

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

FILED

JAN - 9 2013

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

Don E. Jones,)
)
Plaintiff,)
)
v.)
)
Department of Justice)
Drug Enforcement Administration *et al.*)
)
)
Defendants.)

Civil Action No. **13 0029**

MEMORANDUM OPINION


This matter is before the Court on its initial review of plaintiff's *pro se* complaint and application for leave to proceed *in forma pauperis*. Pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e), the Court is required to dismiss a complaint upon a determination that it, among other grounds, is frivolous. 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B)(i).

Plaintiff is a District of Columbia resident suing the U.S. Drug Enforcement Administration, Secret Service, Central Intelligence Agency, and Federal Bureau of Investigations. He states that “[t]his complaint is for illegal surveillance and illegal human experimentation [sic] by corrupt government agencies as discribed [sic] in the report surveillanceissues.com.” Compl. at 2. Plaintiff alleges, *inter alia*, that since January 2007, he has been “connected to a recruiting satellite radio signal which is used for recruiting agents to work undercover and in intelligence.” *Id.* The complaint continues in this vein for three more pages and concludes with plaintiff’s demand for \$1 trillion and “employment” with the listed defendant agencies. *Id.* at 6.

N

3

The complaint presents the very type of fantastic or delusional scenarios warranting dismissal of the case under § 1915(e) as frivolous. *See Neitzke v. Williams*, 490 U.S. 319, 325 (1989); *Best v. Kelly*, 39 F.3d 328, 330-31 (D.C. Cir. 1994). Furthermore, complaints that lack “an arguable basis in law and fact” are, too, subject to dismissal as frivolous. *Brandon v. District of Columbia Bd. of Parole*, 734 F.2d 56, 59 (D.C. Cir. 1984); *see Crisafi v. Holland*, 655 F.2d 1305, 1307-08 (D.C. Cir. 1981) (“A court may dismiss as frivolous complaints reciting bare legal conclusions with no suggestion of supporting facts, or postulating events and circumstances of a wholly fanciful kind.”). A separate Order of dismissal accompanies this Memorandum Opinion.


United States District Judge

Date: January 3, 2013