

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

**FILED**

SEP 14 2012

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

TYRONE JULIUS,

Plaintiff,

v.

NEMADII RESEARCH CORPORATION,

Defendant.

Civil Action No. **12 1523**

**MEMORANDUM OPINION**

This matter comes before the court on review of plaintiff's *pro se* complaint and application to proceed *in forma pauperis*. The court will grant the application and dismiss the complaint.

The court has reviewed plaintiff's complaints, 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).

As is the case with plaintiff's prior complaints, the pleading utterly fails to meet Rule 8(a)'s minimal pleading standard. The complaint contains neither a short and plain statement of a claim showing plaintiff's entitlement to relief nor any indication of the actual claim asserted against the defendant. Nor is there any stated basis for plaintiff's demand of \$199,999,999.00 in damages.

An Order is issued separately.

  
United States District Judge

DATE: August 26, 2012