

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA**

Joan F.M. Malone,)	
)	
Plaintiff,)	
)	Case: 1:16-cv-01561
v.)	Assigned To : Unassigned
)	Assign. Date : 8/2/2016
)	Description: Pro Se Gen. Civil (F Deck)
George Washington University Hospital,)	
)	
Defendant.)	

MEMORANDUM OPINION

This matter comes before the court on review of plaintiff's application to proceed *in forma pauperis* and *pro se* civil complaint. The court will grant the application, and dismiss the complaint.

The court must dismiss a complaint if it is frivolous, malicious, or fails to state a claim upon which relief can be granted. 28 U.S.C. § 1915(E)(1)(B). In *Neitzke v. Williams*, 490 U.S. 319 (1989), the Supreme Court states that the trial court has the authority to dismiss not only claims based on an indisputably meritless legal theory, but also claims whose factual contentions are clearly baseless. Claims describing fantastic or delusional scenarios fall into the category of cases whose factual contentions are clearly baseless. *Id.* at 328. The trial court has the discretion to decide whether a complaint is frivolous, and such finding is appropriate when the facts alleged are irrational or wholly incredible. *Denton v. Hernandez*, 504 U.S. 25, 33 (1992).

Among other allegations, plaintiff states that, while waiting for proceedings to begin in the Landlord and Tenant Branch of the Superior Court of the District of Columbia, "President Clinton and Hillary Clinton . . . came over to [her] and told [her] to drop her case." Compl. at 2.

When plaintiff refused, the Clintons allegedly became “angry with [her],” and during the proceedings they “made [gestures]” directed at the jury suggesting that plaintiff “was lying,” and thereafter the judge ruled in the landlord’s favor. *Id.* It is unclear what relief, if any, plaintiff demands. Nor is it clear what claim plaintiff intends to bring against the named defendant.

The Court is mindful that complaints filed by *pro se* litigants are held to less stringent standards than those applied to formal pleadings drafted by lawyers. *See Haines v. Kerner*, 404 U.S. 519, 520 (1972). Having reviewed plaintiff’s complaint, the Court concludes that what factual contentions are identifiable are baseless and wholly incredible. For this reason, the complaint is frivolous and must be dismissed. *See* 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B)(i).

An Order consistent with this Memorandum Opinion is issued separately.


United States District Judge

DATE: 8/1/16