

NOTE: This order is nonprecedential.

**United States Court of Appeals  
for the Federal Circuit**

---

**STACY ALLEN TAYLOR,**  
*Plaintiff-Appellant,*

v.

**UNITED STATES,**  
*Respondent-Appellee.*

---

2014-5110

---

Appeal from the United States Court of Federal  
Claims in No. 1:14-cv-00393-EDK, Judge Elaine Kaplan.

---

**ON MOTION**

---

PER CURIAM.

**ORDER**

Stacy Allen Taylor, an incarcerated pro se litigant, challenges the dismissal of his complaint as frivolous under 19 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B)(i) by the United States Court of Federal Claims. Because we agree that the complaint was frivolous, we grant the government's motion to summarily affirm.

Taylor's complaint alleges that he entered into an agreement with the Central Intelligence Agency to assist its agents in collecting various information and assets in exchange for witness protection and full immunity. His complaint requests that the court direct the government to turn over evidence showing corruption and wrongdoing by the CIA and honor the agreement's obligations to pay Taylor a recurring monthly salary. After granting Taylor leave to proceed *in forma pauperis*, the United States Court of Federal Claims screened the suit and dismissed the complaint.

A district court is required to dismiss a frivolous complaint from a litigant who is proceeding *in forma pauperis*. 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B). Frivolous complaints include those in which the factual allegations asserted are so unbelievable that there is no need for an evidentiary hearing to determine their veracity. See *Neitzke v. Williams*, 490 U.S. 319, 327 (1989) (frivolous claims include those that describe "fantastic or delusional scenarios"); *Gladney v. Pendleton Correctional Facility*, 302 F.3d 773, 774 (7th Cir. 2002); cf. *Galloway Farms, Inc. v. United States*, 834 F.2d 998, 1000 (Fed. Cir. 1987) (A frivolous claim is one "whose disposition is obvious.").

That description fits this case. Taylor's complaint alleges a tale of international intrigue involving the Irish Republican Army, the CIA's sale of decommissioned Russian nuclear warheads to Iran and North Korea, and CIA agents exchanging long-range missiles for American and French prisoners. Because the Court of Federal Claims correctly determined that Taylor's complaint was frivolous, we grant the motion to summarily affirm. See *Joshua v. United States*, 17 F.3d 378, 380 (Fed. Cir. 1994) (Summary affirmance "is appropriate, *inter alia*, when the position of one party is so clearly correct as a matter of law that no substantial question regarding the outcome of the appeal exists.").

TAYLOR v. US

3

Accordingly,

IT IS ORDERED THAT:

- (1) The motion for summary affirmance is granted.
- (2) Each side shall bear its own costs.

FOR THE COURT

/s/ Daniel E. O'Toole  
Daniel E. O'Toole  
Clerk of Court

s19