UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

FILED AUG 1 0 2015

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

Tiemoko Coulibaly,	)
Plaintiff,	) Case: 1:15-cv-01279 ) Assigned To : Unassigned
v.	Assigned 10 : 6/14/2015  Assign. Date : 8/10/2015  Description: Pro Se Gen. Civil (F)
John Kerry et al.,	) Describing
Defendants.	) )

## MEMORANDUM OPINION

This matter is before the Court on its initial review of 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). Under that statute, the Court is required to dismiss a case "at any time" it determines that the complaint fails to state a claim upon which relief can be granted.

Plaintiff is a resident of Silver Spring, Maryland. The complaint is not a model of clarity, but plaintiff sues employees of the U.S. Department of State, the Merit System Protection Board ("MSPB"), and the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission ("EEOC") for the manner in which they handled his employment grievances. *See generally* Compl. and Compl. Caption. "[N]o cause of action against the EEOC exists for challenges to its processing of a claim." *Smith v. Casellas*, 119 F.3d 33, 34 (D.C. Cir. 1997), *cert. denied*, 118 S.Ct. 386 (1997). Rather, "Congress intended the private right of action . . . under which an aggrieved employee may bring a Title VII action directly against his or her employer [] to serve as the remedy for any improper handling of a discrimination charge by the EEOC." *Id.* Similarly, "[n]either [Title VII nor the Age Discrimination in Employment Act] creates a cause of action against the MSPB for

its processing of a case." *Woodruff v. McPhie*, 383 Fed. App'x 5, 6 (D.C. Cir. 2010).

Accordingly, this case will be dismissed. A separate Order accompanies this Memorandum Opinion.

Date: August \_\_\_\_\_\_, 2015

Buff Hwell
United States District Judge