

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF
MISSOURI, EASTERN DIVISION

Amanda Jolee Oliver v. United States of America, et al.

Oliver · No. 1:25-cv-182-ACL · Decided February 13, 2026

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the Eastern District of Missouri grants Amanda Jolee Oliver leave to proceed in forma pauperis but dismisses her complaint without prejudice as frivolous under 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B). The court denies her motion to appoint counsel as moot and certifies that an appeal would not be taken in good faith.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the Eastern District of Missouri, Eastern Division
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the Eastern District of Missouri, Eastern Division
DECIDED	February 13, 2026
DOCKET	1:25-cv-182-ACL
DISPOSITION	dismissed
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	A self-represented plaintiff filed a civil action against the United States and Missouri, moved to proceed in forma pauperis, and moved for appointment of counsel. The district court granted in forma pauperis status, conducted the required screening, dismissed the action without prejudice as frivolous, denied appointment of counsel as moot, and certified that an appeal would not be taken in good faith.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	Under 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2), an in forma pauperis complaint must be dismissed if it is frivolous. A complaint is frivolous when it lacks an arguable basis in law or fact, including when its factual allegations are clearly baseless, fanciful, fantastic, delusional, irrational, or wholly incredible. Pro se pleadings are liberally construed, but they must still allege facts that state a legally cognizable claim.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	Unpublished federal district court memorandum and order; generally nonprecedential.

TOPICS

civil procedure

pleadings

civil rights

remedies

PRACTICE AREAS

civil procedure

civil rights

in forma pauperis proceedings

remedies

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether the plaintiff qualified to proceed in forma pauperis based on the financial information submitted.
2. Whether the complaint was frivolous and therefore subject to dismissal under 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B) (i).
3. Whether the complaint's defects could be remedied through amendment.
4. Whether appointment of counsel should be denied as moot after dismissal.
5. Whether the court should certify that an appeal would not be taken in good faith.

HOLDINGS

1. The plaintiff was unable to pay the filing fee and was entitled to proceed in forma pauperis with the filing fee waived.
2. The complaint was frivolous because its factual allegations were fanciful, fantastic, delusional, irrational, and wholly incredible, and it lacked an arguable basis in law or fact.
3. Dismissal without prejudice was appropriate because the defects in the complaint could not be remedied through amendment.
4. The motion to appoint counsel was denied as moot because the action was dismissed.
5. An appeal from the dismissal would not be taken in good faith.

KEY QUOTATIONS

“The term frivolous “embraces not only the inarguable legal conclusion, but also the fanciful factual allegation.””

“These allegations are fanciful, fantastic, delusional, and rise to the level of the irrational or wholly incredible.”

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Plaintiff alleged that the federal and Missouri governments had systematically abused, exploited, and discriminated against her throughout her life. Her allegations included claims that government actors drugged her, removed her hair, monitored her home and social-media broadcasts, altered her Bibles, caused abuse by various private individuals, and were responsible for abuses involving employers, churches, medical personnel, jail inmates, an ex-husband, police, and men encountered on Christian dating sites. She sought \$20 million in damages.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Plaintiff filed the complaint on October 29, 2025. After reviewing her financial information, the court granted leave to proceed in forma pauperis and screened the complaint under 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2). The court concluded that the allegations were fanciful, fantastic, delusional, and wholly incredible, that the defects could not be cured by amendment, and dismissed the action without prejudice.

DISPOSITION

dismissed

CASES CITED

- Neitzke v. Williams, 490 U.S. 319, 325, 327-28 (1989)
- Denton v. Hernandez, 504 U.S. 25, 32-33 (1992)
- Solomon v. Petray, 795 F.3d 777, 787 (8th Cir. 2015)
- Stone v. Harry, 364 F.3d 912, 914-15 (8th Cir. 2004)
- McNeil v. United States, 508 U.S. 106, 113 (1993)
- Higgins v. Steele, 195 F.2d 366, 369 (8th Cir. 1952)

OPINION

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT EASTERN DISTRICT OF MISSOURI EASTERN DIVISION AMANDA JOLEE OLIVER,)) Plaintiff,)) v.) Case No. 1:25-cv-182-ACL) UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, et al.,)) Defendants.) MEMORANDUM AND ORDER Self-represented Plaintiff Amanda Jolee Oliver brings this civil action against the United States of America and the State of Missouri. ECF No. 1.

Now before the Court is Plaintiff's motion to proceed in forma pauperis. ECF No. 2. Based on the financial information provided, the Court finds that Plaintiff is unable to pay the filing fee for this matter. As such, the motion will be granted and the filing fee waived. See 28 U.S.C. § 1915(a)(1). Furthermore, because Plaintiff is now proceeding in forma pauperis, her pleadings are subject to review under 28 U.S.C. § 1915.

Based on such review, and as explained below, this action will be dismissed for frivolity. See 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B)(i). Plaintiff's motion to appoint counsel will be denied as moot. Background Plaintiff filed the instant complaint on October 29, 2025. ECF No. 1.

The filing asserts highly unusual facts. Plaintiff identifies the defendants as the United States Federal Government and the State of Missouri. Id. at 1-2. Where the form complaint prompts Plaintiff to state the facts supporting her claims, she alleges in part: The Federal US government has abused me, exploited me and discriminated against me my entire life.

The State of Missouri has accumulated too and it escalated a few years ago they came into my house and drugged me and did hair removal on me they let people listen to me in my own home and on facebook lives the people on the other side could see and hear me and abused me. Id. at 7. Plaintiff claims the state and federal government are responsible for abuses she has suffered by employers, churches, hospital staff, doctors, jail inmates, her ex-husband, and police.

Id. She claims her pets have been abused as well. Id. Plaintiff also claims that she drank alcohol excessively and was incarcerated where she was denied clean pants and placed in solitary confinement. Id. at 7-8. She claims “they” have “messed up all my Bibles” and deny her access to movies and literature and instead give her “insane books.” Id. at 10. Plaintiff also reports she was wrongfully arrested 20 years ago and was abused in jail.

Id. at 12. She claims the government is responsible for men on Christian dating sites abusing her. Id. at 14. For relief she requests \$20 million. Id. at 8. Legal Standard on Initial Review Federal law requires this Court to dismiss a complaint filed in forma pauperis if, among other reasons, it is frivolous. 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2). “[A] complaint ... is frivolous where it lacks an arguable basis either in law or in fact.” *Neitzke v. Williams*, 490 U.S. 319, 325 (1989).

The term frivolous “embraces not only the inarguable legal conclusion, but also the fanciful factual allegation.” Id. Accordingly, the Court may dismiss “those claims whose factual contentions are clearly baseless,” id. at 327, including those “allegations that are ‘fanciful, fantastic, [or] delusional.’” *Denton v. Hernandez*, 504 U.S. 25, 32-33 (1992) (quoting *Neitzke*, 490 U.S. at 325, 328).

Although “[a]n in forma pauperis complaint may not be dismissed ... simply because the [C]ourt finds the plaintiff’s allegations unlikely,” “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.

Complaints filed by laypeople “are to be given liberal construction.” *Solomon v. Petray*, 795 F.3d 777, 787 (8th Cir. 2015). That means that “if the essence of an allegation is discernible ... then the district court should construe the complaint in a way that permits the layperson’s claim to be considered within the proper legal framework.” Id. (alteration in original) (quoting *Stone v. Harry*, 364 F.3d 912, 914 (8th Cir.

2004)). However, even pro se complaints must allege facts that, if true, state a claim for relief as a matter of law. See *Stone*, 364 F.3d at 915 (explaining that even in a pro se case, federal courts need not “assume facts that are not alleged, just because an additional factual allegation would have formed a stronger complaint”).

Finally, giving a pro se complaint the benefit of a liberal construction does not mean that courts should interpret the procedural rules of civil litigation “so as to excuse mistakes by those who

proceed without counsel.” See *McNeil v. United States*, 508 U.S. 106, 113 (1993). Discussion Having carefully reviewed and liberally construed Plaintiff’s Complaint, the Court finds that the allegations are frivolous.

Plaintiff seeks monetary relief based on allegations that the Federal and State governments have been systematically abusing her for her entire life. This includes everything from altering her bibles, to infiltrating her house to take her hair, to using Christian dating sites in order to entice men to abuse her. These allegations are fanciful, fantastic, delusional, and rise to the level of the irrational or wholly incredible.

Denton, 504 U.S. at 32-33. Plaintiff’s complaint is frivolous because it “lacks an arguable basis... in law or in fact.” *Neitzke*, 490 U.S. at 325. In addition, the Court finds that these Complaint defects could not be remedied through amendment of the pleadings.

As such, this action will be dismissed as frivolous. See 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B)(q). For the same reasons the Court deems Plaintiff’s complaint frivolous, the Court is convinced that there would be no substantial question for review and that an appeal would be futile. *Higgins v. Steele*, 195 F.2d 366, 369 (8th Cir. 1952).

The Court will therefore certify that an appeal would not be taken in good faith. See *id.*; 28 U.S.C. § 1915(a)(3). Finally, because this action is being dismissed as frivolous, the Court will deny Plaintiffs motion to appoint counsel as moot.

Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that Plaintiff's motion for leave to proceed in forma pauperis [ECF No. 2] is GRANTED and the filing fee waived. See 28 U.S.C. § 1915(a)(1). IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that this action is DISMISSED without prejudice as frivolous. See 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B)(Q). IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that Plaintiff's motion to appoint counsel [ECF No. 3] is DENIED as moot.

IT IS HEREBY CERTIFIED that an appeal from this dismissal would not be taken in good faith. An Order of Dismissal will accompany this Memorandum and Order. Dated this 13th day of February, 2026. UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE