face.” *Bell Atl. Corp. v. Twombly*, 550 U.S. 544, 568 (2007).

8 Plaintiff alleges that Defendants denied Plaintiff’s anti-harassment order because  
9 Defendants were involved in illegal behavior. Dkt. # 4 (Complaint). Plaintiff also claims that  
10 her case in front of the Defendants was dismissed because she refused to sign a document  
11 agreeing to pay fees, and she alleges that the U.S. Attorney will track her down and charge her  
12 for such payments. *Id.* Plaintiff further alleges knowledge about terrorist plots and a war  
13 involving Canada. *Id.* Plaintiff asks this Court to reconsider a decision—presumably one made  
14 by Defendants. *Id.* On the whole, Plaintiff’s allegations are conclusory, incomprehensible, and  
15 in disarray. These allegations lack any basis in fact and fail to state a plausible claim for which  
16 any type of relief could be granted by this Court.

17 Taking these allegations as true and construing them liberally, the Court concludes that  
18 Plaintiff’s complaint is frivolous and fails to state a valid claim for relief. The Court  
19 **DISMISSES** Plaintiff’s complaint **without leave to amend**. *Lucas v. Dep’t of Corr.*, 66 F.3d  
20 245, 248 (9th Cir. 1995) (dismissal without leave to amend is proper where “it is absolutely clear  
21 that no amendment can cure the defect”). In doing so, Plaintiff’s remaining motions are **MOOT**.  
22 Dkt. ## 5, 10, 11.

23 Dated this 15th day of August, 2017.

24  
25 

26 The Honorable Richard A. Jones  
27 United States District Judge