

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

PRINCESS MARIA SPENCER,)	
)	
Plaintiff,)	
)	
v.)	Civil Action No. 23-0798 (UNA)
)	
DEPARTMENT OF HUMAN SERVICES,)	
)	
Defendant.)	

MEMORANDUM OPINION

This matter is before the Court on review of this *pro se* plaintiff's application to proceed *in forma pauperis* and her civil complaint.

Plaintiff "would like a benefit awards letter and an explanation of benefits" from the District of Columbia's Department of Human Services, through which she has received Supplemental Nutritional Assistant Program benefits in recent months. *See* Compl. at 1. The complaint neither alleges facts establishing that a demand for benefits from the District of Columbia presents a federal question, nor otherwise establishes grounds for this Court's jurisdiction.

Insofar as plaintiff challenges a determination made by the Department of Human Services, it appears that her recourse, if any, may be before the District of Columbia Office of Administrative Hearings, not federal district court. *See Brooks v. District of Columbia*, 375 F. Supp. 3d 41, 49 (D.D.C. 2019), *aff'd sub nom. Patten v. District of Columbia*, 9 F.4th 921 (D.C. Cir. 2021), *cert. denied*, 142 S. Ct. 1129 (2022); D.C. Code § 2-1813.03(a)(2); *see also Malone v. District of Columbia*, No. 22-cv-3527, 2022 WL 17496215, at *1 (D.D.C. Dec. 5, 2022)

(dismissing challenge to OAH determination because appeal must be taken to District of Columbia Court of Appeals).

A party seeking relief in the district court must at least plead facts that bring the suit within the Court's jurisdiction. *See* Fed. R. Civ. P. 8(a). This plaintiff has not done so and, therefore, the Court will dismiss the complaint without prejudice for lack of subject matter jurisdiction.

An Order is issued separately.

DATE: May 8, 2023

/s/
JIA M. COBB
United States District Judge