

United States District Court, Northern District of Illinois

Name of Assigned Judge or Magistrate Judge	Matthew F. Kennelly	Sitting Judge if Other than Assigned Judge	
CASE NUMBER	13 C 3633	DATE	6/7/2013
CASE TITLE	Crystal L. Cox vs. Tracy L. Coenen		

DOCKET ENTRY TEXT

The Court grants plaintiff's motion to proceed *in forma pauperis* [# 3]. For the reasons stated below, the Court directs the Clerk to enter judgment dismissing this case as legally frivolous. Plaintiff's motion to file electronically [# 5] is terminated as moot.

■ [For further details see text below.]

Docketing to mail notices.
*Mail AO 450 form.

STATEMENT

Plaintiff Crystal Cox has filed a motion to proceed *in forma pauperis*, that is, without paying the filing fee. The Court grants the motion [#3] and has reviewed Cox's complaint as provided by 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e) to determine if it is legally or factually frivolous or fails to state a claim upon which relief may be granted.

Cox's complaint, not including the exhibits, is 122 pages long and names 35 defendants, one of whom is a federal district court judge. Ms. Cox's sprawling complaint includes allegations that various groups of defendants defamed her, violated her constitutional rights, infringed her copyrights, engaged in a conspiracy to silence her, engaged in negligent conduct, violated federal laws against witness tampering, , tortuously interfered with her business prospects, and violated the antitrust laws.

Inclusion of these disparate claims against disparate defendants in a single lawsuit renders the suit legally frivolous. *Cf. George v. Smith*, 507 F.3d 605 (7th Cir. 2007). Among other problems, there is no plausible basis for suing most (and perhaps all) of the defamation defendants in Illinois, and the allegations that all of the defendants – who include, for example, the World Intellectual Property Organization, Forbes, the New York Times, a federal judge, an Oregon sheriff, and several lawyers and law firms – conspired with each other are fantastical and implausible.

For these reasons, the Court dismisses this case as legally frivolous pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e).