

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

FILED

MAY 17 2010

**Clerk, U.S. District & Bankruptcy
Courts for the District of Columbia**

Nathaniel Agosta Hinds,

Plaintiff,

v.

Fich Bacanmore *et al.*,

Defendants.

Civil Action No. **10 0813**


MEMORANDUM OPINION

This matter is before the Court on plaintiff's *pro se* complaint and application to proceed *in forma pauperis*. The Court will grant plaintiff's application and dismiss the complaint for lack of subject matter jurisdiction.

The subject matter jurisdiction of the federal district courts is limited and is set forth generally at 28 U.S.C. §§ 1331 and 1332. Under those statutes, federal jurisdiction is available only when a "federal question" is presented or the parties are of diverse citizenship and the amount in controversy exceeds \$75,000. A party seeking relief in the district court must at least plead facts that bring the suit within the court's jurisdiction. *See* Fed. R. Civ. P. 8(a). Failure to plead such facts warrants dismissal of the action. *See* Fed. R. Civ. P. 12(h)(3).

Plaintiff, a resident of the District of Columbia, sues an individual listed as either working or residing in the District, as well as the State of Maryland, the federal government and a local union based in Lanham, Maryland, for fraud. The complaint does not present a federal question and does not provide a basis for diversity jurisdiction because the plaintiff and at least

one defendant “reside” in the same state and no amount in controversy is pleaded. A separate Order of dismissal accompanies this Memorandum Opinion.


United States District Judge

Date: May 17, 2010