UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

MARY JO WEIDRICK, *Plaintiff*, v. JOSEPH R. BIDEN, JR. *President of the United States*, et al., *Defendants*.	)	Civil Action No. 22-1531 (UNA)

MEMORANDUM OPINION

This matter is before the Court on review of Plaintiff's *pro se* Complaint, Dkt. 1, and application for leave to proceed *in forma pauperis* (IFP), Dkt. 2. In IFP proceedings, the Court is required to dismiss a case "at any time" it determines, as here, that the action is frivolous. 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B)(i).

The plaintiff has again filed a Complaint "primarily 'to allow' her 'to immediately confer with her attorney of [now 5] years, Mark J. Geragos.'" *Weidrick v. Biden*, No. 21-cv-416 (UNA), 2021 WL 1099934, at *1 (D.D.C. Mar. 4, 2021), *aff'd*, 848 Fed. App'x 436 (D.C. Cir. 2021); *see* Compl. ¶ 1. She seeks to stop "named and unnamed Defendants daily forge pro-terrorism material making it appear it is Plaintiff's, then threaten to arrest Mr. Geragos." *Id.* Plaintiff admits that she has filed at least one "previous lawsuit in 2021/22," which was "denied by SCOTUS." *Id.* ¶ 2. Allegedly, her "sources have indicated seven out of nine SCOTUS Justices are participants in this terrorism," so she has named them as defendants in this action, *id.*, along with President Biden,

EX. "A"

U.S. Attorney General Merrick Garland, the United States Military, and the United States Congress, *id.* at 2.

The instant Complaint, like those dismissed previously, is replete with rehashed allegations of terrorism, sexual assault, slander, and torture. For example, Plaintiff claims "there are many planks of this 24/7 terrorism of 32 1/2+ years including but not limited to raping of Plaintiff's brain with mind reading equipment[.]" *Id.* ¶ 7; *cf. Weidrick*, *supra* at *1 (concluding that complaint alleging same "satisfies [the frivolous] standard.") (surveying cases)); *Weidrick v. Biden*, No. 21-cv-2224 (UNA), 2021 WL 6621164, at *1 (D.D.C. Sept. 23, 2021), *aff'd*, No. 21-5247, 2022 WL 190758 (D.C. Cir. Jan. 18, 2022) ("Upon careful review of the [similarly pled] complaint, the Court concludes that its factual allegations are irrational or wholly incredible, rendering this case subject to dismissal as frivolous."); *Weidrick v. Obama*, No. 12-cv-0944, 2012 WL 2308103, at *1 (D.D.C. June 11, 2012) ("Plaintiff's outlandish accusations [of stalking and mind control] are the type of fantastic or delusional scenarios warranting dismissal under § 1915(e)(2) as frivolous."). Consequently, this case will be dismissed with prejudice. *See Firestone v. Firestone*, 76 F.3d 1205, 1209 (D.C. Cir. 1996) (holding that dismissal with prejudice is warranted upon determining "that 'the allegation of other facts consistent with the challenged pleading could not possibly cure the deficiency'" (quoting *Jarrell v. United States Postal Serv.*, 753 F.2d 1088, 1091 (D.C. Cir. 1985))). A separate order accompanies this Memorandum Opinion.

/s/
DABNEY L. FRIEDRICH
United States District Judge

Date: June 27, 2022

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

MARY JO WEIDRICK, *Plaintiff*, v. JOSEPH R. BIDEN, JR. *President of the United States*, et al., *Defendants*.	)	Civil Action No. 22-1531 (UNA)

ORDER

For the reasons stated in the accompanying Memorandum Opinion, it is

ORDERED that Plaintiff's motion for leave to proceed *in forma pauperis*, Dkt. 2, is **GRANTED**, and her motion to expedite, Dkt. 3, is **DENIED**; it is further

ORDERED that the complaint and this case are **DISMISSED** with prejudice.

This is a final appealable Order.

/s/
DABNEY L. FRIEDRICH
United States District Judge

Date: June 27, 2022

Ex. "A"