

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

FILED

JUN 11 2012

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

LATISHA RAY WINKLER, *et al.*,

Plaintiffs,

v.

SUPREME COURT OF CALIFORNIA,

Defendant.

Civil Action No. **12 0951**

MEMORANDUM OPINION

This matter comes before the court on review of plaintiffs' applications to proceed *in forma pauperis* and *pro se* civil complaint. The Court will grant the applications, 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).

(N)

5

The complaint is so incoherently written that the Court cannot discern a viable claim within this Court's subject matter jurisdiction or a basis for exercising personal jurisdiction over the named defendant or a clear statement showing plaintiffs' entitlement to the relief they seek. Accordingly, the Court will dismiss the complaint without prejudice. An Order consistent with this Memorandum Opinion is issued separately.

DATE: 6/5/12



United States District Judge