

**FILED**

**JUN - 5 2017**

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

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Donetta Michelle Byrd-Sanders, )  
 )  
 Plaintiff, )  
 )  
 v. )  
 )  
 Child Support. )  
 )  
 Defendant. )

Civil Action No. 17-965 (UNA)

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*. The Court will grant the application and dismiss the complaint for lack of subject matter jurisdiction. *See* Fed. R. Civ. P. 12(h)(3) (requiring the court to dismiss an action "at any time" if it determines that subject matter jurisdiction is wanting).

The subject matter jurisdiction of the federal district courts is limited and is set forth generally at 28 U.S.C. §§ 1331 and 1332. Under those statutes, federal jurisdiction is available only when a "federal question" is presented or the parties are of diverse citizenship and the amount in controversy exceeds \$75,000. A party seeking relief in the district court must at least plead facts that bring the suit within the court's jurisdiction. *See* Fed. R. Civ. P. 8(a). Failure to plead such facts warrants dismissal of the action. *See* Fed. R. Civ. P. 12(h)(3).

Plaintiff, a District of Columbia resident, has submitted a Complaint for monetary relief against "Child Support." Based on the address listed for the defendant, it appears that the complaint is directed against the District's Child Support Services Division of the Office of the Attorney General. *See* <https://cssd.dc.gov>. The complaint does not present a federal question,

and diversity jurisdiction is inapplicable because “the District of Columbia, like a state, is not a citizen of a state (or of itself) for diversity purposes[.]” *Barwood, Inc. v. D.C.*, 202 F.3d 290, 292 (D.C. Cir. 2000) (citing *Long v. District of Columbia*, 820 F.2d 409, 414 (D.C. Cir. 1987)). Hence, this case will be dismissed. A separate order accompanies this Memorandum Opinion.

Date: June 1, 2017

  
United States District Judge