

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Alfreda Denise Williams v. Irene (Unknown)

Williams v. Unknown · No. 1:25-cv-04113 (UNA) · Decided April 14, 2026

SUMMARY

The U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia granted Plaintiff Alfreda Denise Williams’s application to proceed in forma pauperis but denied her motion for a temporary restraining order. The court dismissed the complaint and case without prejudice because Plaintiff failed to establish subject-matter jurisdiction.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the District of Columbia
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Amir H. Ali
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the District of Columbia
DECIDED	April 14, 2026
DOCKET	1:25-cv-04113 (UNA)
DISPOSITION	dismissed
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	Pro se plaintiff filed a complaint, an application to proceed in forma pauperis, and a motion for a temporary restraining order. The district court granted the IFP application, denied the temporary restraining order, and dismissed the action without prejudice for lack of subject matter jurisdiction.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	The court considered subject matter jurisdiction and the sufficiency of the jurisdictional allegations under Federal Rules of Civil Procedure 8(a) and 12(h)(3).
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	published
PARTIES	Alfreda Denise Williams v. Irene (Unknown)

TOPICS

- subject matter jurisdiction
- pleadings
- motions to dismiss
- injunctions
- civil procedure

PRACTICE AREAS

- civil procedure
- federal jurisdiction
- injunctive relief

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether the complaint adequately pleaded a basis for federal subject matter jurisdiction.
2. Whether the motion for a temporary restraining order should be granted.
3. Whether Plaintiff should be permitted to proceed in forma pauperis.

HOLDINGS

1. A complaint must provide a short and plain statement of the grounds for federal jurisdiction, and failure to plead facts establishing jurisdiction requires dismissal under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 12(h)(3). Because Plaintiff identified no jurisdictional basis and the court could not independently discern one, the action was dismissed without prejudice.
2. The motion for a temporary restraining order was denied.
3. Plaintiff's application for leave to proceed in forma pauperis was granted.

KEY QUOTATIONS

“*[F]ederal court jurisdiction must affirmatively appear clearly and distinctly.*”

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Plaintiff, a District of Columbia resident, sued a defendant identified only as Irene (Unknown), whom she described as a system hacker. The complaint was otherwise largely blank and attached documents concerning cases Plaintiff apparently filed in D.C. Superior Court involving allegations that a woman stalked her from Florida to the District of Columbia.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Plaintiff filed this federal action against a defendant identified only as Irene (Unknown), together with an IFP application and a motion for temporary restraining order. The court found that the complaint did not plead any basis for federal jurisdiction, granted IFP status, denied the requested temporary restraining order, and dismissed the complaint and case without prejudice.

DISPOSITION

dismissed

CASES CITED

- Johnson v. Robinson, 576 F.3d 522, 522 (D.C. Cir. 2009) (per curiam)

OPINION

Williams v. Unknown

PER CURIAM.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

)

ALFREDA DENISE WILLIAMS,)

) Plaintiff,)) v.) Civil Action No. 1:25-cv-04113 (UNA))

IRENE UNKNOWN,)

) Defendant.) _____) Memorandum Opinion Plaintiff has filed a pro se complaint, an application for leave to proceed in forma pauperis (“IFP”), and a motion for temporary restraining order. The court grants Plaintiff’s IFP application, denies Plaintiff’s motion for temporary restraining order, and dismisses this matter without prejudice. Plaintiff, a D.C. resident, sues a defendant identified only as “Irene (Unknown),” whom Plaintiff alleges is a “system hacker.” ECF No. 1 at 1–2. Apart from listing the parties, the complaint is left blank. See *id.* at 1–5. The complaint attaches documents related to cases that Plaintiff appears to have filed in D.C. Superior Court, in which she alleged that she was being stalked by a woman who followed her from Florida to D.C. See *id.* at 7–36. Plaintiff has failed to establish subject matter jurisdiction. A party seeking relief in federal court must provide “a short and plain statement of the grounds for the court’s jurisdiction.” Fed. R. Civ. P. 8(a). Failure to plead such facts warrants dismissal of the action. See Fed. R. Civ. P. 12(h)(3). Here, Plaintiff has not stated any grounds for this court’s jurisdiction, and the court cannot independently discern a basis for jurisdiction from the facts provided. See *Johnson v. Robinson*, 576 F.3d 522, 522 (D.C. Cir. 2009) (per curiam) (“[F]ederal court jurisdiction must affirmatively appear clearly and distinctly.”) (citation omitted). Accordingly, Plaintiff’s application for leave to proceed in forma pauperis, ECF No. 2, is granted. Plaintiff’s motion for temporary restraining order, ECF No. 3, is denied. Plaintiff’s complaint, ECF No. 1, and this case are dismissed without prejudice. A separate order accompanies this memorandum opinion. Date: April 14, 2026 /s/ _____

AMIR H. ALI

United States District Judge