

FILED

MAY 26 2015

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

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Audrey Taylor Carter,)
)
Plaintiff,)
)
v.)
)
President George Bush *et al.*)
)
)
Defendants.)

Case: 1:15-cv-00778
Assigned To : Unassigned
Assign. Date : 5/26/2015
Description: Pro Se Gen. Civil (F Deck)

MEMORANDUM OPINION

This matter is before the Court on its initial review of plaintiff's *pro se* complaint and application for leave to proceed *in forma pauperis*. Pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e), the Court is required to dismiss a complaint upon a determination that it, among other grounds, is frivolous. 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B)(i).

Plaintiff, a resident of Hamilton, New Jersey, makes the same type of outlandish allegations against current and former high-level officials and certain celebrities that she has made in previous actions dismissed as frivolous. *See generally* Compl; *cf. with Carter v. Bush*, Civ. Action No. 12-1825, slip op. (D.D.C. Nov. 9, 2012); *Carter v. Romney*, Civ. Action No. 12-1648, slip op. (D.D.C. Oct. 4, 2012); *Carter v. Obama*, Civ. Action No. 12-0482, slip op. (D.D.C. Mar. 29, 2012); *Carter v. Dempsey*, Civ. Action No. 11-1696, slip op. (D.D.C. Sept. 20, 2011) (citing *Carter v. Dempsey*, Civ. Action No. 11-1580)), *aff'd*, No. 11-5284 (D.C. Cir. Jan. 27, 2012). The accusations present the type of fantastic or delusional scenarios warranting dismissal under § 1915(e)(2) as frivolous. *See Neitzke v. Williams*, 490 U.S. 319, 325 (1989); *Best v. Kelly*, 39 F.3d 328, 330-31 (D.C. Cir. 1994). In addition, the purported claims are so


N

3

“patently insubstantial” as to deprive the Court of subject matter jurisdiction. *Tooley v. Napolitano*, 586 F.3d 1006, 1010 (D.C. Cir. 2009); *see Caldwell v. Kagan*, 777 F. Supp. 2d 177, 178 (D.D.C. 2011) (“A district court lacks subject matter jurisdiction when the complaint ‘is patently insubstantial, presenting no federal question suitable for decision.’”) (quoting *Tooley*, 586 F.3d at 1009).

Since plaintiff’s last dismissal occurred in 2012, the Court will not consider sanctions at this time. However, plaintiff is warned, as she was then, that her persistence in submitting frivolous lawsuits for filing may result ultimately in the Court enjoining her from the privilege of proceeding *in forma pauperis* in future actions. *See Carter v. Bush*, No. 12-1932 (UNA), slip op. (D.D.C. Nov. 29, 2012) (citing *Hurt v. Social Security Admin.*, 544 F.3d 308, 310 (D.C. Cir. 2008); *Butler v. Dep’t of Justice*, 492 F.3d 440, 446 (D.C. Cir. 2007); *Ibrahim v. District of Columbia*, 208 F.3d 1032, 1036 (D.C. Cir. 2000)). A separate Order of dismissal accompanies this Memorandum Opinion.

Date: May 15, 2015


United States District Judge