

FILED

SEP 30 2009

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

NANCY MAYER WHITTINGTON, CLERK  
U.S. DISTRICT COURT

LLOYD BELL,

Plaintiff,

v.

JILL R. GRANT,

Defendant.

Civil Action No. 09 1868

**MEMORANDUM OPINION**

This matter comes before the Court on review of plaintiff's *pro se* complaint and application to proceed *in forma pauperis*. The application will be granted, but the complaint will be dismissed.

Plaintiff alleges that Dr. Jill Grant engaged in a criminal conspiracy by prescribing medication for the treatment of plaintiff's mental illness with knowledge of its objectionable side affects. *See* Compl. at 2. Plaintiff "is seeking restitutional punishment money for the crimes exposed in this complaint" in the amount of \$1 million. *Id.* at 3.

Generally, "in the criminal context, the Supreme Court has refused to imply a private right of action in 'a bare criminal statute.'" *Prunte v. Universal Music Group*, 484 F. Supp. 2d 32, 42 (D.D.C. 2006) (quoting *Cort v. Ash*, 422 U.S. 66, 79-80 (1975)). The criminal statute on which plaintiff appears to rely, 18 U.S.C. § 241, does not create a private right of action. *See Ibrahim v. Latham & Watkins*, No. 09-0732, 2009 WL 1076695 (D.D.C. Apr. 22, 2009) (dismissing criminal conspiracy claim on the ground that "[o]nly the federal government can bring an action for criminal conspiracy under 18 U.S.C. § 241"), *aff'd*, No. 09-7048, 2009 WL 2762198 (D.C. Cir. Aug. 28, 2009).

The Court will dismiss this action because the complaint fails to state a claim upon which relief can be granted. *See* 28 U.S.C. §§ 1915(e)(2)(B)(ii), 1915A(b)(1).

An Order consistent with this Memorandum Opinion is issued separately.

Date:

9/24/09

E/Lea S. Hinkle  
United States District Judge