

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

DANNY AMEN VALENTINE SHABAZZ, )

Plaintiff, )

v. )

CHRIS BRUCE, *et al.*, )

Defendants. )

Civil Action No. 1:23-cv-01607 (UNA)

**MEMORANDUM OPINION**

This matter is before the Court on its initial review of plaintiff’s *pro se* complaint, ECF No. 1, and application for leave to proceed *in forma pauperis*, ECF No. 2. The Court will grant the *in forma pauperis* application and dismiss the case pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B)(ii), by which the Court is required to dismiss a case “at any time” if it determines that the action 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), and a “complaint plainly abusive of the judicial process is properly typed malicious,” *Crisafi v. Holland*, 655 F.2d 1305, 1309 (D.C. Cir. 1981).

Plaintiff, a resident of Georgia, sues several individuals, including the Attorney General of Delaware and the First Lady of the United States. He fails, however, to provide any contact information for any of the defendants, in contravention of D.C. Local Civil Rule 5.1(c)(1). The complaint is then comprised of a tangled mess of assertions that fails to string together enough facts to state a cognizable claim or to establish this Court’s subject matter jurisdiction. At root,

plaintiff seemingly alleges that defendants have engaged in various acts of fraud and executed a conspiracy at “Del Tech” to steal his “data,” and to list fraudulent information online, which has also resulted in over 25 deaths. He demands that Delaware remove his “likeness from all channels and return his trust fund.”

This 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,” including where the plaintiff allegedly “was subjected to a campaign of surveillance and harassment deriving from uncertain origins.”). Consequently, a court is obligated to dismiss a complaint as frivolous “when the facts alleged rise to the level of the irrational or the wholly incredible,” *Denton v. Hernandez*, 504 U.S. 25, 33 (1992), or “postulat[e] events and circumstances of a wholly fanciful kind,” *Crisafi*, 655 F.2d at 1307–08. The instant complaint falls squarely into this category. In addition to failing to state a claim for relief or establish this Court’s jurisdiction, the complaint is frivolous on its face.

For this reason, this case will be dismissed without prejudice. A separate order accompanies this memorandum opinion.



---

TREVOR N. McFADDEN  
United States District Judge

Date: July 12, 2023