

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

MARY JO WEIDRICK,)	
)	
Plaintiff,)	
)	
v.)	Civil Action No. 21-416 (UNA)
)	
)	
JOSEPH R. BIDEN, JR. <i>et al.</i> ,)	
)	
Defendants.)	

MEMORANDUM OPINION

Plaintiff, appearing *pro se*, has filed a Complaint against President Joe Biden and the United States Congress and an application to proceed *in forma pauperis*. The court will grant the application and dismiss this action pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B)(i) (requiring dismissal of a case upon a determination that the complaint is frivolous).

Plaintiff brings this action primarily “to allow” her “to immediately confer with her attorney of 3-4 years, Mark J. Geragos, and to immediately be deposed by the Manhattan District Attorney, Cyrus R. Vance Jr., for purposes of testifying before the Grand Jury to indict, arrest, try; and imprison Defendants immediately.” Compl. at 4. Plaintiff alleges, among other things, that “Defendants, named and unnamed, have engaged in terrorist activity 24/7 for over 31 years and continue to do so[.]” *Id.* Such activities include “violently raping” plaintiff’s “brain 24/7 with mind-reading equipment,” “slandering” her, “slowly trying to kill her[,] and simultaneously making a joke of Plaintiff and this terrorism of her.” *Id.* In addition, plaintiff alleges far-reaching “smear campaigns against her” by national and local media, “seemingly all federal intelligence agencies,” state and local officials, and social media. *Id.* at 5.

Complaints premised on fantastic or delusional scenarios or supported wholly by allegations lacking “an arguable basis either in law or in fact” are subject to dismissal as frivolous. *Neitzke v. Williams*, 490 U.S. 319, 325 (1989); *see Denton v. Hernandez*, 504 U.S. 25, 33 (1992) (“[A] finding of factual frivolousness is appropriate when the facts alleged rise to the level of the irrational or the wholly incredible[.]”); *Best v. Kelly*, 39 F.3d 328, 330-31 (D.C. Cir. 1994) (a court may dismiss claims that are “essentially fictitious”-- for example, where they suggest “bizarre conspiracy theories . . . [or] fantastic government manipulations of their will or mind”) (citations and internal quotation marks omitted)); *Crisafi v. Holland*, 655 F.2d 1305, 1307-08 (D.C. Cir. 1981) (“A court may dismiss as frivolous complaints . . . postulating events and circumstances of a wholly fanciful kind.”). The instant complaint satisfies this standard and therefore will be dismissed. A separate order accompanies this Memorandum Opinion.

Date: March 4, 2021

____s/_____
AMIT P. MEHTA
United States District Judge