## UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

FILED
MAY 1 8 2010

JOSEPH SLOVINEC,	)		Clerk, U.S. District & Bankruptcy Courts for the District of Columbi
Plaintiff,	)		
v.	)	Civil Action No.	
AMERICAN UNIVERSITY,	)		10 0827
Defendant.	)		

## **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 complaints filed by pro se litigants are held to less stringent standards than those applied to formal pleadings drafted by lawyers. 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).



It appears that American University is about to destroy financial aid records of interest to plaintiff, and plaintiff now asks the Court "to e-mail an order not to destroy these records and allow pleadings next week also." Compl. at 2. The complaint does not contain a short and plain statement of the grounds upon which the Court's jurisdiction depends or a claim that plaintiff is entitled to the relief he seeks. 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 30, 2010