

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

TYESHA N. ISOM,)	
)	
Plaintiff,)	
)	
v.)	Civil Action No. 21-3057 (UNA)
)	
MERRICK B. GARLAND,)	
)	
Defendant.)	

MEMORANDUM OPINION

This matter is before the Court on plaintiff’s application to proceed *in forma pauperis* and her *pro se* civil complaint. The application will be granted, and the complaint will be dismissed for lack of subject matter jurisdiction.

“Article III of the United States Constitution limits the judicial power to deciding ‘Cases and Controversies.’” *In re Navy Chaplaincy*, 534 F.3d 756, 759 (D.C. Cir. 2008) (quoting U.S. Const. art. III, § 2), *cert. denied*, 556 U.S. 1167 (2009). “One element of the case-or-controversy requirement is that plaintiffs must establish that they have standing to sue.” *Comm. on Judiciary of U.S. House of Representatives v. McGahn*, 968 F.3d 755, 762 (D.C. Cir. 2020) (citations and internal quotation marks omitted). A party has standing for purposes of Article III if she has “(1) suffered an injury in fact, (2) that is fairly traceable to the challenged conduct of the defendant, and (3) that is likely to be redressed by a favorable judicial decision.” *Id.* at 763 (quoting *Lujan v. Defenders of Wildlife*, 504 U.S. 555, 560 (1992)).

The complaint appears to reflect plaintiff’s thoughts and observations regarding Puerto Rico and its status with respect to the United States of America. The Court has reviewed the pleading carefully, yet discerns no factual allegations supporting a viable legal claim. Nor is

there any indication that plaintiff stands to suffer an injury if Puerto Rico were to remain a territory of the United States.

Absent a case or controversy, and absent a showing that plaintiff has standing to sue, the Court will dismiss the complaint. An Order is issued separately.

DATE: November 24, 2021

/s/
COLLEEN KOLLAR-KOTELLY
United States District Judge