

FILED

MAR 23 2009

NANCY MAYER WHITTINGTON, CLERK
U.S. DISTRICT COURT

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

KAREEMAH BELL-BOSTON,

Plaintiff,

v.

GLENETTE M. HILTON,

Defendant.

Civil Action No.

09 0538

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 February 21, 2009, culminating with an encounter with security officers at the University of the District of Columbia and Metropolitan Police Department officers. She alleges that she has been barred from the University for one year.

The Court has reviewed plaintiff's complaint, keeping in mind that a complaint filed by a *pro se* litigant is held to a less stringent standard than is applied to a formal pleading drafted by a lawyer. *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, 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

Date: *March* 12, 2009