## UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

		-		
Cleri	k, U.S.	Dis	trict	and
Ва	nkrupi	tcv (	Court	ts

GERALD LEE SCHULTZ,	)
Plaintiff,	)
v.	) Civil Action No. /3-/908
PRESIDENT BARACK OBAMA, et al.,	)
Defendants.	<i>)</i>

## MEMORANDUM OPINION

This matter is before the Court on review of the plaintiff's application to proceed in forma pauperis and pro se civil complaint.

Plaintiff alleges that the President of the United States, every Cabinet secretary, and presumably every member of the United States Congress are responsible not only for the country's debt, see Compl. at 56, but also acts of terrorism on the citizens in the form of chemical weapons, hatred, fear and tyranny, among others. See id. at 57. Plaintiff demands impeachment of the President, replacement of those currently holding seats in the United States Congress, and restitution of \$ 2 billion "payable through the U.S. treasury to the plaintiff." Id. at 59. Notwithstanding the Court's obligation to construe a *pro se* complaint liberally, *see Haines* v. Kerner, 404 U.S. 519, 520 (1972), the Court has "not only the authority to dismiss a claim based on an indisputably meritless legal theory, but also the unusual power to pierce the veil of the complaint's factual allegations and dismiss those claims whose factual contentions are clearly baseless." Neitzke v. Williams, 490 U.S. 319, 327 (1989). Plaintiff's claims are indeed frivolous.

Furthermore, plaintiff's general displeasure with the executive and legislative branches of

the federal government does not amount to an injury in fact to satisfy the requirement of standing

to sue. See Valley Forge Christian Coll. v. Americans United for Separation of Church and

State, Inc., 454 U.S. 464, 485-86 (1982); Moore v. U.S. Congress, No.13-cv-1744, 2013 WL

4041993, at \*3 (concluding that plaintiff's "generalized grievance" against Congress "which

might be shared in substantially equal measure by all or a large class of citizens," does not

establish that she suffered an "injury in fact")

An Order consistent with this Memorandum Opinion is issued separately.

United States District Judge

DATE: MN.8, 2013

2