

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

FILED

SEP - 7 2011

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

Shawn Martin Finch,

Plaintiff,

v.

Kim R. Gibson,

Defendant.

Civil Action No.

11 1605


MEMORANDUM OPINION

This matter is before the Court on review of the 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).

The plaintiff is a District of Columbia resident suing an individual in Johnstown, Pennsylvania. In the cryptic complaint captioned "Action Involves Discrimination," the plaintiff claims violations of the first, eighth and ninth amendments to the Constitution and the "Civil Rights Act of 1964 Title III . . . [d]ue to dismissal of cases and denying a fair hearing." Complaint at 1. The plaintiff has stated no supporting facts. He therefore has failed to provide the defendant with any notice of a claim. *See Bell Atlantic Corp. v. Twombly*, 555 U.S. 544, 555 (2007) (a plaintiff's "[f]actual allegations must be enough to raise a right to relief above the speculative level . . .") (citations omitted). A separate Order of dismissal accompanies this Memorandum Opinion.

Date: September 3, 2011


United States District Judge