

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

KAREEMAH BELL-BOSTON,)			
Plaintiff,)			
v.)	Civil Action No.	08	1813
SECOND DISTRICT, METROPOLITAN POLICE DEPARTMENT,)			
TOLICE BELLIKITIVELY,)			
Defendant.)			

MEMORANDUM OPINION

This matter comes before the court on review of plaintiff's application to proceed *in* forma pauperis and pro se civil complaint. The court will grant the application, and dismiss the complaint.

Plaintiff recounts the events of September 13, 2008, culminating with an incident at the United States Post Office at 4005 Wisconsin Avenue, N.W. and an order issued by the Metropolitan Police Department barring plaintiff entry to the Post Office. *See* Compl. at 2 & Attach. (Barring Notice).

The Court has reviewed plaintiff's complaint, keeping in mind that complaints filed by pro se litigants are held to less stringent standards than those applied to formal pleadings drafted by lawyers. See Haines v. Kerner, 404 U.S. 519, 520 (1972). Even pro se litigants, however, must comply with the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure. Jarrell v. Tisch, 656 F. Supp. 237, 239 (D.D.C. 1987). Rule 8(a) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure requires that a complaint contain a short and plain statement of the grounds upon which the court's jurisdiction depends, a short and plain statement of the claim showing that the pleader is entitled to relief, and a demand

for judgment for the relief the pleader seeks. Fed. R. Civ. P. 8(a). The purpose of the minimum standard of Rule 8 is to give fair notice to the defendants of the claim being asserted, sufficient to prepare a responsive answer, to prepare 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).

The complaint sets forth neither a short and plain statement of this court's jurisdiction nor a short and plain statement showing plaintiff's entitlement to relief, nor a demand for any particular relief. For these reasons, the complaint will be dismissed without prejudice for its failure to comply with Rule 8(a). An Order consistent with this Memorandum Opinion is issued separately.

United States District Judge

Norm Robert

Date: 10/3/08