

FILED

MAY 3 1 2012

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

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

_____)	
William Hugh Collington,)	
)	
Plaintiff,)	
)	
v.)	Civil Action No. 12 0879
)	
Department of Human Resources <i>et al.</i> ,)	
)	
Defendants.)	
_____)	

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 is a District of Columbia resident suing an employee of the District's Department of Human Resources for \$35 in damages "for [] personal injury and mentasl [sic] anguish." Compl. at 3. The complaint is based on an alleged exchange between plaintiff and the employee when plaintiff asked "why \$16 [] worth of food stamps were not on my food stamp card." *Id.* at 1. Allegedly, the employee, who was plaintiff's case manager, "said loudly you

better not point at my computer and then stood up and hit [plaintiff] with a close [sic] fist in the face.” *Id.* The complaint neither presents a federal question nor asserts or pleads facts reflecting diversity jurisdiction. A separate Order of dismissal accompanies this Memorandum Opinion.



United States District Judge

Date: May 23, 2012