

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF WISCONSIN

RASHAY ELAINE MASON,

Petitioner,

v.

FORMER GOV. PRES. BUSH;
FORMER PRES. CLINTON;
GEN. ASSEMBLY & SEC. GEN KOFI ANNAN;
U.S. GOVERNMENT;
UNITED NATIONS;
FCC MICHAEL POWELL; and
NEWS CORP CHAIRMAN RUPERT MURDOCK,

Respondents.

ORDER

03-C-322-C

Petitioner Rashay Elaine Mason has requested leave to proceed in forma pauperis in this civil action pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915. From the affidavit of indigency accompanying petitioner's proposed complaint, I conclude that petitioner is unable to prepay the fees and costs of instituting this lawsuit. In addressing any pro se litigant's complaint, the court must construe the complaint liberally, Haines v. Kerner, 404 U.S. 519, 521 (1972), and grant leave to proceed in forma pauperis if there is an arguable basis for a claim in fact or law. 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2).

Petitioner's request for leave to proceed will be denied. First, petitioner's complaint does not specify the relief she wants other than "to file suit in Illinois while [she] reside[s] in Wisconsin for security reasons. Also, immediate process of this suit due to [her] protection." This is not a proper demand for relief as required by Rule 8 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure. A proper request for relief is directed at the defendants rather than at the court, and is crafted so as to make the petitioner as near as whole as possible for harms allegedly inflicted by the respondents. In this case, the lack of a proper request for relief is not the only problem. Petitioner's complaint is more fundamentally flawed by its content. Her allegations of fact are so disjointed and fanciful that the proposed respondents would have no fair notice of her claim.

In order to state a claim upon which relief may granted, a party must provide the respondents "fair notice of what the plaintiff's claim is and the grounds upon which it rests." Leatherman v. Tarrant County Narcotics Intelligence and Coordination Unit, 507 U.S. 163, 168 (1993). Petitioner has failed to give respondents notice of her claims against them. She alleges broadly that her civil rights have been violated by antitrust laws; that she is being followed and misrepresented in hospitals in states other than New York, "blackballed from employment" and subjected to mind control; that her family and friends and strangers are in danger of conspiracies developed during the senior President Bush and Clinton administrations; and that she has been subjected to "arbitration of personal ideas and

vandanas through satellite that transmit voice of actual contact conversation with the President Bush and Charles Bass, an ex-boy friend that [she] went to prom with.” From these allegations, it is impossible to tell what each respondent has done or why petitioner believes respondents have violated her rights.

Furthermore, when the claims in a complaint are “so insubstantial, implausible, foreclosed by prior decisions of [the United States Supreme Court], or otherwise completely devoid of merit as not to involve a federal controversy,” a district court may dismiss a complaint for lack of subject matter jurisdiction. Steel Company v. Citizens for a Better Environment, 523 U.S. 83 (1998) (quoting Oneida Indian Nation of New York v. County of Oneida, 414 U.S. 662, 666 (1974)). Because petitioner’s complaint contains no plausible allegations of fact supporting her belief that respondents have violated her rights, petitioner has failed to show that there is a “case or controversy” between herself and the respondents within the meaning of Article III of the Constitution. Accordingly, I will deny petitioner’s request for leave to proceed in forma pauperis and dismiss this action for lack of subject matter jurisdiction.

ORDER

IT IS ORDERED that petitioner Rashay Elaine Mason's request for leave to proceed in forma pauperis is DENIED and this case is DISMISSED for lack of jurisdiction.

Entered this 20th day of June, 2003.

BY THE COURT:

BARBARA B. CRABB
District Judge