FILED

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

OCT 2 2 2018

Clerk, U.S. District and Bankruptcy Courts

FRANCISCO MONTES, JR.)	
Plaintiff,)))
V.)	Civil Action No.: 1:18-cv-02081 (UNA)
)	
ROC-A-FELLA, et al.,)	
Defendants.)	

MEMORANDUM OPINION

This matter is before the Court on its initial review of plaintiff's *pro se* complaint ("Compl.") [ECF No. 1] and application for leave to proceed *in forma pauperis* ("IFP") [ECF No. 2]. The Court will grant the IFP application and dismiss the case 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 the subject matter jurisdiction is wanting). Plaintiff has also filed a motion to appoint counsel [ECF No. 3], which will be denied as moot.

Plaintiff, a resident of Washington, D.C., filed his complaint on September 5, 2018. Compl. at caption. Since that time, plaintiff has filed four "amendments" to the original complaint, which seek to join additional defendants to this action. *See* First Amnd. [ECF No. 4]; Sec. Amnd. [ECF No. 5]; Third Amnd. (also including list of attorneys who have denied plaintiff services) [ECF No. 6]; and Fourth Amnd. [ECF No. 7]. Plaintiff has named approximately 113 defendants. *See id.*; *see also* Compl. at caption. These defendants constitute a range of individuals and entities, including, but not limited to: music recording companies, professional sports organizations, health care providers, movie studios, schools, vehicle repair shops, Walmart, Facebook, and federal agencies. *See id*.

Plaintiff alleges that defendants violated his privacy. Compl. at 1. He posits that

defendants "orchestrat[ed] a film" without his consent. As a result, he has suffered damage to his

"mind, body, and emotional state." Id. Plaintiff also alleges that defendants committed "other

infractions" that he admits "are undetermined due to not completely seeing, knowing, and properly

having documented what really happen[ed] through this whole time frame." *Id.* He believes that

defendants have been perpetuating these unknown "infractions" against him possibly "from the

beginning of time to present." Id. Plaintiff requests a trial with the "possibility of formal charges,"

though the actual civil relief plaintiff seeks is completely unclear. *Id.*

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 fails to raise any federal question. He also fails to satisfy the burden to establish

diversity jurisdiction. Therefore, this case will be dismissed for want of subject matter jurisdiction,

and plaintiff's motion to appoint counsel is denied as moot. A separate Order accompanies this

Memorandum Opinion.

Date: October _______, 2018

2