UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA FILED MAY 14 2013 Clerk, U.S. District and Exercise piccy Courts v. Civil Action No.

MEMORANDUM OPINION

Harp Twins Management,

Defendant.

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 case will be dismissed pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B)(ii) (requiring dismissal of a case upon a determination that the complaint fails to state a claim upon which relief may be granted).

Plaintiff, a homeless individual who submitted more than 30 cryptic complaints within the first two weeks of March alone, sues a private company in Huntley, Illinois, purportedly under the Americans with Disabilities Act ("ADA"), 42 U.S.C. § 12101 *et seq*. The complaint "is a denial of a price quote and service of seeing a live performance of the Harp Twins." Compl. at 1.

A plaintiff's "allegations must be enough to raise a right to relief above the speculative level" *Bell Atlantic Corp. v. Twombly*, 550 U.S. 544, 555 (2007) (citations omitted); *see Aktieselskabet AF 21. Nov. 2001 v. Fame Jeans, Inc.*, 525 F.3d 8, 16 n.4 (D.C. Cir. 2008) ("We have never accepted 'legal conclusions cast in the form of factual allegations' because a

complaint needs some information about the circumstances giving rise to the claims.") (quoting Kowal v. MCI Commc'ns Corp., 16 F.3d 1271, 1276 (D.C. Cir. 1994)). Plaintiff has stated no facts to support an ADA claim. Even if he had, such a claim is properly brought in the judicial district where the alleged unlawful practice occurred or where the relevant records are maintained and administered, which appears in this case to be a federal district court in Illinois.

See 42 U.S.C. § 12117(a) (incorporating Title VII's enforcement procedures set forth at 42 U.S.C. § 2000e-5(f)(3). A separate Order of dismissal accompanies this Memorandum Opinion.

Date: May ________, 2013

United States District Judge