

**FILED**

SEPT. 23, 2021

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

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

MARY JO WEIDRICK,

Plaintiff,

v.

JOSEPH R. BIDEN, JR., *et al.*,

Defendants.

Civil Action No. 21-2224 (UNA)

**MEMORANDUM OPINION**

This matter is before the Court on the plaintiff's application to proceed *in forma pauperis* and *pro se* complaint. For the reasons discussed below, the Court grants the application and dismisses the complaint as frivolous.

Plaintiff's goal is "to immediately and safely confer with her attorney of 4 years, Mark J. Geragos, for purposes of stopping terrorism of Plaintiff." Compl. ¶ 1; *see id.* ¶ 16. Plaintiff alleges that the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court instructed the President of the United States, the military, and the Attorney General of the United States "to stop this terrorism of Plaintiff and to 'make a deal.'" *Id.* ¶ 2. Instead, plaintiff alleges, the Attorney General in conjunction with "the U.S. Military Psychological Operations division . . . have increased the 24/7 violence exponentially[.]" *Id.* Further, plaintiff alleges that defendants have employed "mind-reading equipment" as a "tool of terrorism," *id.* ¶ 6, that they "keep raping, sexually assaulting, slandering, terrorizing, [and] torturing" her, *id.*, and otherwise have continued to cause her harm, *see, e.g., id.* ¶¶ 8, 17, and violate constitutionally-protected rights, *see id.* ¶¶ 19-21. Among other relief, plaintiff asks this Court to "issue stays; use any of its powers against any illegal and

unconstitutional Executive Orders or similar instruments which prevent Plaintiff from conferring immediately with her attorney[.]” *Id.* ¶ 30.e.

Upon careful review of the complaint, the Court concludes that its factual allegations are irrational or wholly incredible, rendering this case subject to dismissal as frivolous. *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[.]”); *Neitzke v. Williams*, 490 U.S. 319, 325 (1989) (“[A] complaint, containing as it does both factual allegations and legal conclusions, is frivolous where it lacks an arguable basis either in law or in fact.”); *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 Court will grant plaintiff’s application to proceed *in forma pauperis* and will dismiss the complaint pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B)(i). An Order consistent with this Memorandum Opinion is issued separately.

/s/  
AMY BERMAN JACKSON  
United States District Judge

DATE: September 23, 2021