FILED

MAY - 6 2009

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Clerk, U.S. District and Bankruptcy Courts

KAREEMAH BELL,)		
Plaintiff,))	
v.)	Civil Action No.	09 0827
NATIVITY, et al.,)		
Defendants.)		

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.

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).

Plaintiff alleges that the woman with whom she shared a room at a homeless shelter

"decided to toss all of [her] paperwork out of the second floor window." Compl. at 1. She states that she filed a complaint with the Metropolitan Police Department and that the crime would be considered destruction of property. *Id.* at 2. 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: April 22, 2009