

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

MICAH ANDERSON,

Plaintiff,

v.

WALT DISNEY INC.,

Defendant.

Civil Action No. 22-cv-3770 (UNA)

MEMORANDUM OPINION

This matter is before the court on its initial review of Plaintiff's *pro se* complaint, ECF No. 1, and applications for leave to proceed *in forma pauperis*, ECF Nos. 2, 4, 8. The Court will grant the *in forma pauperis* applications and dismiss the complaint pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915A(b)(i), which mandates dismissal of a prisoner's complaint if it is frivolous.

"A complaint must contain sufficient factual matter, accepted as true, to 'state a claim to relief that is plausible on its face.'" *Ashcroft v. Iqbal*, 556 U.S. 662, 678 (2009) (quoting *Bell Atl. Corp. v. Twombly*, 550 U.S. 544, 570 (2007)). A complaint that lacks "an arguable basis either in law or in fact" is frivolous. *Neitzke v. Williams*, 490 U.S. 319, 325 (1989). Plaintiff's complaint is incomprehensible to say the least. What few factual allegations appearing therein are incoherent, irrational or wholly incredible, rendering the complaint 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[.]”). And the Court cannot exercise subject matter jurisdiction over a frivolous complaint, *Hagans v. Lavine*, 415 U.S. 528, 536-37 (1974) (“Over the years, this Court has repeatedly held that the federal courts are without power to entertain claims otherwise within their jurisdiction if they are ‘so attenuated and unsubstantial as to be absolutely devoid of merit.’”) (quoting *Newburyport Water Co. v. Newburyport*, 193 U.S. 561, 579 (1904)); *Tooley v. Napolitano*, 586 F.3d 1006, 1010 (D.C. Cir. 2009) (examining cases dismissed “for patent insubstantiality”).

A separate order will issue.

DATE: May 19, 2023

/s/
CHRISTOPHER R. COOPER
United States District Judge