

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE DISTRICT OF MARYLAND**

ANNAMARIE,

\*

Plaintiff

\*

v

\*

Civil Action No. JKB-12-2934

619 OTHERS, *et al.*,

\*

Defendants

\*

\* \* \* \* \*

**MEMORANDUM**

The above-captioned complaint was filed with a motion to proceed in forma pauperis. ECF Nos. 1 and 2. Because the Plaintiff appears to be indigent, the motion shall be granted.

The 52 page typewritten complaint is essentially incomprehensible. Plaintiff states her last name is uncertain; however at one time it appears to have been Riethmiller. She states that she and 619 others were parties in mental health cases decided in Manatee County, Florida. She appears to allege that the Florida Court rendered decisions based on evidence of a psychiatrist whose license fraudulently represented that she was certified by the American Board of Psychiatry and Neurology.

Plaintiff also requests this court declare Barak Hussein Obama ineligible as candidate for President and interdict the Electors of the State of Maryland from allowing him on the ballot, in part because he is not a natural born citizen. Plaintiff further requests the court order the Federal Crimes Unit take action against various government officials, including President Obama for various offenses and protect Plaintiff and other victims by appointing counsel.

Plaintiff alleges she has “suffered extreme violations of individual, human rights and women’s rights abuses at the hand of the Obama regime over a prolonged period of time.” She

alleges treason by various government officials and a “broken” judicial system. The remaining allegations concern her belief that President Obama is ineligible to be President of the United States and are in regard to Florida cases regarding an alleged fraudulent psychiatric and her own divorce case in Florida. The complaint concludes with a list of additional complaints regarding President Obama wherein Plaintiff alleges he violated the Constitution by “launching an illegal war in Libya,” appointing “czars,” making illegal recess appointments, denying the Affordable Health Care Act individual mandate was a tax, “stonewalling on Fast and Furious,” etc.<sup>1</sup>

Plaintiff is not a resident of the State of Maryland has alleged no facts involving any resident of the State of Maryland. Moreover, the complaint does not comply with Fed. R. Civ. P. 8(a) which directs that a pleading contain “a short and plain statement of the ground for the court’s jurisdiction” and “a short and plain statement of the claims showing that the pleader is entitled to relief.”

Additionally, it is noted that plaintiff does not have standing to bring this action. “A plaintiff must allege personal injury fairly traceable to the defendant’s allegedly unlawful conduct and likely to be redressed by the requested relief.” *Allen v. Wright*, 468 U.S. 737, 751 (1984). Plaintiff has not alleged how the Electors of the State of Maryland have harmed her, a non-resident of the State of Maryland. Further, she lacks standing to challenge President Obama’s eligibility to run for or serve as President of the United States. *See Drake v. Obama*, 664 F.3d 774, 780-82 (9th Cir. 2011); *Kerchner v. Obama*, 612 F. 3d 204, 207 (3rd Cir. 2010). Lastly, she lacks standing to request an order that “the Federal Crimes Unit” prosecute any alleged offenders or offenses. *See Linda R.S. v. Richard D.*, 410 U.S. 614, 619 (1973) (“[A]

---

<sup>1</sup> Suspecting Plaintiff may have filed identical cases in other districts, the court reviewed PACER (Public Access to Court Electronic Records) which revealed Plaintiff filed at least 13 similar or identical cases against Electors of numerous states on behalf of herself and 649 others. The orders dismissing those cases uniformly cited frivolousness as a ground for dismissal.

private citizen lacks a judicially cognizable interest in the prosecution or non-prosecution of another.”)

Additionally, this court lacks jurisdiction to take any action regarding her Florida divorce proceedings. A federal district court has no jurisdiction “over challenges to a state court decision in a particular case arising out of judicial proceedings even if those challenges allege that the state court’s action was unconstitutional.” *District of Columbia Court of Appeals v. Feldman*, 460 U.S. 462, 486 (1983).

Finally, a complaint that is totally implausible or frivolous, such as this, may be dismissed *sua sponte* for lack of subject matter jurisdiction pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 12 (b)(1). *See Apple v. Glenn*, 183 F.3d 477 (6th Cir. 1999); *O’Connor v. United States*, 159 F.R.D. 22 (D. Md. 1994); *see also Crowley Cutlery Co. v. United States*, 849 F.2d 273, 277 (7th Cir. 1988) (federal district judge has authority to dismiss a frivolous suit on his own initiative). Clearly, the allegations asserted by plaintiff are the product of fantasy or delusional thinking that cannot be addressed by this court. Plaintiff has not provided any information that might lead to a reasonable conclusion that some plausible cause of action has accrued on her behalf.

A separate order will dismiss this action.

DATED this 28th day of January, 2013.

BY THE COURT:

\_\_\_\_\_  
/s/  
James K. Bredar  
United States District Judge