APR 1 9 2010

Clerk, U.S. District & Bankruptcy
Courts for the District of Columbia

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Kevin Fennick,)	
Plaintiff,))	
v.) Civil Action No.	10 0600
George W. Bush et al.,)	
Defendants.)	

MEMORANDUM OPINION

Plaintiff Kevin Fennick has filed an application to proceed in forma pauperis and a pro se complaint. The application will be granted and the complaint will be dismissed without prejudice.

A complaint filed by a pro se litigant is held to a lesser standard than is a formal pleading drafted by a lawyer, *see Haines v. Kerner*, 404 U.S. 519, 520 (1972), but even a pro se complaint must meet the minimum standards set by 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 showing that the pleader is entitled to relief, and a demand for judgment for the relief the pleader seeks to obtain. 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 and 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 two-page complaint is entitled "Complaint to Civil Rights," identifies as defendants George W. Bush, Boeing, the U.S. House of Representatives, and Republicans, and is comprised of the plaintiff's description and criticism of various alleged Bush administration policies regarding subjects both foreign and domestic, including war, health care, poverty programs, immigration, and the economy. The complaint does not contain any statement of the grounds upon which the court's jurisdiction depends, does not contain a statement showing that the plaintiff is entitled to relief, and makes no demand for relief. As drafted, it does not meet the minimum standards of Rule 8. It also does not demonstrate that this court has subject matter jurisdiction over this complaint. Accordingly the complaint will be dismissed without prejudice.

A separate order accompanies this memorandum opinion.

Date: April 12, 7010