



challenged act of the defendant, and likely to be redressed by a favorable decision in the federal court.” *Navegar, Inc. v. United States*, 103 F.3d 994, 998 (D.C. Cir. 1997) (quoting *Lujan v. Defenders of Wildlife*, 504 U.S. 555, 560-61 (1992)). Here, the plaintiff does not show that he has suffered an injury or that the defendants’ action (or inaction) otherwise affects him personally. Rather, the plaintiff presents “a generalized grievance shared in substantially equal measure by all or a large class of citizens [and this alleged] harm alone normally does not warrant exercise of jurisdiction.” *Warth v. Seldin*, 422 U.S. 490, 499 (1975) (internal quotation marks and citations omitted). In other words, because this plaintiff is “raising only a generally available grievance about government – claiming only harm to his and every citizen’s interest in proper application of the Constitution and laws, and seeking relief that no more directly and tangibly benefits him than it does the public at large – [he] does not state an Article III case or controversy.” *Lujan*, 504 U.S. at 573-74.

The plaintiff lacks standing, and the Court will dismiss the complaint for lack of subject matter jurisdiction. An Order accompanies this Memorandum Opinion.

DATE:

10/16/15



United States District Judge