•	NITED STATES DISTRICT COURT OR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA	
1	OK THE DISTINCT OF COLUMNIA	FILED
		AUG 2 0 2010
Tamica R. Whitaker,)	Clerk, U.S. District & Bankruptcy Courts for the District of Columbia
Plaintiff,)	
v.) Civil Action No.	10 1410
Shantell L. Whitaker,)	
Defendant.)	

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 another District of Columbia resident for an alleged debt of \$3,500. The complaint neither presents a federal question nor provides a basis for diversity jurisdiction because the parties are not of diverse citizenship and the amount in controversy is well below the jurisdictional minimum. Plaintiff's recourse lies, if

at all, in the Superior Court of the District of Columbia. A separate Order of dismissal accompanies this Memorandum Opinion.

Gluby Kessler United States District Judge

Date: August 12, 2010

2