FC	OR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMI	FILED
Dawn Norman,)	AUG 2 3 2011 Clerk, U.S. District & Bankruptcy Courts for the District of Columbia
Plaintiff,)	
v.) Civil	Action No.
Boneca Norman et al.,)	

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

MEMORANDUM OPINION

11 1519

Defendants.

This matter is before the Court on review of plaintiff's *pro se* complaint and application to proceed *in forma pauperis*. The application will be granted and the complaint will be dismissed for lack of subject matter jurisdiction. *See* Fed. R. Civ. P. 12(h)(3) (requiring the court to dismiss an action "at any time" it determines that subject matter jurisdiction is wanting).

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).

Plaintiff is a resident of Richmond, Virginia, suing individuals mostly in Virginia. *See*Compl. Caption. She seeks "[d]amages of zillion plus." *Id.* The cryptic complaint neither presents a federal question nor provides a basis for diversity jurisdiction because the plaintiff and

most of the defendants reside in the same state. It therefore will be dismissed. A separate Order accompanies this Memorandum Opinion.

DATE: August **20**11

United States District Judge