

JUN - 8 2010

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

monitors inside the secret CIA headquarter location beneath the basement of the DeKalb police department” the CIA and police “orders confidential informants . . . to secretly contact then pay \$ money and many kilos of cocaine to all CIA staff and confidential informants . . . in order to eventually cause [his] death by cyanide poison through the conformity to the CIA in Arlington, Virginia” Compl. at 1. Such allegations, part of a rambling, disjointed, and nearly incoherent string of phrases, are typical of the 56 complaints submitted for filing. In summary, the allegations in the complaints indicate that Muhammad believes several persons in the CIA and DeKalb police department and those working with them as confidential informants watch and follow him, have invaded his personal mental and physical space, have besmirched his character, and are trying to kill him. In several of the complaints, he demands “a total sum amount of 1,275 centrillion dollars in one lump sum to be issued to [him] immediately after the verdict in [his] favor, [by] the presiding federal judge on that same day.” The factual allegations in these complaints repeat allegations made in prior filings by the plaintiff, all of which have been dismissed immediately as frivolous.²

These complaints, both individually and as a whole, describe fantastic and delusional scenarios. As such, they are subject to immediate dismissal as frivolous. *See Neitzke v. Williams*, 490 U.S. 319, 328 (1989); *Best v. Kelly*, 39 F.3d 328, 330-31 (D.C. Cir. 1994). Accordingly, these consolidated complaints will be dismissed with prejudice. The plaintiff has a history of filing frivolous complaints, which result in an unwarranted consumption of judicial resources. He has been warned previously that if he persisted in filing frivolous actions, the

² See Civil Action Nos. 06-2193, 07-75, 07-76, 07-77, 07-78, 07-96, 07-145, 07-146, 09-980, 09-1046 (dismissing seven consolidated complaints), 09-1643.

Court could limit or deny his ability to proceed without prepayment of fees. *See Order, Muhammad v. The Governor to the CIA of Illinois et al.*, Civil Action No. 09-1046 (D.D.C. May 18, 2009). Accordingly, the plaintiff will be required to show cause in writing why he should not be barred prospectively from filing without prepayment of the filing fee.

A separate, related order accompanies this memorandum opinion.

Date:

5/27/10


United States District Judge