



committed”).

Plaintiff now demands “injunctive relief . . . in the form of an order enjoining the defendant[] [from] requiring him to pay initial filing fees, and collecting monthly payments” from his prison trust account, as well as the “return [of] all funds collected pursuant to the PLRA.” Compl. at 1. Because the PLRA does not apply to him, plaintiff contends that “the Fourth Circuits’ [sic] rule requiring him to sign and file the authorization consent forms” pursuant to the PLRA is improper. *Id.* at 2. The Court presumes that plaintiff’s reference to the Fourth Circuit pertains to its recent decision to deny his petition for a writ of mandamus “seeking an order directing the district court to return any monies taken from [his] institutional inmate trust fund account and cease taking money via consent form.” *In re Wattleton*, \_\_ F. App’x \_\_, \_\_, 2013 WL 3929099, at \*1 (4th Cir. July 31, 2013) (per curiam) (internal quotation marks omitted). Plaintiff thus appears to challenge the Fourth Circuit’s ruling, a matter over which this Court lacks jurisdiction. *See* 28 U.S.C. §§ 1331, 1332 (general jurisdictional provisions); *Fleming v. United States*, 847 F. Supp. 170, 172 (D.D.C. 1994), *aff’d*, 1994 WL 474995 (D.C. Cir. July 27, 1994) (per curiam), *cert. denied* 513 U.S. 1150 (1995).

An Order is issued separately.

  
United States District Judge

DATE:

8/21/13