

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

JESSE RILES,

Plaintiff,

v.

TIMOTHY GEITHNER, Secretary,
United States Department of the Treasury,
et al.,

Defendants.

Civil Action No. 09-1329 (PLF)

MEMORANDUM OPINION

This matter is before the Court on *pro se* plaintiff Jesse Riles' complaint for damages and injunctive relief and motion for a preliminary injunction. This is the second time Mr. Riles has sought relief from this Court. On February 4, 2009, Mr. Riles filed a complaint and a motion for a preliminary injunction which differed little, if at all, from the complaint and motion for a preliminary injunction currently before the Court. On July 2, 2009, the Court issued a Memorandum Opinion in which it concluded that the claims set forth in Mr. Riles' first complaint – all of which stemmed from his belief that the government was using advanced technology to read his thoughts – were obviously frivolous. See *Riles v. Geithner*, Civil Action No. 09-0214, 2009 WL 1886214, at *2 (D.D.C. July 2, 2009). The Court therefore dismissed Mr. Riles' complaint for lack of subject matter jurisdiction pursuant to Rule 12(b)(1) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure. See *id.*; see also *Watson v. United States*, Civil Action No. 09-0268, 2009 WL 377136, at *1 (D.D.C. Feb. 13, 2009) (“[F]ederal courts are without power to

entertain claims otherwise within their jurisdiction if they are so attenuated and unsubstantial as to be absolutely devoid of merit, . . . wholly insubstantial, [or] obviously frivolous[.]”) (quoting *Hagans v. Lavine*, 415 U.S. 528, 536-37 (1974)) (internal quotation marks and citations omitted).

Because Mr. Riles’ complaint in this case is identical in all relevant respects to the complaint in his first case, the Court will dismiss it *sua sponte* for lack of subject matter jurisdiction. In addition, because it appears that Mr. Riles intends to continue clogging this Court’s docket with meritless complaints and motions, the Court will bar him from filing any future cases asserting claims identical to (or substantially similar to) the claims asserted in this case or the claims asserted in his previous case, Civil Action No. 09-0214.

An Order consistent with this Memorandum Opinion will issue this same day.

SO ORDERED.

/s/ _____
PAUL L. FRIEDMAN
United States District Judge

DATE: July 21, 2009