UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Eric E. Miller,)			
Plaintiff,)) () () () () () () () () () () () ()	Case: 1:16-cv-01378 Assigned To : Unassigned Assign. Date : 6/29/2016		
v.				
Washington, D.C.'s, Catholic Charities,			Description: Pro Se Gen. Civil	(F-Deck)
)			
Defendant.)			

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 is a resident of Catlett, Virginia. He purports to bring a "Third Party Action Complaints [sic]" against Catholic Charities in the District of Columbia "for co-operating, conducting and participating with Dream Interrogation Program that specifically are [sic] designed to discriminate and harass me!" Compl. at 1. Plaintiff then proceeds in eighteen pages to "explain how this was done," *id.*, but his allegations are simply incoherent.

The complaint implicates the United States in "Dream Scenarios" that allegedly violate federal discrimination laws. Compl. at 1. Such accusations warrant dismissal under § 1915 (e)(2) as frivolous. *Neitzke v. Williams*, 490 U.S. 319, 325 (1989); *see Best v. Kelly*, 39 F.3d 328, 330-31 (D.C. Cir. 1994) (a court may dismiss claims that are "essentially fictitious"—for example, where they suggest "bizarre conspiracy theories . . . [or] fantastic government manipulations of their will or mind") (citations and internal quotation marks omitted); *Crisafi v.*

: 1

Holland, 655 F.2d 1305, 1307-08 (D.C. Cir. 1981) ("A court may dismiss as frivolous complaints... postulating events and circumstances of a wholly fanciful kind."). Furthermore, the complaint is patently insubstantial, and "[a] district court lacks subject matter jurisdiction [over a] complaint [that] 'is patently insubstantial, presenting no federal question suitable for decision." Caldwell v. Kagan, 777 F. Supp. 2d 177, 178 (D.D.C. 2011) (quoting Tooley v. Napolitano, 586 F.3d 1006, 1009 (D.C. Cir. 2009)). Hence, this case will be dismissed with prejudice. A separate Order accompanies this Memorandum Opinion.

Date: June 2, 2016

United States District Judge