

**FILED**

**MAY 26 2009**

**Clerk, U.S. District and  
Bankruptcy Courts**

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA**

**Herbert Francis Young,**

**Plaintiff,**

**v.**

**John Caulfield, Warden,**

**Defendant.**

:  
:  
:  
:  
:  
:  
:  
:  
:  
:  
:

**Civil Action No.**

**09 0979**

**MEMORANDUM OPINION**

The plaintiff has filed a *pro se* complaint and an application to proceed *in forma pauperis*. The Court will grant the application to proceed *in forma pauperis* and dismiss the complaint.

Rule 8 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure states the minimum requirements for complaints. Fed. R. Civ. P. 8(a). Rule 8(a) requires that a complaint contain a short and plain statement of the grounds upon which federal jurisdiction rests, a short and plain statement showing that the plaintiff is entitled to relief, and a demand for judgment for the relief sought. The minimum requirements Rule 8 imposes are designed to provide defendants with sufficient notice of the claim or claims being asserted in order to allow defendants to prepare a responsive answer and an adequate defense, and to determine whether the doctrine of *res judicata* applies. *Brown v. Califano*, 75 F.R.D. 497, 498 (D.D.C. 1977). Compliance with Rule 8(a)'s requirements should also provide a court with sufficient information to determine whether it has jurisdiction over the claims.

As submitted, there are no factual allegations in the complaint. Attached to the form of the complaint are various grievances that the plaintiff submitted in the past, which give some indication of the nature of his complaint, but they are not sufficient to meet the requirements of Rule 8. As submitted, there is no indication of which of plaintiff's civil rights are alleged to have been violated, the facts on which the civil rights claim(s) is/are based, or the relief sought. Accordingly, the complaint will be dismissed without prejudice because it does not meet the minimum requirements of a complaint. *See Fed. R. Civ. P. 8.*

A separate order accompanies this memorandum opinion.

Date: 15 May 2009

  
United States District Judge