

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

Mills v. Bluth

Mills · No. No. 4:26-CV-00262 JMB · Decided March 5, 2026

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the Eastern District of Missouri denied Anthony Mills's application to proceed without prepaying fees or costs. The court dismissed his complaint as frivolous and malicious under 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B), finding that it failed to state a plausible claim and was part of a widespread pattern of nearly identical filings against Arlene Bluth.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the Eastern District of Missouri, Eastern Division
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Henry Edward Autrey
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the Eastern District of Missouri, Eastern Division
DECIDED	March 5, 2026
DOCKET	No. 4:26-CV-00262 JMB
DISPOSITION	dismissed
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	Pro se plaintiff sought leave to proceed in forma pauperis. The district court screened the complaint under 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B) and denied the application, denied the complaint, and dismissed it as frivolous and malicious.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	The court liberally construed the pro se complaint and applied the pleading plausibility standard under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 8 and Ashcroft v. Iqbal, together with mandatory screening under 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2).
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	unpublished district court opinion

TOPICS

- pleadings
- civil procedure
- civil rights
- motions to dismiss

PRACTICE AREAS

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether the complaint stated a plausible claim for relief when it contained only conclusory allegations and no factual context.
2. Whether the complaint was malicious under 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B)(i) because it was one of numerous substantially identical complaints filed in federal courts within days of one another.
3. Whether the plaintiff's application to proceed in forma pauperis should be denied and the complaint dismissed under 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B).

HOLDINGS

1. The complaint failed to state a claim because, even when liberally construed in light of the plaintiff's pro se status, it contained insufficient factual matter, did not identify the parties or explain the basis for federal jurisdiction, and provided no context supporting the alleged due-process conspiracy.
2. The complaint was malicious because filing the same complaint, containing the same three bare allegations, in numerous federal courts within a few days demonstrated an intent to harass the defendant, the courts, or both.

KEY QUOTATIONS

“Even construing the Plaintiff’s Complaint liberally, as the Court must, given his pro se status, the Plaintiff’s allegations fail to state a claim.”

“Certainly, where a plaintiff files the same complaint with the same three meager allegations — just the barest possible sentences — in a plethora of courts within just days of each other, that plaintiff intends to harass either the defendant, the court, or both.”

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Mills's complaint alleged only that Bluth conspired with others to deprive him of due process, failed to dismiss a matter identified as 100269/2023, and thereby caused unreasonable costs. He asserted federal jurisdiction and demanded a jury trial and \$1 million, but provided no meaningful identification of the parties, factual context, or explanation for federal jurisdiction. The court also found that Mills had filed materially identical complaints against Bluth in numerous federal courts within a short period, with complaints dated February 1, 2026, and mailed from an envelope postmarked in New York despite his listed address in Guam.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Anthony Mills filed a three-allegation complaint against Arlene Bluth together with an application to proceed without prepaying fees or costs. The court reviewed the complaint under the mandatory in forma pauperis screening statute, concluded that it failed to state a claim and was part of a repetitive filing pattern intended to harass, and ordered dismissal.

DISPOSITION

dismissed

CASES CITED

- Neitzke v. Williams, 490 U.S. 319, 324 (1989)
- Erickson v. Pardus, 551 U.S. 89, 94 (2007)
- Ashcroft v. Iqbal, 556 U.S. 662, 678 (2009)
- Bell Atlantic Corp. v. Twombly, 550 U.S. 544, 570 (2007)
- Swanson v. Citibank, N.A., 614 F.3d 400, 404 (7th Cir. 2010)
- Martin v. Aubuchon, 623 F.2d 1282, 1286 (8th Cir. 1980)
- Stone v. Harry, 364 F.3d 912, 914-15 (8th Cir. 2004)
- Lindell v. McCallum, 352 F.3d 1107, 1109 (7th Cir. 2003)
- Horsey v. Asher, 741 F.2d 209, 212-13 (8th Cir. 1984)
- Carter v. Schafer, 273 Fed. Appx. 581 (8th Cir. 2008)
- Cooper v. Wood, 111 F.3d 135 (8th Cir. 1997)