

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

FILED

FEB 07 2019

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

Mrs. Akofa,	)	
	)	
Plaintiff,	)	
	)	
v.	)	Civil Action No. 19-254 (UNA)
	)	
Michael D. Johnson <i>et al.</i> ,	)	
	)	
Defendants.	)	

**MEMORANDUM OPINION**

This matter is before the Court on plaintiff's *pro se* complaint and application to proceed *in forma pauperis* (IFP). The Court will grant the IFP application and dismiss the complaint for lack of subject matter jurisdiction.

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. "For jurisdiction to exist under 28 U.S.C. § 1332, there must be complete diversity between the parties, which is to say that the plaintiff may not be a citizen of the same state as any defendant." *Bush v. Butler*, 521 F. Supp. 2d 63, 71 (D.D.C. 2007) (citing *Owen Equip. & Erection Co. v. Kroger*, 437 U.S. 365, 373-74 (1978)). 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).

The complaint, styled as an “Emergency Motion Regarding Improper Venue: Order to Discharge,” is brought by a Maryland resident against an attorney and law firm in Baltimore, Maryland. *See* Compl. Caption. The complaint arises from the attorney’s representation of plaintiff in court proceedings in Maryland. It does not present a cognizable federal question, and diversity jurisdiction is lacking because both parties are citizens of Maryland. Additionally, plaintiff has not pled an amount in controversy, much less the threshold amount. Therefore, this case will be dismissed. A separate order accompanies this Memorandum Opinion.

  
United States District Judge

Date: February 7, 2019