

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)