

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

Plaintiff,

V.

SWIFT TRANS INC., *et al.*,

Defendants.

Civil Action No.

12 1271

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).

The "Draft Complaint," replete with typographical errors and sentence fragments, mentions an arbitration proceeding. Apparently plaintiff is dissatisfied with the outcome, yet he neither articulates a basis for this Court's jurisdiction, states a claim showing an entitlement to relief, nor demands any particular form of 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:

2/19/12