

United States Court of Appeals
for the Fifth Circuit

United States Court of Appeals
Fifth Circuit

FILED

May 31, 2022

Lyle W. Cayce
Clerk

No. 22-10195

CHARISE L. LOGAN,

Plaintiff—Appellant,

versus

CENTRAL INTELLIGENCE AGENCY; HOMELAND SECURITY;
DEPARTMENT OF SECRET SERVICE; GEORGE W. BUSH; WENDY
LOGAN; CALVIN B. DAVIS,

Defendants—Appellees.

Appeal from the United States District Court
for the Northern District of Texas
USDC No. 3:22-CV-00038

Before JOLLY, WILLETT, and ENGELHARDT, *Circuit Judges.*

PER CURIAM:*

Charise Logan filed a pro se complaint in the Northern District of Texas. She purported to sue, among others, the Central Intelligence Agency, the Secret Service, the Department of Homeland Security, and former

* Pursuant to 5TH CIRCUIT RULE 47.5, the court has determined that this opinion should not be published and is not precedent except under the limited circumstances set forth in 5TH CIRCUIT RULE 47.5.4.

No. 22-10195

President George W. Bush. From what we can best surmise from the complaint, Logan alleges that these defendants conspired with Wendy Logan, who impersonated Charise at various sporting events and at a dinner with the Bush family. Logan sought to amend her complaint to attach various exhibits, including a urine chain of custody form and a Texas appellate court decision which held that Logan was not competent to represent herself in a criminal trial for trespass.

A magistrate judge recommended dismissing Logan’s complaint as frivolous pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e). The district court agreed and adopted the magistrate judge’s recommendation. Logan appeals. Her brief on appeal is conclusory and contains additional allegations, including that defendants conspired to make her believe she had dementia with the use of “electronic equipment/surveillance systems” and that her young adult children were coerced or manipulated into attending public functions, including two Super Bowl games. Logan cites to various unrelated news articles to explain the importance of identity theft and dedicates a portion of her brief to the late Chadwick Boseman and the cast of the movie *21 Bridges*.

“We review a district court’s dismissal of an *in forma pauperis* complaint as frivolous pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B)(i) for an abuse of discretion.” *Brewster v. Dretke*, 587 F.3d 764, 767 (5th Cir. 2009). “A claim may be dismissed as frivolous if it does not have an arguable basis in fact or law.” *Id.* After reviewing the record and Appellant’s brief, we see no error in the district court’s judgment dismissing Logan’s complaint as

No. 22-10195

frivolous pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2).¹ Accordingly, we AFFIRM the district court.

¹ This is not the first time we have affirmed the dismissal of a complaint filed by Logan as frivolous. *See Logan v. Homeland Security*, 802 F. App'x 838 (5th Cir. 2020) (per curiam).