

**U.S. District Court**  
**District of Columbia (Washington, DC)**  
**CIVIL DOCKET FOR CASE #: 1:21-cv-02424-UNA**

BREWER v. FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION et al  
Assigned to: Unassigned  
Cause: 42:1983 Civil Rights Act

Date Filed: 09/13/2021  
Jury Demand: None  
Nature of Suit: 440 Civil Rights: Other  
Jurisdiction: U.S. Government Defendant

**Plaintiff**

**DENNIS SHELDON BREWER**

represented by **DENNIS SHELDON BREWER**  
1210 City Place  
Edgewater, NJ 07020  
PRO SE

V.

**Defendant**

**FEDERAL BUREAU OF  
INVESTIGATION**

*My. Christopher Wray, Director*

**Defendant**

**DEPARTMENTS, AGENCIES, AND  
CONTRACTORS OF THE UNITED  
STATES OF AMERICA**

*other unidentifiable*

Date Filed	#	Docket Text
09/13/2021		<b>Initiating Pleading &amp; IFP Application Received on 9/13/2021.</b> A copy of the docket sheet has been mailed to the address of record for the pro se party. (znm) (Entered: 09/17/2021)

22-5158

Dennis Sheldon Brewer  
1210 City Place  
Edgewater, NJ 07020

---

---

**FILED**

SEPT. 27, 2021

Clerk, U.S. District & Bankruptcy  
Court for the District of Columbia

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA**

DENNIS SHELDON BREWER,

Plaintiff,

v.

FEDERAL BUREAU OF  
INVESTIGATION, *et al.*,

Defendants.

Civil Action No. 1:21-cv-02424 (UNA)

**ORDER**

For the reasons stated in the accompanying memorandum opinion, it is

**ORDERED** that plaintiff's application for leave to proceed *in forma pauperis*, ECF No. 2, is **GRANTED**, and it is further

**ORDERED** that, pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B)(i), the complaint, ECF No. 1, and this case, are **DISMISSED** without prejudice, and it is further

**ORDERED** that the request for emergency restraining order, ECF No. 3, is **DENIED**.

This is a final appealable order. *See* Fed. R. App. P. 4(a).

**SO ORDERED.**

/s/  
AMY BERMAN JACKSON  
United States District Judge

Date: September 27, 2021

**FILED**

SEPT. 27, 2021

Clerk, U.S. District & Bankruptcy  
Court for the District of Columbia

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA**

DENNIS SHELDON BREWER,

Plaintiff,

v.

FEDERAL BUREAU OF  
INVESTIGATION, *et al.*,

Defendants.

Civil Action No. 1:21-cv-02424 (UNA)

**MEMORANDUM OPINION**

This matter is before the court on its initial review of plaintiff's *pro se* complaint ("Compl."), ECF No. 1, and application for leave to proceed *in forma pauperis*, ECF No. 2. The court will grant the *in forma pauperis* application and dismiss the case pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B)(ii), by which the court is required to dismiss a case "at any time" if it determines that the action is frivolous. Plaintiff has also submitted a request for emergency restraining order, ECF No. 3, which will be denied.

"A complaint must contain sufficient factual matter, accepted as true, to 'state a claim to relief that is plausible on its face.'" *Ashcroft v. Iqbal*, 556 U.S. 662, 678 (2009), quoting *Bell Atl. Corp. v. Twombly*, 550 U.S. 544, 570 (2007). A complaint that lacks "an arguable basis either in law or in fact" is frivolous, *Neitzke v. Williams*, 490 U.S. 319, 325 (1989), and a "complaint plainly abusive of the judicial process is properly typed malicious," *Crisafi v. Holland*, 655 F.2d 1305, 1309 (D.C. Cir. 1981).

Plaintiff, a resident of Edgewater, New Jersey, sues the Federal Bureau of Investigation ("FBI") and "other unidentifiable Departments, Agencies, and contractors of the United States of America." Compl. at 1, 2. Preliminarily, the Local Rules of this court state: "[t]he first filing by

A court may dismiss a complaint as frivolous “when the facts alleged rise to the level of the irrational or the wholly incredible,” *Denton v. Hernandez*, 504 U.S. 25, 33 (1992), or “postulat[e] events and circumstances of a wholly fanciful kind,” *Crisafi*, 655 F.2d at 1307–08. The instant complaint satisfies this standard. In addition to failing to state a claim for relief or establish this court’s jurisdiction, the complaint is deemed frivolous on its face.

Therefore, this case is dismissed without prejudice, and the request for emergency restraining order is denied. A separate order accompanies this memorandum opinion.

/s/  
AMY BERMAN JACKSON  
United States District Judge

Date: September 27, 2021

**FILED**

SEPT. 27, 2021

Clerk, U.S. District & Bankruptcy  
Court for the District of Columbia

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA**

DENNIS SHELDON BREWER,

Plaintiff,

v.

FEDERAL BUREAU OF  
INVESTIGATION, *et al.*,

Defendants.

Civil Action No. 1:21-cv-02424 (UNA)

**ORDER**

For the reasons stated in the accompanying memorandum opinion, it is

**ORDERED** that plaintiff's application for leave to proceed *in forma pauperis*, ECF No. 2, is **GRANTED**, and it is further

**ORDERED** that, pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B)(i), the complaint, ECF No. 1, and this case, are **DISMISSED** without prejudice, and it is further

**ORDERED** that the request for emergency restraining order, ECF No. 3, is **DENIED**.

This is a final appealable order. *See* Fed. R. App. P. 4(a).

**SO ORDERED.**

/s/  
AMY BERMAN JACKSON  
United States District Judge

Date: September 27, 2021

**FILED**

SEPT. 27, 2021

Clerk, U.S. District & Bankruptcy  
Court for the District of Columbia

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA**

DENNIS SHELDON BREWER,

Plaintiff,

v.

FEDERAL BUREAU OF  
INVESTIGATION, *et al.*,

Defendants.

Civil Action No. 1:21-cv-02424 (UNA)

**MEMORANDUM OPINION**

This matter is before the court on its initial review of plaintiff's *pro se* complaint ("Compl."), ECF No. 1, and application for leave to proceed *in forma pauperis*, ECF No. 2. The court will grant the *in forma pauperis* application and dismiss the case pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B)(ii), by which the court is required to dismiss a case "at any time" if it determines that the action is frivolous. Plaintiff has also submitted a request for emergency restraining order, ECF No. 3, which will be denied.

"A complaint must contain sufficient factual matter, accepted as true, to 'state a claim to relief that is plausible on its face.'" *Ashcroft v. Iqbal*, 556 U.S. 662, 678 (2009), quoting *Bell Atl. Corp. v. Twombly*, 550 U.S. 544, 570 (2007). A complaint that lacks "an arguable basis either in law or in fact" is frivolous, *Neitzke v. Williams*, 490 U.S. 319, 325 (1989), and a "complaint plainly abusive of the judicial process is properly typed malicious," *Crisafi v. Holland*, 655 F.2d 1305, 1309 (D.C. Cir. 1981).

Plaintiff, a resident of Edgewater, New Jersey, sues the Federal Bureau of Investigation ("FBI") and "other unidentifiable Departments, Agencies, and contractors of the United States of America." Compl. at 1, 2. Preliminarily, the Local Rules of this court state: "[t]he first filing by

or on behalf of a party shall have in the caption the name and full residence address of the party.” LCvR 5.1(c). The rambling prolix complaint, totaling 159 pages, is difficult to follow. Plaintiff seems to allege that the FBI and other unnamed federal entities have unlawfully orchestrated a decades-long conspiracy to investigate, surveil, and harass him, and have used their “novel technology” to infiltrate his thoughts and actions and commit other clandestine crimes both domestically and internationally. *See* Compl. at 5–7. Though he cites to a laundry list of federal authority, the applicability of this authority to his intended claims is entirely unclear. *See id.* at 3.

Plaintiff states that he has suffered physical, emotional, financial difficulties. *See id.* at 5–7. He demands unspecified monetary damages. *See id.* at 7. He also seeks an emergency injunction immediately requiring the United States and defendants to “cease and desist all use of this illegally and unconstitutionally deployed technology and related oppressive operational tactics against all persons[,]” both in the United States and abroad, and an order directing the United States to “either affirm to deny Plaintiff’s assertion of the existence of this technology and it[s] deployment within or without the United States.” *Id.*

This court cannot exercise subject matter jurisdiction over a frivolous complaint. *Hagans v. Lavine*, 415 U.S. 528, 536–37 (1974) (“Over the years, this Court has repeatedly held that the federal courts are without power to entertain claims otherwise within their jurisdiction if they are ‘so attenuated and unsubstantial as to be absolutely devoid of merit.’”), quoting *Newburyport Water Co. v. Newburyport*, 193 U.S. 561, 579 (1904); *Tooley v. Napolitano*, 586 F.3d 1006, 1010 (D.C. Cir. 2009) (examining cases dismissed “for patent insubstantiality,” including where the plaintiff allegedly “was subjected to a campaign of surveillance and harassment deriving from uncertain origins.”).



A court may dismiss a complaint as frivolous “when the facts alleged rise to the level of the irrational or the wholly incredible,” *Denton v. Hernandez*, 504 U.S. 25, 33 (1992), or “postulat[e] events and circumstances of a wholly fanciful kind,” *Crisafi*, 655 F.2d at 1307–08. The instant complaint satisfies this standard. In addition to failing to state a claim for relief or establish this court’s jurisdiction, the complaint is deemed frivolous on its face.

Therefore, this case is dismissed without prejudice, and the request for emergency restraining order is denied. A separate order accompanies this memorandum opinion.

/s/  
AMY BERMAN JACKSON  
United States District Judge

Date: September 27, 2021

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

DENNIS SHELDON BREWER,

Plaintiff,

v.

CHRISTOPHER WRAY, *et al.*,

Defendants.

Civil Action No. 21-2954 (UNA)

**MEMORANDUM OPINION**

This matter is before the court on its initial review of plaintiff's *pro se* complaint ("Compl."), ECF No. 1, and application for leave to proceed *in forma pauperis*, ECF No. 2. The Court will grant the *in forma pauperis* application and dismiss the case pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B)(ii), by which the Court is required to dismiss a case "at any time" if it determines that the action is frivolous.

According to plaintiff, defendants "have conducted ongoing operations against [him]" Compl. at 6 (page numbers designated by CM/ECF), using "novel technologies," *id.* at 7, which "cause[] emotional trauma, physical pain, manufactured body movements, thoughts, and verbalizations," *id.* Plaintiff deemed these technologies "more sophisticated than[] the technology used by adversaries of the United States to create Havana Syndrome symptoms, illnesses, and permanent brain damage." *Id.* at 10. Although "[m]onetary damages cannot be properly identified at this time due to [defendants'] durable pattern of misconduct," plaintiff declared that "[t]he amount in controversy exceeds \$15,000,000." *Id.* at 5.

"A complaint must contain sufficient factual matter, accepted as true, to 'state a claim to relief that is plausible on its face.'" *Ashcroft v. Iqbal*, 556 U.S. 662, 678 (2009) (quoting *Bell Atl. Corp. v. Twombly*, 550 U.S. 544, 570 (2007)). A complaint that lacks "an arguable basis

**U.S. District Court**  
**District of Columbia (Washington, DC)**  
**CIVIL DOCKET FOR CASE #: 1:21-cv-02671-UNA**

BREWER v. WRAY et al  
Assigned to: Unassigned  
Cause: 28:1331 Fed. Question

Date Filed: 10/12/2021  
Jury Demand: None  
Nature of Suit: 890 Other Statutory Actions  
Jurisdiction: U.S. Government Defendant

**Plaintiff**

**DENNIS SHELDON BREWER**

represented by **DENNIS SHELDON BREWER**  
1210 City Place  
Edgewater, NJ 07020  
PRO SE

V.

**Defendant**

**CHRISTOPHER WRAY**

*Mr., Director, Federal Bureau of  
Investigation*

**Defendant**

**ALEJANDRO MAYORKAS**

*Mr., Secretary, Department of Homeland  
Security*

**Defendant**

**JANET YELLEN**

*Ms., Secretary, Department of the Treasury*

**Defendant**

**JOHN DOES**

*1-99, including Federal Agencies and  
Departments*

Date Filed	#	Docket Text
10/12/2021		<b>Initiating Pleading &amp; IFP Application Received on 10/12/2021.</b> A copy of the docket sheet has been mailed to the address of record for the pro se party. (znmw) (Entered: 10/15/2021)

**FILED**

**OCT. 15, 2021**

Clerk, U.S. District & Bankruptcy  
Court for the District of Columbia

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA**

DENNIS SHELDON BREWER,

Plaintiff,

v.

CHRISTOPHER WRAY, *et al.*,

Defendants.

Civil Action No. 21-2671 (UNA)

**ORDER**

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

ORDERED that the plaintiff's application to proceed *in forma pauperis* [2] is

GRANTED; it is

FURTHER ORDERED that the plaintiff's motion for a temporary restraining order [3] is

DENIED; and it is

FURTHER ORDERED the complaint and this civil action are DISMISSED WITHOUT  
PREJUDICE as frivolous.

This is a final appealable Order. *See* Fed. R. App. P. 4(a).

The Clerk of Court shall TERMINATE this case.

SO ORDERED.

/s/

JAMES E. BOASBERG

United States District Judge

DATE: October 15, 2021

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

**FILED**

OCT. 15, 2021

Clerk, U.S. District & Bankruptcy  
Court for the District of Columbia

DENNIS SHELDON BREWER,

Plaintiff,

v.

CHRISTOPHER WRAY, *et al.*,

Defendants.

Civil Action No. 21-2671 (UNA)

**MEMORANDUM OPINION**

This matter is before the court on its initial review of plaintiff's *pro se* complaint ("Compl."), ECF No. 1, and application for leave to proceed *in forma pauperis*, ECF No. 2. The Court will grant the *in forma pauperis* application and dismiss the case pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B)(ii), by which the Court is required to dismiss a case "at any time" if it determines that the action is frivolous. Plaintiff has also submitted a request for emergency restraining order, ECF No. 3, which will be denied.

Generally, plaintiff alleges that defendants have subjected him to "Brain Remote Management Technology (BRMT)." Compl. at 6 (page numbers designated by CM/ECF). Through BRMT and other technologies, plaintiff alleges that defendants control his body movements, speech and thought, *see, e.g., id.* at 9-12, and thus have caused physical and psychological injury, *see, e.g., id.* at 6-7, for which he demands damages of \$15 million and an order enjoining defendants from deploying BRMT, *see id.* at 7.

"A complaint must contain sufficient factual matter, accepted as true, to 'state a claim to relief that is plausible on its face.'" *Ashcroft v. Iqbal*, 556 U.S. 662, 678 (2009), quoting *Bell Atl. Corp. v. Twombly*, 550 U.S. 544, 570 (2007). A complaint that lacks "an arguable basis either in law or in fact" is frivolous, *Neitzke v. Williams*, 490 U.S. 319, 325 (1989), and a "complaint

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

DENNIS SHELDON BREWER,

Plaintiff,

v.

CHRISTOPHER WRAY, *et al.*,

Defendants.

)  
)  
)  
)  
)  
)  
)  
)  
)  
)  
)

Civil Action No. 21-2954 (UNA)

**ORDER**

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

ORDERED that the plaintiff's application to proceed *in forma pauperis* [2] is

GRANTED; and it is

FURTHER ORDERED the complaint and this civil action are DISMISSED WITHOUT  
PREJUDICE as frivolous.

This is a final appealable Order. *See* Fed. R. App. P. 4(a).

The Clerk of Court shall TERMINATE this case.

SO ORDERED.

/s/

COLLEEN KOLLAR-KOTELLY  
United States District Judge

DATE: November 16, 2021

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

DENNIS SHELDON BREWER,

Plaintiff,

v.

CHRISTOPHER WRAY, *et al.*,

Defendants.

Civil Action No. 21-2954 (UNA)

**MEMORANDUM OPINION**

This matter is before the court on its initial review of plaintiff's *pro se* complaint ("Compl."), ECF No. 1, and application for leave to proceed *in forma pauperis*, ECF No. 2. The Court will grant the *in forma pauperis* application and dismiss the case pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B)(ii), by which the Court is required to dismiss a case "at any time" if it determines that the action is frivolous.

According to plaintiff, defendants "have conducted ongoing operations against [him]" Compl. at 6 (page numbers designated by CM/ECF), using "novel technologies," *id.* at 7, which "cause[] emotional trauma, physical pain, manufactured body movements, thoughts, and verbalizations," *id.* Plaintiff deemed these technologies "more sophisticated than[] the technology used by adversaries of the United States to create Havana Syndrome symptoms, illnesses, and permanent brain damage." *Id.* at 10. Although "[m]onetary damages cannot be properly identified at this time due to [defendants'] durable pattern of misconduct," plaintiff declared that "[t]he amount in controversy exceeds \$15,000,000." *Id.* at 5.

"A complaint must contain sufficient factual matter, accepted as true, to 'state a claim to relief that is plausible on its face.'" *Ashcroft v. Iqbal*, 556 U.S. 662, 678 (2009) (quoting *Bell Atl. Corp. v. Twombly*, 550 U.S. 544, 570 (2007)). A complaint that lacks "an arguable basis

either in law or in fact” is frivolous, *Neitzke v. Williams*, 490 U.S. 319, 325 (1989), and a “complaint plainly abusive of the judicial process is properly typed malicious,” *Crisafi v. Holland*, 655 F.2d 1305, 1309 (D.C. Cir. 1981). On review of the complaint, the Court concludes that its factual allegations are incoherent, irrational or wholly incredible, rendering the complaint subject to dismissal as frivolous. *See Denton v. Hernandez*, 504 U.S. 25, 33 (1992) (“[A] finding of factual frivolousness is appropriate when the facts alleged rise to the level of the irrational or the wholly incredible[.]”).

The Court will grant plaintiff’s application to proceed *in forma pauperis* and will dismiss the complaint pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B)(i) as frivolous. A separate order will issue.

DATE: November 16, 2021

/s/  
COLLEEN KOLLAR-KOTELLY  
United States District Judge



UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

**FILED**

JAN 24 2022

Clerk, U.S. District & Bankruptcy  
Court for the District of Columbia

DENNIS SHELDON BREWER,

Plaintiff,

v.

CHRISTOPHER WRAY, *et al.*,

Defendants.

Civil Action No. 1:22-cv-00116 (UNA)

**MEMORANDUM OPINION**

This matter is before the court on its initial review of Plaintiff's *pro se* complaint ("Compl."), ECF No. 1, and application for leave to proceed *in forma pauperis*, ECF No. 2. The court will grant the *in forma pauperis* application and dismiss the case pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B)(i), which requires a court to dismiss a case "at any time" if it determines that the action is frivolous.

"A complaint must contain sufficient factual matter, accepted as true, to 'state a claim to relief that is plausible on its face.'" *Ashcroft v. Iqbal*, 556 U.S. 662, 678 (2009) (quoting *Bell Atl. Corp. v. Twombly*, 550 U.S. 544, 570 (2007)). A complaint lacking "an arguable basis either in law or in fact" is frivolous, *Neitzke v. Williams*, 490 U.S. 319, 325 (1989), and a "complaint plainly abusive of the judicial process is properly typed malicious," *Crisafi v. Holland*, 655 F.2d 1305, 1309 (D.C. Cir. 1981).

Plaintiff, a resident of New Jersey, Compl. at 1, alleges that various federal officials and agencies, members of the New York City Police Department, and 99 John Does,<sup>1</sup> *id.* at 2, 8-9, "have conducted ongoing operations against [him]" *id.* at 5, using "novel technologies," *id.* at 6,

<sup>1</sup> The Local Rules of this court state that a plaintiff "filing *pro se in forma pauperis* must provide in the [complaint's] caption the name and full residence address or official address of each party." D.C. LCvR 5.1(c)(1).

which “cause[] emotional trauma, physical pain, manufactured body movements, thoughts, and verbalizations,” *id.* Plaintiff deems these technologies “more s[]o[p]histicated than the technology used by U.S. adversaries to cause and create the symptoms of Havana Syndrome.” *Id.* Plaintiff alleges that this purported technology is “an immediate and durable threat to” both his “life and health” and the safety of many others. *Id.* He declares that although “[m]onetary damages cannot be properly identified at this time due to [defendants’] durable pattern of misconduct,” “[t]he amount in controversy exceeds \$15,000,000.” *Id.* at 4.

The court cannot exercise subject matter jurisdiction over a frivolous complaint. *Hagans v. Lavine*, 415 U.S. 528, 536-37 (1974) (“Over the years, this Court has repeatedly held that the federal courts are without power to entertain claims otherwise within their jurisdiction if they are ‘so attenuated and unsubstantial as to be absolutely devoid of merit.’”) (quoting *Newburyport Water Co. v. Newburyport*, 193 U.S. 561, 579 (1904)); *Tooley v. Napolitano*, 586 F.3d 1006, 1010 (D.C. Cir. 2009) (examining cases dismissed “for patent insubstantiality,” including where the plaintiff allegedly “was subjected to a campaign of surveillance and harassment deriving from uncertain origins.”). A court may dismiss a complaint as frivolous “when the facts alleged rise to the level of the irrational or the wholly incredible,” *Denton v. Hernandez*, 504 U.S. 25, 33 (1992), or “postulat[e] events and circumstances of a wholly fanciful kind,” *Crisafi*, 655 F.2d at 1307-08. The instant Complaint satisfies this standard. In addition to failing to state a claim for relief, the complaint is frivolous on its face.

Consequently, the Complaint and this case are dismissed. Plaintiff's motion for temporary restraining order, ECF No. 3, which raises similarly fantastic and implausible claims, is also denied. A separate order accompanies this memorandum opinion.

Date: January 24, 2022

Tanya S. Chutkan

TANYA S. CHUTKAN  
United States District Judge

JAN 24 2022  
Clerk, U.S. District & Bankruptcy  
Court for the District of Columbia

## 1

**U.S. District Court  
District of Columbia (Washington, DC)  
CIVIL DOCKET FOR CASE #: 1:22-cv-00365-UNA**

BREWER v. WRAY et al  
Assigned to: Unassigned  
Cause: 42:1983 Prisoner Civil Rights

Date Filed: 02/07/2022  
Jury Demand: Plaintiff  
Nature of Suit: 440 Civil Rights: Other  
Jurisdiction: Federal Question

**Plaintiff**

**DENNIS SHELDON BREWER**

represented by **DENNIS SHELDON BREWER**  
1210 City Place  
Edgewater, NJ 07020  
PRO SE

V.

**Defendant**

**CHRISTOPHER WRAY**  
*Director, Federal Bureau of Investigation*

**Defendant**

**ALEJANDRO MAYORKAS**  
*Secretary, Department of Homeland  
Security*

**Defendant**

**JANET YELLEN**  
*Secretary, Department of the Treasury*

**Defendant**

**MERRICK GARLAND**  
*Hon.; Attorney General of the United States*

**Defendant**

**AVRIL HAINES**  
*Director of National Intelligence*

**Defendant**

**CITY OF NEW YORK POLICE  
DEPARTMENT**

**Defendant**

**ERNEST HART**  
*Deputy Commissioner for Legal Matters*

**Defendant**

**WILLIAM BURNS**

FEB. 23, 2022

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA**

Civil Action No. 22-0365 (UNA)

## United States District Judge

**U.S. District Court  
District of Columbia (Washington, DC)  
CIVIL DOCKET FOR CASE #: 1:22-cv-00592-UNA**

BREWER v. WRAY et al  
Assigned to: Unassigned  
Cause: 42:1983 Civil Rights Act

Date Filed: 02/25/2022  
Jury Demand: Plaintiff  
Nature of Suit: 440 Civil Rights: Other  
Jurisdiction: U.S. Government Defendant

**Plaintiff**

**DENNIS SHELDON BREWER**

represented by **DENNIS SHELDON BREWER**  
1210 City Place  
Edgewater, NJ 07020  
(201) 887-6541  
PRO SE

V.

**Defendant**

**CHRISTOPHER WRAY**

*Mr., Director, Federal Bureau of  
Investigation*

**Defendant**

**ALEJANDRO MAYORKAS**

*Mr., Secretary, Department of Homeland  
Security*

**Defendant**

**JANET YELLEN**

*Ms., Secretary, Department of Treasury*

**Defendant**

**MERRICK GARLAND**

*Hon., Attorney General of the United States*

**Defendant**

**AVRIL HAINES**

*Ms., Director of National Intelligence*

**Defendant**

**CITY OF NEW YORK POLICE  
DEPARTMENT**

**Defendant**

**WILLIAM BURNS**

*Mr., Director, Central Intelligence Agency*

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

DENNIS SHELDON BREWER,

Plaintiff,

v.

CHRISTOPHER WRAY *et al.*,

Defendants.

Civil Action No. 22-592 (UNA)

**ORDER**

Upon consideration of the Complaint and Request for Emergency Injunctive Relief, ECF No. 1, it is

**ORDERED** that Plaintiff's motion to proceed *in forma pauperis*, ECF No. 2, is **GRANTED**, and his Emergency Motion for a Temporary Restraining Order and Preliminary Injunction, ECF No. 3, is **DENIED**. It is further

**ORDERED** that the complaint and this case are **DISMISSED**, substantially for the reasons stated in the Memorandum Opinion issued in *Brewer v. Wray*, No. 22-cv-116 (UNA) (D.D.C. Jan. 24, 2022) (attached).

This is a final appealable Order.

\_\_\_\_\_/s/\_\_\_\_\_  
TIMOTHY J. KELLY  
United States District Judge

Date: April 6, 2022



**FILED**

JAN 24 2022

Clerk, U.S. District & Bankruptcy  
Court for the District of Columbia

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA**

DENNIS SHELDON BREWER,

Plaintiff,

v.

CHRISTOPHER WRAY, *et al.*,

Defendants.

Civil Action No. 1:22-cv-00116 (UNA)

**MEMORANDUM OPINION**

This matter is before the court on its initial review of Plaintiff's *pro se* complaint ("Compl."), ECF No. 1, and application for leave to proceed *in forma pauperis*, ECF No. 2. The court will grant the *in forma pauperis* application and dismiss the case pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B)(i), which requires a court to dismiss a case "at any time" if it determines that the action is frivolous.

"A complaint must contain sufficient factual matter, accepted as true, to 'state a claim to relief that is plausible on its face.'" *Ashcroft v. Iqbal*, 556 U.S. 662, 678 (2009) (quoting *Bell Atl. Corp. v. Twombly*, 550 U.S. 544, 570 (2007)). A complaint lacking "an arguable basis either in law or in fact" is frivolous, *Neitzke v. Williams*, 490 U.S. 319, 325 (1989), and a "complaint plainly abusive of the judicial process is properly typed malicious," *Crisafi v. Holland*, 655 F.2d 1305, 1309 (D.C. Cir. 1981).

Plaintiff, a resident of New Jersey, Compl. at 1, alleges that various federal officials and agencies, members of the New York City Police Department, and 99 John Does,<sup>1</sup> *id.* at 2, 8–9, "have conducted ongoing operations against [him]" *id.* at 5, using "novel technologies," *id.* at 6,

<sup>1</sup> The Local Rules of this court state that a plaintiff "filing *pro se in forma pauperis* must provide in the [complaint's] caption the name and full residence address or official address of each party." D.C. LCvR 5.1(c)(1).

Consequently, the Complaint and this case are dismissed. Plaintiff's motion for temporary restraining order, ECF No. 3, which raises similarly fantastic and implausible claims, is also denied. A separate order accompanies this memorandum opinion.

Date: January 24, 2022

Tanya S. Chutkan

TANYA S. CHUTKAN  
United States District Judge

**U.S. District Court**

**District of Columbia**

**Notice of Electronic Filing**

The following transaction was entered on 3/6/2023 at 10:54 AM EDT and filed on 3/6/2023

**Case Name:** BREWER v. WRAY et al

**Case Number:** 1:22-cv-00996-UNA

**Filer:**

**WARNING: CASE CLOSED on 05/16/2022**

**Document Number:** No document attached

**Docket Text:**

**MINUTE ORDER:** Plaintiff's motion for leave to proceed on appeal in forma pauperis [8] is **DENIED** as moot. The D.C. Circuit has affirmed the district court's dismissal of this civil action, see *Brewer v. Wray*, No. 22-5158 (D.C. Cir. Sept. 20, 2022), and issued its Mandate on November 14, 2022. Signed by Judge Randolph D. Moss on 3/4/23. (psu2)

**1:22-cv-00996-UNA Notice has been electronically mailed to:**

**1:22-cv-00996-UNA Notice will be delivered by other means to::**

DENNIS SHELDON BREWER  
1210 City Place  
Edgewater, NJ 07020

**U.S. District Court**  
**District of Columbia (Washington, DC)**  
**CIVIL DOCKET FOR CASE #: 1:23-mc-00014-UNA**

IN RE: DENNIS BREWER  
Assigned to: Unassigned  
Cause: Civil Miscellaneous Case

Date Filed: 02/10/2023  
Jury Demand: None  
Nature of Suit: 890 Other Statutory Actions  
Jurisdiction: Federal Question

**In Re**

**DENNIS SHELDON BREWER**

**Petitioner**

**DENNIS SHELDON BREWER**

represented by **DENNIS SHELDON BREWER**  
1210 City Place  
Edgewater, NJ 07020  
(210) 887-6541  
PRO SE

Date Filed	#	Docket Text
02/10/2023		<b>Initiating Pleading &amp; IFP Application Received on 02/10/2023.</b> A copy of the docket sheet has been mailed to the address of record for the pro se party. (zsl) (Entered: 02/10/2023)

**U.S. District Court**

**District of Columbia**

**Notice of Electronic Filing**

The following transaction was entered on 2/22/2023 at 5:06 PM EDT and filed on 2/22/2023

**Case Name:** IN RE: DENNIS BREWER

**Case Number:** 1:23-mc-00014-UNA

**Filer:**

**WARNING: CASE CLOSED on 02/13/2023**

**Document Number:** No document attached

**Docket Text:**

**MINUTE ORDER.** Petitioner's motion [4] to reconsider the order denying leave to file a nonconforming pleading and to proceed in forma pauperis in this miscellaneous case is **DENIED**. "Rule 59(e) permits a court to alter or amend a judgment, but it may not be used to relitigate old matters." *Leidos, Inc. v. Hellenic Republic*, 881 F.3d 213, 217 (D.C. Cir. 2018) (cleaned up). The instant motion, to the extent intelligible, is based on arguments that the Court has already considered and rejected. **SO ORDERED**. Signed by Judge Rudolph Contreras on 2/22/2023. (psu1)

**1:23-mc-00014-UNA Notice has been electronically mailed to:**

**1:23-mc-00014-UNA Notice will be delivered by other means to::**

DENNIS SHELDON BREWER  
1210 City Place  
Edgewater, NJ 07020

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA**

In Re

DENNIS SHELDON BREWER,

Petitioner,

)  
)  
)  
) Miscellaneous Action No. 23-mc-14 (UNA)  
)

**ORDER**

Petitioner, appearing *pro se*, wants the “Clerk of the Court to File Documents Not in Direct Conformance with Court Rules Due to Active Obstruction of Defendants’ Abusing Police Powers to Obstruct Justice.” The motion, to the extent intelligible, requests permission for Petitioner to file his official-capacity complaint against FBI Director Christopher Wray via a USB flash drive because the complaint consists of “approximately 20,000 [printed] pages.” Mot. ¶ 1.

A complaint of that length cannot plausibly satisfy the pleading standards of Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 8(a). Regardless, Petitioner claims that “Defendants have and do continue to abuse their police powers to block and obstruct the Lead Plaintiff in submitting this complex litigation to the District Court,” Mot. ¶ 2, which is belied by at least seven cases Petitioner filed against Wray but were dismissed as frivolous. *See Brewer v. Wray*, No. 22-cv-996 (UNA), 2022 WL 1597610, *aff’d*, No. 22-5158, 2022 WL 4349776 (D.C. Cir. Sept. 20, 2022); *Brewer v. Wray*, No. 1:22-cv-00116 (UNA), 2022 WL 226879, at \*2 (D.D.C. Jan. 24, 2022); *Brewer v. Wray*, No. 21-cv-03218 (UNA), 2022 WL 160269, at \*1 (D.D.C. Jan. 18, 2022); *see also Brewer v. Wray*, 22-cv-592 (UNA) (dismissed Apr. 7, 2022); *Brewer v. Wray*, 22-cv-365 (UNA) (dismissed Feb. 23, 2022); *Brewer v. Wray*, 21-cv-2954 (UNA) (dismissed Nov. 16, 2021); *Brewer v. Wray*, 21-cv-2671 (UNA) (dismissed Oct. 15, 2021).

Accordingly, it is

**ORDERED** that Petitioner's motion to file a nonconforming pleading, ECF No. 1, and his accompanying motion to proceed in forma pauperis, ECF No. 2, are **DENIED**, and this miscellaneous action is closed.<sup>1</sup>

Date: February 13, 2023

/s/  
RUDOLPH CONTRERAS  
United States District Judge

---

<sup>1</sup> Petitioner may initiate a civil action by submitting a proper complaint in paper form with the Clerk of the Court, *see* LCvR 5.1, accompanied by either the \$402 filing fee applicable to civil actions, *see* 28 U.S.C. § 1914(a) and Misc. Fee Schedule ¶ 14, or a motion to proceed in forma pauperis.

**U.S. District Court  
District of Columbia (Washington, DC)  
CIVIL DOCKET FOR CASE #: 1:23-cv-00415-UNA**

BREWER v. WRAY et al  
Assigned to: Unassigned  
Cause: 42:1983 Civil Rights Act

Date Filed: 02/14/2023  
Jury Demand: Plaintiff  
Nature of Suit: 440 Civil Rights: Other  
Jurisdiction: U.S. Government Defendant

**Plaintiff**

**DENNIS SHELDON BREWER**  
*Individually and on Behalf of All Others  
Similarly Situated*

represented by **DENNIS SHELDON BREWER**  
1210 City Place  
Edgewater, NJ 07020  
PRO SE

V.

**Defendant**

**CHRISTOPHER WRAY**  
*Mr.; Director, Federal Bureau of  
Investigation*

**Defendant**

**KIMBERLY CHEATLE**  
*Ms.; Director, United States Secret Service*

**Defendant**

**ALEJANDRO MAYORKAS**  
*Mr.; Secretary, Department of Homeland  
Security*

**Defendant**

**JANET YELLEN**  
*Ms.; Secretary, Department of the Treasury*

**Defendant**

**WILLIAM BURNS**  
*Mr.; Director*

**Defendant**

**LLOYD AUSTIN**  
*Mr.; Secretary of Defense*

**Defendant**

**STEFANIE TOMPKINS**  
*Dr.; Director, Defense Advanced Research  
Projects Agency*



**Defendant**

**FRANK KENDALL, III**

*Secretary, United States Air Force*

**Defendant**

**CHRISTINE WORMUTH**

*Secretary, United States Army*

**Defendant**

**CARLOS DEL TORO**

*Secretary, United States Navy*

Date Filed	#	Docket Text
02/14/2023		<b>Initiating Pleading &amp; IFP Application Received on 2/14/2023.</b> A copy of the docket sheet has been mailed to the address of record for the pro se party. (zrtw) (Entered: 02/16/2023)

Leave to file DENIED.

Dated: 4/10/2023

/s/ TANYA S. CHUTKAN

United States District Judge

First, plaintiff cannot amend his complaint because this case was already dismissed on 2/28/23. Second, plaintiff has noted an appeal, consequently, this court is want of subject matter jurisdiction. Third, leave to amend will not be granted when, as here, such amendment would be futile. See *Richardson v. United States*, 193 F.3d 545, 548-49 (D.C. Cir. 1999) (citing *Foman v. Davis*, 371 U.S. 178, 182 (1962)). Therefore, assuming plaintiff could even file this submission, the relief sought would be futile because the proposed amendments herein failed to remedy any of the noted original deficiencies.

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR

THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

DENNIS SHELDON BREWER, Individually  
1210 City Pl, Edgewater, NJ 07020,

and on Behalf of All Others Similarly Situated

Plaintiffs,

Civil Action No: 23-cv-0415

v.

Mr. Christopher Wray  
Director, Federal Bureau of Investigation, et al,  
Defendants.

**MOTION AMENDING ERRONEOUS  
COMPLAINT REFERENCE TO *Totten v.*  
*United States*, 92 U. S. 105, 107 (1876)**

1. Lead Plaintiff, acting pro se made the following erroneous citation of SCOTUS in the following arguments. A citation of *United States v. Reynolds* 345 U. S. 1 (1953) was mistakenly referenced to *Totten v. United States*, 92 U. S. 105, 107 (1876). The error correction is noted in the following Complaint excerpts, which is hereby amended as noted herein. The deleted citation is shown in purple, the replacement citation is shown in red:

“1. This Complaint arises on three basic claims against Defendant United States and its co-conspirator Defendants which demand the attention of and action by this Court:

**First**, Defendant United States has and does illegally deploy and operate Brain Remote Management Technology (“BRMT” herein) against US persons in violation of (i) the

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

DENNIS SHELDON BREWER,

Plaintiff,

v.

CHRISTOPHER WRAY *et al.*,

Defendants.

Civil Action No. 23-00415 (UNA)

**ORDER**

It is hereby

**ORDERED** that Plaintiff's application for leave to proceed *in forma pauperis*, ECF No. 2, is **GRANTED**, and the remaining motions, ECF Nos. 5, 6, are **DENIED**; it is further

**ORDERED** that the voluminous complaint (1,534 pages sans exhibits) and this case are **DISMISSED** for the reasons stated in the Memorandum Opinion issued in *Brewer v. Wray*, No. 22-cv-996 (UNA), 2022 WL 1597610, *aff'd*, No. 22-5158, 2022 WL 4349776 (D.C. Cir. Sept. 20, 2022) (attached).<sup>1</sup>

This is a final appealable Order.

Date: February 28, 2023

\_\_\_\_\_/s/\_\_\_\_\_  
RUDOLPH CONTRERAS  
United States District Judge

<sup>1</sup> Plaintiff is notified that his persistence with filing repetitive and frivolous cases, *see id.*; *Brewer v. Wray*, No. 1:22-cv-00116 (UNA), 2022 WL 226879, at \*2 (D.D.C. Jan. 24, 2022); *Brewer v. Wray*, No. 21-cv-03218 (UNA), 2022 WL 160269, at \*1 (D.D.C. Jan. 18, 2022); *Brewer v. Wray*, 22-cv-592 (UNA) (D.D.C. Apr. 7, 2022); *Brewer v. Wray*, 22-cv-365 (UNA) (D.D.C. Feb. 23, 2022); *Brewer v. Wray*, 21-cv-2954 (UNA) (D.D.C. Nov. 16, 2021); *Brewer v. Wray*, 21-cv-2671 (UNA) (D.D.C. Oct. 15, 2021), may result ultimately in an injunction preventing him from bringing future cases in forma pauperis (IFP). *See Hurt v. Soc. Sec. Admin.*, 544 F.3d 308, 310 (D.C. Cir. 2008) (approving the denial of IFP status "prospectively" when "the number, content, frequency, and disposition of a litigant's filings show an especially abusive pattern").

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

DENNIS SHELDON BREWER,	)	
	)	
Plaintiff,	)	
	)	Civil Action No. 1:22-cv-00996 (UNA)
v.	)	
	)	
CHRISTOPHER WRAY, <i>et al.</i> ,	)	
	)	
Defendants.	)	

**MEMORANDUM OPINION**

This matter is before the Court on its initial review of plaintiff's *pro se* complaint ("Compl."), ECF No. 1, and application for leave to proceed *in forma pauperis*, ECF No. 3. The Court will grant the *in forma pauperis* application and dismiss the case pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B)(ii), by which the Court is required to dismiss a case "at any time" if it determines that the action is frivolous. Plaintiff has filed a motion for temporary restraining order ("Mot."), ECF No. 2, which will be denied.

"A complaint must contain sufficient factual matter, accepted as true, to 'state a claim to relief that is plausible on its face.'" *Ashcroft v. Iqbal*, 556 U.S. 662, 678 (2009) (quoting *Bell Atl. Corp. v. Twombly*, 550 U.S. 544, 570 (2007)). A complaint that lacks "an arguable basis either in law or in fact" is frivolous, *Neitzke v. Williams*, 490 U.S. 319, 325 (1989), and a "complaint plainly abusive of the judicial process is properly typed malicious," *Crisafi v. Holland*, 655 F.2d 1305, 1309 (D.C. Cir. 1981).

Plaintiff, a resident of Edgewater, New Jersey, sues several federal officials, the New York City Police Department and several of its officials, and additional John Does. *See* Compl. at 1–2, 10–11. Any claims against the Doe defendants cannot stand, however, because the Local Rules of

and declaratory relief and monetary damages. *See id.* at 8. Plaintiff's motion for temporary restraining order is equally incredible. *See e.g.*, Mot. at 6 (discussing defendants' two alleged "notable recent efforts" to control plaintiff by use of "remote manipulation of brain and bodily functions," causing him to, respectively, choke on a piece of steak and to fall out of his chair, due to the government's "deadly manipulations.").

This Court cannot exercise subject matter jurisdiction over a frivolous complaint. *Hagans v. Lavine*, 415 U.S. 528, 536-37 (1974) ("Over the years, this Court has repeatedly held that the federal courts are without power to entertain claims otherwise within their jurisdiction if they are 'so attenuated and unsubstantial as to be absolutely devoid of merit.' ") (quoting *Newburyport Water Co. v. Newburyport*, 193 U.S. 561, 579 (1904)); *Tooley v. Napolitano*, 586 F.3d 1006, 1010 (D.C. Cir. 2009) (examining cases dismissed "for patent insubstantiality," including where the plaintiff allegedly "was subjected to a campaign of surveillance and harassment deriving from uncertain origins."). Consequently, a court is obligated to dismiss a complaint as frivolous "when the facts alleged rise to the level of the irrational or the wholly incredible," *Denton v. Hernandez*, 504 U.S. 25, 33 (1992), or "postulat[e] events and circumstances of a wholly fanciful kind," *Crisafi*, 655 F.2d at 1307-08. The instant complaint satisfies this standard. In addition to failing to state a claim for relief or establish this Court's jurisdiction, the complaint is deemed frivolous on its face.

Therefore, this case is dismissed without prejudice, and the motion for temporary restraining order is denied. A separate order accompanies this memorandum opinion.

Dated: May 16, 2022

  
TREVOR N. McFADDEN  
United States District Judge

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

DENNIS SHELDON BREWER,

Plaintiff,

v.

CHRISTOPHER WRAY *et al.*,

Defendants.

Civil Action No. 23-00415 (UNA)

**ORDER**

It is hereby

**ORDERED** that Plaintiff's application for leave to proceed *in forma pauperis*, ECF No. 2, is **GRANTED**, and the remaining motions, ECF Nos. 5, 6, are **DENIED**; it is further

**ORDERED** that the voluminous complaint (1,534 pages sans exhibits) and this case are **DISMISSED** for the reasons stated in the Memorandum Opinion issued in *Brewer v. Wray*, No. 22-cv-996 (UNA), 2022 WL 1597610, *aff'd*, No. 22-5158, 2022 WL 4349776 (D.C. Cir. Sept. 20, 2022) (attached).<sup>1</sup>

This is a final appealable Order.

Date: February 28, 2023

/s/  
RUDOLPH CONTRERAS  
United States District Judge

<sup>1</sup> Plaintiff is notified that his persistence with filing repetitive and frivolous cases, *see id.*; *Brewer v. Wray*, No. 1:22-cv-00116 (UNA), 2022 WL 226879, at \*2 (D.D.C. Jan. 24, 2022); *Brewer v. Wray*, No. 21-cv-03218 (UNA), 2022 WL 160269, at \*1 (D.D.C. Jan. 18, 2022); *Brewer v. Wray*, 22-cv-592 (UNA) (D.D.C. Apr. 7, 2022); *Brewer v. Wray*, 22-cv-365 (UNA) (D.D.C. Feb. 23, 2022); *Brewer v. Wray*, 21-cv-2954 (UNA) (D.D.C. Nov. 16, 2021); *Brewer v. Wray*, 21-cv-2671 (UNA) (D.D.C. Oct. 15, 2021), may result ultimately in an injunction preventing him from bringing future cases in forma pauperis (IFP). *See Hurt v. Soc. Sec. Admin.*, 544 F.3d 308, 310 (D.C. Cir. 2008) (approving the denial of IFP status "prospectively" when "the number, content, frequency, and disposition of a litigant's filings show an especially abusive pattern").

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

DENNIS SHELDON BREWER, Individually  
1210 City Pl, Edgewater, NJ 07020,

and on Behalf of All Others Similarly Situated

Plaintiffs,

v.

**Known Federal Defendants:**

Mr. Christopher Wray  
Director, Federal Bureau of Investigation  
935 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW  
Washington, District of Columbia 20535-0001  
202-324-3000,

Ms. Kimberly Cheatle  
Director, United States Secret Service  
245 Murray Ln SW - BLDG T-5  
Washington, DC 20223  
202-406-5708,

Mr. Alejandro Mayorkas  
Secretary, Department of Homeland Security  
245 Murray Lane, SW  
Washington, DC 20528-0075  
202-282-800,

Case: 1:23-cv-00415

Assigned To : Unassigned

Assign. Date : 2/14/2023 Jury Demand

Description: Pro Se Gen. Civ. (F-Deck)

Civil Action No:

**DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL**

**RECEIVED**

**FEB 14 2023**

Clerk, U.S. District & Bankruptcy  
Courts for the District of Columbia

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

DENNIS SHELDON BREWER,

Plaintiff,

v.

CHRISTOPHER WRAY, *et al.*,

Defendants.

)  
)  
)  
)  
)  
)  
)  
)  
)  
)

Civil Action No. 21-2954 (UNA)

**ORDER**

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

ORDERED that the plaintiff's application to proceed *in forma pauperis* [2] is

GRANTED; and it is

FURTHER ORDERED the complaint and this civil action are DISMISSED WITHOUT  
PREJUDICE as frivolous.

This is a final appealable Order. *See* Fed. R. App. P. 4(a).

The Clerk of Court shall TERMINATE this case.

SO ORDERED.

/s/

COLLEEN KOLLAR-KOTELLY  
United States District Judge

DATE: November 16, 2021