

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE THIRD CIRCUIT

NO. 06-4686

---

BATSAIHAN PURVEEGIIN,

Appellant

v.

USCA 3RD CIRCUIT COURTS, Corrupt Administratives;  
MARCIA M. WALDRON, USCA 3RD Cir. Court; LYNN LOPEZ,  
USCA 3RD Cir. Legal Aid; BRADFORD BALDUS, USCA 3RD Cir.  
Legal Aid; USCA 3RD CIR. CLERK ADMINISTRATION,  
USCA 3RD Cir. Clerks Office

---

On Appeal From the United States District Court  
For the Eastern District of Pennsylvania  
(D.C. Civ. No. 06-04580)  
District Judge: Honorable John P. Fullam

---

Submitted For Possible Dismissal Under 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B)  
March 29, 2007

BEFORE: RENDELL, SMITH and JORDAN, CIRCUIT JUDGES

(Filed April 30, 2007)

---

OPINION

---

PER CURIAM

Batsaihan Purveegiin, representing himself, sued this Court, or at least its “corrupt administratives” and “administration,” as well as members of the Court’s staff. In his complaint, Purveegiin expressed dissatisfaction with how pending appeals were being handled. He took issue with an instruction that he communicate in writing with this Court in lieu of expressing his concerns in abusive telephone calls. Also, as the District Court accurately and diplomatically summarized, Purveegiin alleged that his counsel in another case had seduced, or been seduced by, Court personnel.

The District Court denied Purveegiin’s request to proceed in forma pauperis and dismissed Purveegiin’s complaint as legally frivolous. Purveegiin appeals and requests appointment of counsel. Also, in a “motion to strike,” he moves to quash the appearance of Appellees’ counsel, arguing, among other things, that Appellees’ counsel unlawfully colluded with Purveegiin’s former counsel and seduced, or was seduced by, a district court judge.

As the District Court acknowledged, Purveegiin was entitled to proceed in forma pauperis, as he was absolutely without assets. However, Purveegiin’s complaint, full of baseless complaints and not without malice, could not proceed. The District Court properly dismissed it as meritless.<sup>1</sup> Purveegiin’s appeal is likewise without merit in fact or law. Accordingly, we will dismiss Purveegiin’s appeal pursuant to 28 U.S.C.

---

<sup>1</sup>Furthermore, to the extent that Purveegiin requested that the District Court superintend the activities of this Court, the District Court was without jurisdiction to proceed, as the District Court noted.

§ 1915(e)(2)(B)(i) and deny his motion for appointment of counsel. Without dallying with the spurious accusations in his “motion to strike,” we deny that motion as well.