

FILED

AUG 26 2011

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

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Dawn Norman,

Plaintiff,

v.

Aston Judiciary Square *et al.*,

Defendant.

Civil Action No. **11 1539**

MEMORANDUM OPINION

This matter is before the Court on review of plaintiff's 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 Richmond, Virginia, sues two defendants in Washington D.C., one

-11-

3

in Richmond, Virginia, and another in New York, New York. *See* Compl. Caption. She seeks damages exceeding \$121 million “for withholding official documentation and trespassing – out of warrent [sic] – illegal entry on property” Compl. at 1. The cryptic complaint fails to provide any notice of a claim or a basis for federal court jurisdiction. A separate Order of dismissal accompanies this Memorandum Opinion.

Date: August 16, 2011



United States District Judge