

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

BRUD ROSSMANN,	)	
	)	
<i>Plaintiff,</i>	)	
	)	
v.	)	Civil Action No. 22-1483 (UNA)
	)	
JOE BIDEN	)	
<i>President of the United States, et al.,</i>	)	
	)	
<i>Defendants.</i>	)	

**MEMORANDUM OPINION**

This matter is before the Court on review of the plaintiff’s *pro se* Complaint, Dkt. 1, and application for leave to proceed *in forma pauperis* (IFP), Dkt. 2. In IFP proceedings, the Court is required to dismiss a case “at any time” it determines, as here, that the action is frivolous. 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B)(i).

Plaintiff, a District of Columbia resident, has sued President Joe Biden, Vice President Kamala Harris, former President Barack Obama, U.S. District Judge Amy Berman Jackson, retired U.S. District Judge Ellen Segal Huvelle, and numerous other individuals in the public and private sectors. *See* Compl. Caption at 1-9. Plaintiff seeks \$50 million in damages and various forms of equitable relief. *See* Compl. at 44.

A complaint that lacks “an arguable basis either in law or in fact” may be dismissed as frivolous. *Neitzke v. Williams*, 490 U.S. 319, 325 (1989). The instant complaint, like many of the plaintiff’s previous complaints filed in this court, *see, e.g., Rossmann v. Newsham*, No. 1:21-cv-02415 (UNA), 2021 WL 5292546, at \*1 (D.D.C. Sept. 24, 2021), *aff’d*, No. 21-7130, 2022 WL 605729 (D.C. Cir. Feb. 25, 2022) (citing other frivolous case), contains no concrete factual allegations against any of the defendants. Instead, it is “a diatribe” consisting of “insults,”

obscurities, racial, ethnic, and homophobic “slurs,” and, to the extent intelligible, “general grievances.” *Id.* at \*2; *see, e.g., Rossman v. Sewell*, No. 20-cv-01425 (UNA), 2020 WL 3064445, at \*2 (D.D.C. June 8, 2020), *aff’d sub nom. Rossman v. Sewell*, 831 Fed. App’x 520 (D.C. Cir. 2020) (deeming the plaintiff’s rambling complaint “frivolous on its face”). The complaint also contains various threats against the defendants. *See, e.g.,* Compl. ¶ 16 (“Brud Rossman will hunt, torturre, and kssslslsl them, and their families, when this Court, of course, does nothing.”). Because the plaintiff is unlikely to cure these defects, this case will be dismissed with prejudice. *See Firestone v. Firestone*, 76 F.3d 1205, 1209 (D.C. Cir. 1996) (A dismissal with prejudice is warranted upon determining “that ‘the allegation of other facts consistent with the challenged pleading could not possibly cure the deficiency.’”) (quoting *Jarrell v. United States Postal Serv.*, 753 F.2d 1088, 1091 (D.C. Cir. 1985) (other citation omitted)). A separate order accompanies this Memorandum Opinion.

Date: July 15, 2022

/s/  
\_\_\_\_\_  
DABNEY L. FRIEDRICH  
United States District Judge