

FILED _____ ENTERED _____
 LOGGED _____ RECEIVED _____
 bl AUG 17 2010
 AT WASHINGTON
 CLERK U.S. DISTRICT COURT
 DISTRICT OF MARYLAND
 DEPUTY

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF MARYLAND

ERICA D. TAYLOR *
Plaintiff

BY _____ DEPUTY

v. * Civil Action Case No. RDB-10-2214

OBAMA ADMINISTRATION *
U.S. GOVERNMENT *
NATIONAL GEOSPATIAL INTEL *
AGENCY *
Defendants *

MEMORANDUM OPINION

On August 11, 2010, the Court received the instant *pro se* Complaint, accompanied by an indigency application. Plaintiff, a resident of Owings Mills, Maryland, claims that her human and civil rights have been violated and seeks \$950,000,000.00 in damages for “pain and suffering , loss wages [sic], hospital expenses, torture/human rights violations/wrongings, stalking for almost 1 year, [and] mental turmoil.” (Paper No. 1). The Complaint sets out the following factual statement:

I worked for Defense Contractor NJVC-LLC (primary contractor to the National Geospatial Intelligence Agency Bethesda, MD) from June 08 - Sep 09. While employed I was harassed and retaliated against for asking the Inspector General (agency’s) to further investigate a security incident that was deemed my fault. I was also chosen for what I believe to be government mind control research and experimentation. This was conducted without my consent. Following what I thought was an experiment, I underwent electronic physical torture/radiation to all parts of my body, mind/emotional alterations and am now undergoing server electronic harassment via voice to skull technology which has resulted in me being mentally harassed. I have suffered invasion of privacy, implant technology which is against my Christian beliefs. CAT 2340 has also been violated. Cruel and tortuous treatment/inhumane treatment. This was not done at will or consent. Organized stalking is also involved as well as use of directed energy devices/weapons. I was also ritually abused and used as a human gambling event that followed me to every state in which I traveled. I was also electronically harassed in each state in which I traveled.”

(Paper No. 1)

Allegations in a *pro se* complaint are to be liberally construed, and a court should not dismiss an action for the failure to state a claim “ ‘unless after accepting all well-pleaded allegations in the plaintiff’s complaint as true and drawing all reasonable factual inferences from those facts in the plaintiff’s favor, it appears certain that the plaintiff cannot prove any set of facts in support of his claim entitling him to relief. “*De’Lonta v. Angelone*, 330 F.3d 630, 633 (4th Cir. 2003) (quoting *Veney v. Wyche*, 293 F.3d 726, 730 (4th Cir. 2002)). Courts are instructed that *pro se* filings “however unskillfully pleaded, must be liberally construed.” *Noble v. Barnett*, 24 F.3d 582, 587 n. 6 (4th Cir. 1994) (citing *Haines v. Kerner*, 404 U.S. 519 (1972); *Vinnedge v. Gibbs*, 550 F.2d 926, 928 (4th Cir. 1977)). However, the complaint must contain sufficient facts “to raise a right to relief above the speculative level” and “state a claim to relief that is plausible on its face.” *Bell Atl. Corp. v. Twombly*, 550 U.S. 544, 555 (2007). A claim having no arguable basis in law or fact may be dismissed as frivolous. *Neitzke v. Williams*, 490 U.S. 319, 325 (1989); *see also* 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B), (outlining screening process for indigent or prisoner complaints).

Examples of frivolous claims include those whose factual allegations are “so nutty,” “delusional,” or “wholly fanciful” as to be simply unbelievable. *Gladney v. Pendelton Corr. Facility*, 302 F.3d. 773, 774 (7th Cir. 2002); *Denton v. Hernandez*, 504 U.S. 25, 29 (1992). Plaintiff’s claims plainly fall into this category of allegations. The Complaint is replete with fantastic assertions of electronic torture, stalking, harassment, and mind control following her in her state-to-state travels.¹

¹ To the extent that Plaintiff is alleging wrongful job termination and retaliation, the Court observes that allegations involving Plaintiff’s employment at NJVC-LLC are currently being litigated in *Taylor v. NJVC-LLC*, Civil Action No. RDB-10-1799 (D. Md.). She is currently scheduled to file her “right-to-sue” letter with the Court on or before August 26, 2010.

Plaintiff's Motion to Proceed *In Forma Pauperis* shall be granted and her action shall be dismissed pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e). A separate Order follows.

Date: AUGUST 16, 2010


RICHARD D. BENNETT
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE