	D STATES DISTRICT COURT HE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA	FILED NOV <sub>1</sub> 6 2011
David P. Phillips,	)	Clerk, U.S. District and Bankruptcy Courts
Plaintiff,	)	
v.	) Civil Action No.	is suit
District of Columbia (U.S.A.),	)	
Defendant.	)	

## 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 is a homeless individual suing the District of Columbia for \$1 billion. He alleges only that "[u]pon arrival have been harassed and involved against my will in many

altercations without an appropriate investigation." This cryptic allegation fails to provide any notice of a claim. *See Bell Atlantic Corp. v. Twombly*, 550 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). Therefore, the complaint will be dismissed. A separate Order accompanies this Memorandum Opinion.

Date: November 2 1, 2011