UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

FILED

JAN 2 5 2012

		TO EDIE
Tyrone Julius,)	Clerk, U.S. District & Bankruptcy Courts for the District of Columbia
Plaintiff,)	
V.) Civil Action	1No. 12 0125
G.A. Leak,)	
Defendant.	<i>)</i>)	

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. *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, a District of Columbia resident, sues another District of Columbia resident for \$999 billion in damages. The complaint, lacking any cogent facts, neither presents a federal question nor provides a basis for diversity jurisdiction because the parties are not of diverse citizenship. A separate Order of dismissal accompanies this Memorandum Opinion.

DATE: January <u>1</u>, 2012

United States District Judge

3