

FILED

MAY 10 2018

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

Civ. Action No. 18-839 (UNA)

therefore, the “*pro se* plaintiff may not file a qui tam action[,]” *Jones v. Jindal*, 409 Fed. App’x. 356 (D.C. Cir. 2011) (per curiam). See *Gunn v. Credit Suisse Grp. AG*, 610 Fed. App’x 155, 157 (3d Cir. 2015) (noting that “every circuit that has [addressed the issue] is in agreement that a *pro se* litigant may not pursue a qui tam action on behalf of the Government.”) (citing cases)); *U.S. ex rel. Szymczak v. Covenant Healthcare Sys., Inc.*, 207 Fed. App’x 731, 732 (7th Cir. 2006) (“[A] qui tam relator—even one with a personal bone to pick with the defendant—sues on behalf of the government and not himself. He therefore must comply with the general rule prohibiting nonlawyers from representing other litigants.”). Accordingly, this case will be dismissed. A separate accompanies this Memorandum Opinion.

Date: May ^a 10, 2018


United States District Judge