

FILED

NOV 15 2013

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

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Daud A. Holiday,)
)
Plaintiff,)
)
v.)
)
United States *et al.*,)
)
Defendants.)

Civil Action No. 13-1166 (UNA)

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 prisoner at the District of Columbia Jail. He sues the United States, the District of Columbia, and four individuals. *See* Compl. Caption. In his Statement of Claims,

N

plaintiff only lists “false imprisonment, excessive force, violation of housing act, disability act, S.S.I. act, food at the DC jail, and monitoring [sic] visit” Compl. at 5. He does not state any supporting facts. Furthermore, in the Parties section of the Complaint, plaintiff does not name any of the defendants listed in the caption but rather writes “For any whom lawyer prove went through damages within.” *Id.* at 4. The attachments to the complaint include a document directed at the “Superior Court of the District of Columbia Court of Appeals,” styled as a “Petition for a Writ of Mandamus,” and various other unexplained documents. Plaintiff seeks his “release . . . with monetary compensation” *Id.* at 5. Since the complaint is simply too cryptic to provide any notice of a claim and the basis of this Court’s jurisdiction, it will be dismissed. *See Holiday v. United States of America*, No. 13-1165 (D.D.C. Oct. 28, 2013) (finding same). A separate Order accompanies this Memorandum Opinion.


United States District Judge

Date: November 13, 2013