

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE SEVENTH CIRCUIT

Everett McKinley Dirksen
United States Courthouse
Room 2722 - 219 S. Dearborn Street
Chicago, Illinois 60604



Office of the Clerk
Phone: (312) 435-5850
www.ca7.uscourts.gov

ORDER

March 12, 2025

Before

CANDACE JACKSON-AKIWUMI, *Circuit Judge*
DORIS L. PRYOR, *Circuit Judge*
JOSHUA P. KOLAR, *Circuit Judge*

| | |
|--------------------------------------|---|
| No. 25-1369 | RYAN CHRISTOPHER ARMSTRONG, Plaintiff - Appellant v. FEDERAL GOVERNMENT, et al., Defendants - Appellees |
| Operating Court Information: | |
| District Court No: 4:25-cv-04007-SLD | |
| Central District of Illinois | |
| District Judge Sara Darrow | |

The following are before the court:

1. **MOTION FOR PERMISSION TO FILE ELECTRONICALLY AS A PRO SE PARTY**, filed on March 7, 2025, by the pro se appellant.
2. **MOTION FOR DISABILITY ACCOMMODATIONS**, filed on March 7, 2025, by the pro se appellant.

This matter comes before the court for its consideration upon the request of appellant Ryan Armstrong for leave to become an electronic filer and for disability accommodations, received by this court on March 7, 2025.

This court has carefully reviewed the record in the district court, the record on appeal, and appellant's motions and opening brief. Based on this review, the court has determined that the issues raised are insubstantial. "Summary disposition is appropriate . . . 'when the position of one party is so clearly correct as a matter of law that no substantial question regarding the

No. 25-1369

Page 2

outcome of the appeal exists.'" *Williams v. Chrans*, 42 F.3d 1137, 1139 (7th Cir. 1994) (quoting *Joshua v. United States*, 17 F.3d 378, 380 (Fed. Cir. 1994)). The district court correctly dismissed the complaint as factually frivolous. *See Felton v. City of Chicago*, 827 F.3d 632, 635 (7th Cir. 2016) (citing *Neitzke v. Williams*, 490 U.S. 319, 325 (2016)). Accordingly,

IT IS ORDERED that the motions are **DENIED** and that the district court's dismissal of appellant's case is summarily **AFFIRMED**.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
CENTRAL DISTRICT OF ILLINOIS
ROCK ISLAND DIVISION

RYAN ARMSTRONG,)
Plaintiff,)
v.) Case No. 4:25-cv-04007-SLD
THE UNITED STATES FEDERAL)
GOVERNMENT, *et al.*,)
Defendants.)

MERIT REVIEW ORDER

The matter comes before the Court for merit review of Plaintiff Ryan Armstrong's Complaint, ECF No. 1, and for ruling on Plaintiff's motion to proceed *in forma pauperis* ("IFP"), ECF No. 3.

I. IFP Motion

Plaintiff requests to proceed without prepayment of fees and costs pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915(a)(1). He submitted an affidavit signed under penalty of perjury which demonstrates that he is unable to pay the costs of the proceeding. IFP Pet. 1–5. The motion to proceed IFP, therefore, is GRANTED.

II. Merit Review

The court must dismiss an action brought by an individual proceeding IFP if it determines the action "is frivolous or malicious." 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B)(i). Section 1915(e)(2)(B)(i) allows courts "to pierce the veil of [a] complaint's factual allegations and dismiss those claims whose factual contentions are clearly baseless." *Neitzke v. Williams*, 490 U.S. 319, 327 (1989).¹

¹ *Neitzke* refers to 28 U.S.C. § 1915(d). *Neitzke*, 490 U.S. at 327. Section 1915(e)(2)(B)(i) is section 1915(d)'s "materially identical successor." *Gladney v. Pendleton Corr. Facility*, 302 F.3d 773, 775 (7th Cir. 2002).

“A claim is factually frivolous if its allegations are bizarre, irrational or incredible.” *Edwards v. Snyder*, 478 F.3d 827, 829 (7th Cir. 2007); *Neitzke*, 490 U.S. at 328 (noting that a court can dismiss complaints that describe “fantastic or delusional scenarios”). A ruling that a suit is frivolous is a jurisdictional ruling. *Gladney v. Pendleton Corr. Facility*, 302 F.3d 773, 775 (7th Cir. 2002). Once the court dismisses a suit as factually frivolous, a plaintiff cannot bring a new suit based on the same allegations. *See id.* (“[W]hile a frivolous suit does not engage the jurisdiction of the district court to decide the merits of the suit, the court has jurisdiction to determine its jurisdiction, and its determination precludes the plaintiff from filing a new suit with the same jurisdictional defect.”).

Plaintiff’s Complaint names over one hundred defendants, including branches of government, government agencies, media companies, schools, hospitals, and websites. *See* Compl. 1–29.² Plaintiff claims that he “has been getting violated with crime on a daily basis for over 32 years.” *Id.* at 31. “Crimes [he has] been violated with include multiple violent murder-attempts . . . , multiple rapes, nonstop mental/physical/sexual abuse, constant privacy invasion, constant sabotage, getting exploited for more than \$1,000,000,000 and more.” *Id.* He alleges that he has been “victim to [the] nation’s highest crimes many separate times.” *Id.* He alleges that he has tried to “contribute designs and inventions that drastically improve life on earth” and that the businesses named as defendants “are all guilty of using [his] designs and suggestions without giving [him] credit nor [his] lawful earnings.” *Id.* at 32. He “expect[s] to be compensated \$10,000,000,000.” *Id.*

Plaintiff filed a nearly identical complaint against many of the same defendants in 2023. Compl., *Armstrong v. The U.S. Fed. Gov’t*, No. 4:23-cv-04139-SLD-JEH (C.D. Ill. Aug. 25,

² The Complaint is not paginated, so the Court uses the page numbers generated by CM/ECF.

2023), ECF No. 1. The Court granted Plaintiff leave to file an amended complaint, Oct. 17, 2023 Merit Review Order, *Armstrong v. The U.S. Fed. Gov't*, No. 4:23-cv-04139-SLD-JEH (C.D. Ill. Oct. 17, 2023), ECF No. 3, and then dismissed his suit after an amended complaint was filed that added 300 pages of allegations illuminating that the suit was factually frivolous, *Armstrong v. The U.S. Fed. Gov't*, No. 4:23-cv-04139-SLD-JEH, 2023 WL 7005376, at *2 (C.D. Ill. Oct. 24, 2023).

Even though the Complaint in this case names some different entities as defendants than in the prior suit, the basis of the two suits is the same—Plaintiff claims that he has been subjected to vague crimes by many people and entities, and that his inventions and thoughts have been stolen. The Court has already found this suit frivolous, precluding Plaintiff from bringing it again. Even if deciding the issue anew, the Court would dismiss Plaintiff's suit as factually frivolous. *Cf. Holmes v. Loung*, No. 18-cv-1063-DRH, 2018 WL 3549834, at *2–3 (S.D. Ill. July 24, 2018) (dismissing a case as factually frivolous where the plaintiff alleged that he was being sexually assaulted while sleeping and subjected to mind control and that he was owed billions of dollars even though the plaintiff included some “more mundane allegations,” noting that “allegations about the mind-control device and sexual torture make up the gravamen of [the] [c]omplaint”).

CONCLUSION

Accordingly, the motion to proceed *in forma pauperis*, ECF No. 2, is GRANTED, and the Complaint, ECF No. 1, is DISMISSED under 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B)(i) as it is frivolous. The Clerk is directed to enter judgment and close the case. Any lawsuit filed using a substantially similar complaint will be summarily dismissed as frivolous. *See Gladney*, 302 F.3d at 775.

Entered this 11th day of February, 2025.

s/ Sara Darrow
SARA DARROW
CHIEF UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

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