UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

)

)

))

)

Toni Patricia Irons Burley, Plaintiff, v. District of Columbia *et al.*, Defendants.

Civil Action No.

11 1090

FILED

JUN 1 5 2011

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

ク

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 Kingston, New York, sues the District of Columbia, the National Historical Society, and the United States for "discrimination of religion" and "discrimination of history." Compl. at 1. She appears to claim that defendants have failed to "expose" certain historical events, but in what context is unknown. Furthermore, the complaint is devoid of any facts establishing a claim and the basis of federal court jurisdiction. A separate Order of dismissal accompanies this Memorandum Opinion.

Date: June 2011

m

United States District Judge