

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

RAJ K. PATEL,

Plaintiff,

v.

JOE BIDEN, *President of the United States*,
et al.,

Defendants.

Civil Action No. 21-cv-1076 (TSC)

MEMORANDUM OPINION

Pro se Plaintiff Raj K. Patel brings this action against the President of the United States, a former U.S. President, the University of Notre Dame, one of its professors, Emory University, the Federal Bureau of Investigation, the “United States Military,” and the State of Indiana. His allegations appear to be based on:

- Notre Dame Law School examinations that were allegedly graded one month late due to the professor’s pregnancy, but in which Plaintiff earned A’s before taking voluntary leave. Compl. p. 5;
- Lowered grades and weight gain caused by “stress weapons,” as well as the use of “stress weapons” by government officials. *Id.* pp. 9, 16-18;
- Law School professors who “said [Plaintiff’s] word patterns,” and the “transference” of “word patterns” to former President Trump, without legal authority or compensation. *Id.* pp. 6-7, 9, 11;
- Breach of Plaintiff’s privacy through eavesdropping and “e-battery through hotel television,” involving government officials. *Id.* pp. 7, 12;
- Violation of Plaintiff’s “Declaration of Independence” right to be “free to represent a charter.” *Id.* p. 6; and

- An ongoing unexplained “conspiracy” involving the whitehouse.gov website since the Obama presidency. *Id.* p. 12.

Although he named fewer Defendants, Plaintiff filed an almost identical Complaint in the Northern District of Indiana, *Patel v. Martinez*, 3:21-cv-241-RLM-JPK, in which the court dismissed his Complaint *sua sponte* for lack of subject matter jurisdiction. This court will do the same.

“Dismissal for lack of subject-matter jurisdiction because of the inadequacy of the federal claim is proper only when the claim is ‘so insubstantial, implausible, foreclosed by prior decisions of this Court, or otherwise completely devoid of merit as not to involve a federal controversy.’” *Steel Co. v. Citizens for a Better Env’t.*, 523 U.S. 83, 89 (1998) (*quoting Oneida Indian Nation of N.Y. v. County of Oneida*, 414 U.S. 661, 666 (1974)). Because Plaintiff has failed to proffer factual allegations that are plausible and/or actionable, by separate order, the court *sua sponte* will dismiss the Complaint and this civil action without prejudice.¹

Date: July 2, 2021

Tanya S. Chutkan

TANYA S. CHUTKAN
United States District Judge

¹ The court will also deny Plaintiff’s Motion to Amend the Complaint, ECF No. 5, because the proposed amendments do not change the outcome of the litigation. Likewise, the court will deny Plaintiff’s Motion for Order directing the United States Marshals to serve process in this action, ECF No. 3, and Plaintiff’s Motion for CM/ECF access, ECF No. 2.