

JUN 29 2011

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

JACK ALLEN HIPES,

Plaintiff,

V.

THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA, *et al.*,

Defendants.

Civil Action No.

11 1193

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 plaintiff's claims arise from the placement of his grandchildren in foster care by state officials in California. The complaint does not state a basis for this Court's jurisdiction or a short and plain statement of plaintiff's entitlement to relief. As drafted, the complaint fails to comply with Rule 8(a) and it will be dismissed.

An Order consistent with this Memorandum Opinion is issued separately.



United States District Judge

DATE:

6/26/11