

**FILED**

**NOV 26 2018**

**Clerk, U.S. District and  
Bankruptcy Courts**

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

PAUL H. DEERING,

Plaintiff,

v.

NANCY A. BERRYHILL, *et al.*,

Defendants.

Civil Action No. 1:18-cv-02450 (UNA)

**MEMORANDUM OPINION**


This matter is before the court on its initial review of plaintiff's *pro se* complaint ("Compl.") and application for leave to proceed *in forma pauperis*. The Court will grant the *in forma pauperis* application and dismiss the case pursuant to Fed. R Civ. P. 12(b)(6), for failure to state a claim upon which relief can be granted. *See Baker v. Director, U.S. Parole Com'n*, 916 F.2d 725, 727 (D.C. Cir. 1990) (holding that a *sua sponte* dismissal is appropriate for failure to state a claim).

Plaintiff is a resident of Birmingham, England. Compl. at caption, 3. He is aggrieved regarding a claim he has filed with the Social Security Administration, which appears to be pending in the Philadelphia, Pennsylvania office. *Id.* at 2, 4, 12–13. Plaintiff fails either to identify a "final decision of the Commissioner of Social Security," 42 U.S.C. § 405(g), or to allege sufficient facts from which the Commissioner may reasonably identify the decision being challenged. As such, the complaint is subject to dismissal under Fed. R Civ. P. 12(b)(6) for failure to state a claim upon which relief may be granted. Plaintiff's motion for CM/ECF password will be denied as moot.

Plaintiff also files a motion for relief from judgment ("Mot. Rel."). That motion seeks review of decisions rendered by Oakland County Circuit Court, located in Pontiac, Michigan. Mot.

Rel. at 3–4. As a general rule, applicable here, a federal district court lacks jurisdiction to review or interfere with the decisions of a state court. *See Richardson v. District of Columbia Court of Appeals*, 83 F.3d 1513, 1514 (D.C. Cir. 1996) (citing *District of Columbia v. Feldman*, 460 U.S. 462, 476 (1983) and *Rooker v. Fidelity Trust Co.*, 263 U.S. 413 (1923), *aff'd*, No. 94-5079, 1994 WL 474995 (D.C. Cir. 1994), *cert. denied*, 513 U.S. 1150 (1995)). Therefore, plaintiff's motion for relief from judgment will be denied. A separate Order accompanies this Memorandum Opinion.

Date: November 26, 2018

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
United States District Judge