

**FILED**

**MAR - 9 2010**

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

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Surf Moore,

Plaintiff,

v.

U.S. Justice Dep't *et al.*,

Defendants.

Civil Action No. **10 0382**

MEMORANDUM OPINION

This matter is before the Court on its initial review of plaintiff's *pro se* complaint and application for leave to proceed *in forma pauperis*. The Court will grant the *in forma pauperis* application and dismiss the case because the complaint fails to meet the minimal pleading requirements of Rule 8(a) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure.

*Pro se* litigants 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 complaints to contain “(1) a short and plain statement of the grounds for the court's jurisdiction [and] (2) a short and plain statement of the claim showing that the pleader is entitled to relief.” Fed. R. Civ. P. 8(a); *see Ashcroft v. Iqbal*, 129 S.Ct. 1937, 1950 (2009); *Ciralsky v. CIA*, 355 F.3d 661, 668-71 (D.C. Cir. 2004). The Rule 8 standard ensures that defendants receive fair notice of the claim being asserted so that they can prepare a responsive answer and an adequate defense and determine whether the doctrine of *res judicata* applies. *Brown v. Califano*, 75 F.R.D. 497, 498 (D.D.C. 1977).

Plaintiff, a resident of Jackson, Mississippi, sues the Department of Justice, the States of Mississippi and California and an individual, Charles Moore, Jr., for civil damages authorized by 18 U.S.C. § 2520, which states:

Except as provided in section 2511(2)(a)(ii), any person whose wire, oral, or electronic communication is intercepted, disclosed, or intentionally used in violation of this chapter may in a civil action recover from the person or entity, other than the United States, which engaged in that violation such relief as may be appropriate.

18 U.S.C. § 2520(a). Demanding \$100 million, plaintiff alleges only that “the Defendant intentional [sic] intruded on plaintiff seclusion and is [illegible] for relief for offensive & objectionable, and tortious intrusion of Privacy Act 1871.” Compl. at 1. The statute precludes plaintiff’s recovery of damages from the United States and plaintiff has not stated sufficient facts to provide adequate notice of a claim against the remaining defendants. A separate order of dismissal accompanies this Memorandum Opinion.

  
United States District Judge

Date: February 19, 2010