

# In the United States Court of Federal Claims

No. 05-957C

(Filed: December 12, 2005)

---

LOURDES LLARENA, *pro se*,

Plaintiff,

v.

THE UNITED STATES,

Defendant.

## ORDER

Plaintiff commenced this pro se action on August 30, 2005, and attached to the Complaint an application to proceed in forma pauperis. In order to provide access to the Federal courts for those who cannot pay the required filing fees, 28 U.S.C. § 1915(a)(1) allows a party to commence an action without prepayment of fees and costs upon a showing by affidavit that the party is unable to pay such amounts. Construing liberally the statutory intent, Plaintiff has made the required showing here, and the Court grants Plaintiff's application to proceed in forma pauperis.

By motion dated October 31, 2005, Defendant has asked the Court pursuant to RCFC 12(b)(1) to dismiss Plaintiff's Complaint for lack of jurisdiction. As Defendant has pointed out, the eight-page, handwritten Complaint is difficult to follow, but seems to allege various grievances against public officials, such as Senator Robert Dole, Senator Hillary Rodham Clinton, Senator Orrin Hatch, Senator Kay Bailey Hutchinson, Senator Arlen Specter, Senator Ted Kennedy, as well as First Lady Laura Bush, and approximately six Federal judges, among others. The Complaint includes mention of an arrest in the State of Florida, an insurance fraud, and the adequacy of social services in the District of Columbia. However, much of the Complaint is unintelligible, and it does not contain any specific allegations that would constitute a claim cognizable in this Court. Plaintiff has not submitted any response to Defendant's motion to dismiss within the required time.

Pursuant to the Tucker Act, 28 U.S.C. § 1491(a), this Court is authorized to “render judgment upon any claim against the United States founded either upon the Constitution, or any Act of Congress or any regulation of an executive department, or upon any express or implied contract with the United States, or for liquidated or unliquidated damages in cases not sounding in tort.” In order to invoke the jurisdiction of this Court, Plaintiff must demonstrate that her claims are based upon a relevant constitutional provision, statute, or regulation that mandates the payment of money to her. United States v. Connolly, 716 F.2d 882, 885-86 (Fed. Cir. 1983) (en banc). Plaintiff has not pleaded any relevant constitutional provision, statute, or regulation.

In the interest of the efficient use of judicial resources, and to minimize the cost and delay of litigation, see RCFC Appendix A, ¶ 1, the Court is authorized to dismiss at any time a case that is frivolous or malicious, fails to state a claim upon which relief may be granted, or seeks monetary relief against a defendant who is immune from such relief, see 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2). Plaintiff’s Complaint here should be dismissed for each of these reasons. Accordingly, Defendant’s motion to dismiss is granted.

**IT IS ORDERED** as follows:

1. The Clerk of the Court shall allow the Complaint to be filed without payment of the filing fees.
2. The Clerk of the Court shall dismiss the Complaint without prejudice for lack of subject matter jurisdiction.

No costs are allowed.

---

THOMAS C. WHEELER  
Judge