## UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA



)
)
) Civil Action No. 21-0496 (UNA)
)
)

## **MEMORANDUM OPINION**

Plaintiff brings this action against monarchs, elected officials, and government officials of foreign countries, and demands awards of "\$48,286,127,340 in lawful money (gold and/or silver)," Compl. at 10 (page numbers designated by CM/ECF), and return of land in South Africa and other property which had been seized, *see id.* at 56-60. It appears that plaintiff is bringing claims against the foreign governments themselves.

"In the United States, the sole avenue for a court to obtain jurisdiction over claims against a foreign state or its agencies and instrumentalities is through the [Foreign Sovereign Immunities Act (FSIA), 28 U.S.C. §§ 1602-1611][.]" Simon v. Republic of Hungary, 812 F.3d 127, 135 (D.C. Cir. 2016). The FSIA "creates a baseline presumption of immunity from suit." Fed. Republic of Germany v. Philipp, 141 S. Ct. 703, 709 (2021) (citing 28 U.S.C. § 1604). "[U]nless specified exception applies, a federal court lacks subject-matter jurisdiction over a claim against a foreign state." Id. (quoting Saudi Arabia v. Nelson, 507 U.S. 349, 355 (1993)); see Roeder v.

Islamic Republic of Iran, 646 F.3d 56, 58 (D.C. Cir. 2011). Waivers of sovereign immunity

must be clear and unequivocal. See United States v. Nordic Village, Inc., 503 U.S. 30, 34 (1992).

Here, defendants are presumed to be immune from suit, and plaintiff does not

demonstrate otherwise. Therefore, the Court will dismiss the complaint and this civil action

without prejudice for lack of subject matter jurisdiction. Plaintiff's application to proceed in

forma pauperis will be granted and his "writ to e-file," construed as a motion for CM/ECF

password, will be denied as moot. An Order consistent with this Memorandum Opinion is issued

separately.

/s/

AMIT P. MEHTA

United States District Judge

DATE: March 24, 2021