

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

_____)	
Pauletta Higgins,)	
)	
Plaintiff,)	
)	
v.)	Case: 1:14-cv-02091
)	Assigned To : Unassigned
D.C. Civil Actions Small Claims,)	Assign. Date : 12/12/2014
)	Description: Pro Se Gen. Civil
Defendant.)	
_____)	

MEMORANDUM OPINION

This matter is before the Court on review of the 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 is a District of Columbia resident. She sues the Small Claims and Conciliation Branch of the Superior Court of the District of Columbia for allegedly refusing to file her “legal paper base[d] on facts of abuse of discretion [sic].” Not. of Compl.; *see* Compl. Attachments (Superior Court forms). The D.C. Superior Court is an entity within the District of Columbia that cannot be sued in its own name. *See Kundrat v. District of Columbia*, 106 F. Supp. 2d 1, 4-8 (D.D.C. 2000). In addition, plaintiff has not alleged sufficient facts or requested any relief to warrant substituting the District of Columbia as the proper defendant. *See* Fed. R. Civ. P. 8(a) (requiring complaints to contain “(1) a short and plain statement of the grounds for the court's jurisdiction[,] (2) a short and plain statement of the claim showing that the pleader is entitled to

N

3

relief[,] and (3) a demand for the relief sought”); *Ashcroft v. Iqbal*, 556 U.S. 662, 678 (2009) (a complaint must contain “more than an unadorned, the-defendant-unlawfully-harmed-me accusation”) (citing *Bell Atlantic Corp. v. Twombly*, 550 U.S. 544, 555 (2007)); *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)). Hence, this case will be dismissed. A separate Order accompanies this Memorandum Opinion.

Date: December 5, 2014


United States District Judge