

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

**FILED**  
JUL 29 2009  
Clerk, U.S. District and  
Bankruptcy Courts

Deborah-Denise Dubose,

Plaintiff,

v.

Mayor Adrian Fenty

Defendant.

:  
:  
:  
:  
:  
:  
:  
:  
:  
:

Civil Action No. **09 1405**

MEMORANDUM OPINION

The plaintiff has filed a *pro se* complaint and an application to proceed *in forma pauperis*. The Court will grant the application to proceed *in forma pauperis* and dismiss the complaint.

Plaintiff, who lists a Washington D.C. address on the complaint, seeks to have several of her records, such as her birth certificate, local taxes, local school records, and the like “placed under Privacy Act.” Compl. at 1.

Unlike state courts of general jurisdiction, federal district courts have limited jurisdiction. A federal district court has jurisdiction in civil actions arising under the Constitution, laws or treaties of the United States. *See* 28 U.S.C. § 1331. Here, however, the complaint concerns records that are not maintained by federal agencies and the application of what is presumed to be a non-federal law. Such concerns do not involve claims that arise under the Constitution or the laws or treaties of the United States.

A federal district court also has jurisdiction over civil actions in matters where the controversy exceeds \$75,000 and is between citizens of different states. *See* 28 C.F.R. §1332(a).

But here it appears that both parties are citizens of the District of Columbia, and the plaintiff does not identify an amount in controversy. Accordingly, the Court will dismiss the complaint, without prejudice, for lack of subject matter jurisdiction.

A separate order accompanies this memorandum opinion.

Date: 7/24/09

  
United States District Judge