

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

FILED

FEB 10 2015

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

ABDULLAH-HANEEF IBN-SADIKA,

Plaintiff,

v.

ERIC HOLDER, *et al.*,

Defendants.

Civil Action No. 14-1880

MEMORANDUM OPINION


This matter is before the Court on the plaintiff's application to proceed *in forma pauperis* and her *pro se* civil complaint. The application will be granted, and the complaint will be dismissed as frivolous.

The plaintiff posits that he "was fraudulently induced as a child into the Social Security . . . Contract while a twelve (12) year old minor by an SSA employee . . . without benefit of the presence or authorizing-signature thereof of a parent, guardian or a lawyer." Compl. ¶ 5. Stemming from this act, he alleges, "the estate of the Plaintiff has been conveyed, transferred, assigned, delivered, or paid to the Alien Property Custodian or seized by him . . . based upon unconscionable/unilateral contract(s) that were terminated" by the plaintiff. *Id.* ¶ 6. As a result, defendants allegedly "continue to imprison Plaintiff and seize/use Plaintiff's said estate without 'fair consideration' and/or 'just compensation' in violation of Due Process of Law," among other provisions of the United States Constitution. *Id.* ¶ 7. Notwithstanding the plaintiff's demands for payment, defendants allegedly refuse to return to him the fair market value of his estate. *See*

id. ¶¶ 10-15. The plaintiff demands a declaratory judgment and an award in the “total amount of Plaintiff’s . . . estate.” *Id.* at 5.

The complaint is replete with baseless factual contentions and references to statutes having no apparent relevance to the claim the plaintiff purportedly raises. The Court concludes, therefore, that this action must be dismissed. *See Neitzke v. Williams*, 490 U.S. 319, 327 (1989) (noting judges’ authority not only “to dismiss a claim based on an indisputably meritless legal theory, but also . . . to pierce the veil of the complaint’s factual allegations and dismiss those claims whose factual contentions are clearly baseless”). An Order consistent with this Memorandum Opinion is issued separately.

DATE: 2/9/2015


United States District Judge