

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF
MISSOURI, WESTERN DIVISION**

Charles E. Lindsey v. Pam Bondi and Denny Hopkins

Lindsey · No. 4:26-cv-00024-RK · Decided May 18, 2026

OPINION

Lindsey

PER CURIAM.

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE
WESTERN DISTRICT OF MISSOURI
WESTERN DIVISION

CHARLES E. LINDSEY,)

) Plaintiff,)) v.) Case No. 4:26-cv-00024-RK)

PAM BONDI, DENNY HOPKINS,)

) Defendants.))

ORDER

Before the Court are Charles E. Lindsey’s pro se motion for leave to proceed in forma pauperis and Affidavit of Financial Status in Support, (Docs. 1, 2), and motion to consolidate, (Doc. 3). After careful consideration and review, and for the reasons explained below, the Court ORDERS that Plaintiff’s pro se motion to proceed in forma pauperis is GRANTED, this case is DISMISSED pursuant to the Court’s initial screening under 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B), and Plaintiff’s motion to consolidate¹ is DENIED as moot. Title 28 U.S.C. § 1915(a)(1) authorizes the Court to allow indigent persons to commence a civil action without the prepayment of costs. However, “[t]he opportunity to proceed in forma pauperis is a privilege, not a right.” *Weaver v. Pung*, 925 F.2d 1097, 1099 n.4 (8th Cir. 1991). When presented with a motion to proceed in forma pauperis, the Court first determines whether the plaintiff satisfies the economic eligibility requirements. Local Rule 83.7(a) provides that the standard for determining in forma pauperis status is whether the requirement to pay the costs of the lawsuit would cause the applicant to be forced to give up the basic necessities of life. If the applicant meets the economic eligibility requirements, the Court then determines whether the applicant’s complaint 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.” 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B). To begin, it appears from his affidavit of financial status that Plaintiff does not qualify by economic status. His affidavit states that he owns a trust fund valued at either \$230 million or \$6 1 On January 5, 2026, Plaintiff filed another case in this district, *Charles E. Lindsey v. Katrin Hataway, Michael Keyhole*, No. 4:26-cv-00006-RK. Plaintiff moves to consolidate the cases. trillion and his only

monthly expense is \$200 for groceries. Plaintiff's motion to proceed in forma pauperis is accordingly denied because based upon Plaintiff's affidavit of financial status, it does not appear that paying the required filing fee would cause Plaintiff to give up the basic necessities of life. See Local Rule 83.7(a). Even if Plaintiff did satisfy the economic eligibility requirements, however, his claims are subject to dismissal as frivolous and for failure to state a claim. "[A] court may dismiss a claim as factually frivolous only if the facts alleged are clearly baseless, a category encompassing allegations that are fanciful, fantastic, and delusional," or if the facts alleged appear "irrational" or "wholly incredible." *Denton v. Hernandez*, 504 U.S. 25, 32-33 (1992) (internal citation omitted). Plaintiff lists numerous laws, including unfair competition and antitrust laws and the RICO and Hobbs Acts. (Doc. 1-2 at 6-7.) He alleges few facts and the facts he does allege are irrational or unintelligible. Plaintiff alleges unspecified threats "to kill [his] family tree" but also that "the local or federal government is using the Kansas City College of Bio science to condemn [sic] local small business who owner is using ex parte Court order to stop me from repairing my home because they are not being allowed repair their property[.]" Plaintiff's claims are frivolous under the § 1915(e)(2)(B) standard. Conclusion Accordingly, after careful consideration and for the reasons explained above, the Court ORDERS that Plaintiff's pro se motion to proceed in forma pauperis, (Doc. 1), is DENIED, this case is DISMISSED without prejudice, and Plaintiff's motion to consolidate, (Doc. 3), is DENIED as moot. The Clerk of Court is directed to mail a copy of this Order to: Charles E. Lindsey 5533 Virginia Ave. Kansas City, MO 64110 IT IS SO ORDERED. s/ Roseann A. Ketchmark
ROSEANN A. KETCHMARK, JUDGE
UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DATED: May 18, 2026