

FILED

JAN 30 2014

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

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Kareemah Bell-Boston,

Plaintiff,

v.

United States of America *et al.*,

Defendants.

Civil Action No. 14-135

MEMORANDUM OPINION


This matter is before the Court on its initial review of the plaintiff's *pro se* "Civil Action" (hereafter Complaint) and her application 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*, 556 U.S. 662, 678-79 (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).

N

3

The plaintiff, a District of Columbia resident, recounts her visit to the Superior Court of the District of Columbia on November 29, 2013, for a “scheduled [] drug testing.” Complaint at 2. She alleges that she was approached by a Court Security Officer who “wanted to know why I was in the build[ing].” *Id.* The plaintiff further alleges that after she informed the officer about her visit and proceeded to the escalators, the officer “started calling me crazy and I informed him not to mentally abuse me, he kept calling me crazy so I used the public pay phone . . . to contact the metropolitan police” *Id.* The plaintiff suggests that the officer is “obsessed” with her and describes his behavior as “unexpectedable [sic].” *Id.* The plaintiff has not requested any relief and has not stated a basis for federal court jurisdiction. Hence, this case will be dismissed.¹


United States District Judge

Date: January 15, 2014

¹ A separate Order accompanies this Memorandum Opinion.