

defendants to prepare a responsive answer and an adequate defense, and to determine whether the doctrine of res judicata applies. *See Brown v. Califano*, 75 F.R.D. 497, 498 (D.D.C. 1977).

While the instant complaint does not expressly assert any basis for federal jurisdiction, it appears that the court may have diversity jurisdiction over this action, as the plaintiff appears to be a citizen of Ohio, the defendants appear to be citizens of Washington, D.C., and the amount in controversy appears to include the value of “the Fox network,” *see* Complaint at 1-2, which is well in excess of the minimum jurisdictional requirement of \$75,000. *See* 28 U.S.C. § 1332(a). As drafted, however, the complaint does not contain “a short and plain statement showing that the plaintiff is entitled to relief,” Fed. R. Civ. P. 8(a), and the court cannot discern what claims plaintiff is pursuing against which defendants on what grounds, or even what protected personal interest the plaintiff is seeking to enforce. In other words, the court cannot discern the plaintiff’s cause of action. As drafted, the complaint does not provide sufficient notice to the defendants of the claims so that they may prepare a proper defense. Accordingly, the complaint will be dismissed without prejudice for failure to comply with the requirements of Rule 8.

A separate order accompanies this memorandum opinion.

Date: 11/3/09


United States District Judge