

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

**FILED**

AUG - 1 2013

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

LARBI SEMIANI, )  
)  
Plaintiff, )  
)  
v. )  
)  
U.S. DEPARTMENT OF STATE, )  
)  
Defendant. )

Civil Action No.

13-1180

**MEMORANDUM OPINION**

This matter comes before the court on review of plaintiff's application to proceed *in forma pauperis* and *pro se* civil complaint. The Court will grant the application and dismiss the complaint.

Plaintiff alleges, in vague and conclusory language, assorted violations of his "rights to life in peace, liberty and security[.]" for which he demands compensatory damages and other relief. Compl. at 3 (page numbers designated by the court). Insofar as plaintiff bases his claims on provisions of the criminal code, *see id.*, his claims must be dismissed. There is no private right of action under the statutes plaintiff cites. *See Banks v. Kramer*, No. 09-5140, 2009 WL 5526780, at \*1 (D.C. Cir. Dec. 30, 2009) (per curiam) ("Appellant alleges violations of 18 U.S.C. §§ 1001, 1503, 1505, 1621, and 241, but there is no private right of action under these criminal statutes."), *cert. denied*, 131 S. Ct. 480 (2010); *Moreno v. Curry*, No. 06-11277, 2007


N

4

WL 4467580 (5th Cir. Dec. 20, 2007) (per curiam) (affirming dismissal of claims under 18 U.S.C. §§ 1503, 1506, and 1511 because they do not provide for a private cause of action); *Hamilton v. Reed*, 29 F. App'x 202, 204 (6th Cir. 2002) (concluding that district court properly dismissed plaintiff's complaint because it failed to state a claim for relief under 18 U.S.C. §§ 1505, 1506, and 1509), *cert. denied*, 536 U.S. 971 (2002); *Lopez v. Kora*, No. 3:12-cv-0510-M, 2012 WL 1242376, at \*2 (N.D. Tex. Apr. 12, 2012) (adopting Magistrate Report and Recommendation to dismiss claim because "there is no private cause of action under the Crime Victims Rights Act, 18 U.S.C. § 3771").

Accordingly, the Court will dismiss the complaint. An Order consistent with this Memorandum Opinion is issued separately.

DATE: 7/24/13

  
United States District Judge