

INDEX TO APPENDICES

APPENDIX A	Case Dismissal in Court of Appeals	V
APPENDIX B	Copy of Lawsuit	V1
APPENDIX C	Forman v Davis 371 US 178 (1962)	V11
APPENDIX D	Judge's Dismissal & Opinion	V111

United States Court of Appeals For the First Circuit

No. 18-1120

NATASHA DELIMA,

Plaintiff, Appellant,

v.

COMMONWEALTH OF MASSACHUSETTS; PRINCE LOBEL LAW FIRM; METROWEST DAILY NEWS; DANIEL CAPETTA; LOWELL SUN; METROWEST HOSPITAL; LEONARD MORSE HOSPITAL; LIBERTY MUTUAL INSURANCE COMPANY; DR. IRMA RASMUSEN; REGISTRY OF MOTOR VEHICLES; FBI; FRAMINGHAM DISTRICT COURT; WORCESTER DISTRICT COURT; AYER DISTRICT COURT; BOSTON FEDERALCOURT; SUPREME JUDICIAL COURT; BBO; FRAMINGHAM POLICE; ORANGE POLICE; MARIAN RYAN, District Attorney; COMMISSION ON JUDICIAL REVIEW; ICE; SSI; MARRIOTT HOTEL,

Defendants, Appellees.

Before

Torruella, Kayatta and Thompson,
Circuit Judges.

JUDGMENT

Entered: March 27, 2019 ✓

The motion for summary disposition is allowed and the judgment of the district court is summarily affirmed essentially for the reasons discussed in its order of January 8, 2018. See 1st Cir. R. 27.0(c). The appellant's request for a default ruling and damages is denied.

By the Court:

Maria R. Hamilton, Clerk

cc:

Natasha Delima, Maura T. Healey, Julia E. Kobick, Cassandra Bolanos, Cynthia A. Young

18-1120

Natasha Delima
Apt 1
192 Roxbury St
Keene, NH 03431

United States Court of Appeals For the First Circuit

No. 18-1120

NATASHA DELIMA,

Plaintiff, Appellant,

v.

COMMONWEALTH OF MASSACHUSETTS; PRINCE LOBEL LAW FIRM; METROWEST DAILY NEWS; DANIEL CAPETTA; LOWELL SUN; METROWEST HOSPITAL; LEONARD MORSE HOSPITAL; LIBERTY MUTUAL INSURANCE COMPANY; DR. IRMA RASMUSEN; REGISTRY OF MOTOR VEHICLES; FBI; FRAMINGHAM DISTRICT COURT; WORCESTER DISTRICT COURT; AYER DISTRICT COURT; BOSTON FEDERALCOURT; SUPREME JUDICIAL COURT; BBO; FRAMINGHAM POLICE; ORANGE POLICE; MARIAN RYAN, District Attorney; COMMISSION ON JUDICIAL REVIEW; ICE; SSI; MARRIOTT HOTEL,

Defendants, Appellees.

Before

Torruebla, Thompson and Kayatta,
Circuit Judges.

CORRECTED JUDGMENT*

Entered: April 1, 2019

The motion for summary disposition is allowed and the judgment of the district court is summarily affirmed essentially for the reasons discussed in its order of January 8, 2018. See 1st Cir. R. 27.0(c). The appellant's request for a default ruling and damages is denied.

By the Court:

Maria R. Hamilton, Clerk

* Corrected Judgment issued to reflect in light of seniority, Judge Thompson now appears before Judge Kayatta.

cc:

Natasha Delima
Maura T. Healey
Julia Eleanor Kobick
Cassandra Bolanos
Cynthia A. Young

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF MASSACHUSETTS

NATASHA DELIMA,)
Plaintiff,)
v.)
COMONWEALTH OF MASSACHUSETTS,)
FBI, FRAMINGHAM DISTRICT COURT,)
WORCESTER DISTRICT COURT, AYER)
DISTRICT COURT, BOSTON FEDERAL)
COURT, SUPREME JUDICIAL COURT,)
BBO, FRAMINGHAM POLICE, WORCESTER)
POLICE, ORANGE POLICE, DISTRICT)
ATTORNEY MARIAN RYAN, COMMISSION)
ON JUDICIAL REVIEW, ICE, SSI,)
MARRIOTT HOTEL, METROWEST DAILY)
NEWS, THE LOWELL SUN, METROWEST)
HOSPITAL, LEONARD MORSE HOSPITAL,)
LIBERTY MUTUAL INSURANCE, PRINCE)
LOBEL LAW FIRM, DANIEL CAPETTA,)
REGISTRY OF MOTOR VEHICLES AND)
DR. IRMA RASMUSEN,)
Defendants.)
)
)

Civil Action No.
17-12535-LTS

ORDER OF DISMISSAL

SOROKIN, D.J.

January 8, 2018

Plaintiff Natasha DeLima's motion to proceed *in forma pauperis* (ECF No. 2) is ALLOWED. Because the plaintiff is proceeding *in forma pauperis*, the complaint is subject to screening. See 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B)(i). A complaint is frivolous "if the facts alleged are clearly baseless, a category encompassing allegations that are fanciful, fantastic and delusional." Denton v. Hernandez, 504 U.S. 25, 32-3 (1992)(citations and quotations omitted). "As those words suggest, a finding of factual frivolousness is appropriate when the facts alleged rise to the

level of the irrational or the wholly incredible, whether or not there are judicially noticeable facts available to contradict them.” Id. at 33. Here, DeLima’s complaint sets forth a wholly implausible so-called “deep state” conspiracy between the federal, state, local and private actors that falls squarely within the contours of a frivolous claim. While the Court does not doubt the sincerity of DeLima’s belief in her claims, the complaint read generously, does not meet the screening requirements of 28 U.S.C. §1915(e)(2)(B)(i).

Accordingly, this action is DISMISSED pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §1915(e)(2)(B)(i). The Clerk is directed to close this case.

So Ordered.

/s/ Leo T. Sorokin
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

**Additional material
from this filing is
available in the
Clerk's Office.**