FILED

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FEB 2 1 201 FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

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

Octavia Wells,) Courts for the	e District of Colum
Plaintiff,)	
v.	Civil Action No. 14-280)
Eric Holder,)	
Defendant)	

MEMORANDUM OPINION

This matter is before the Court on its initial review of the 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, 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).

The plaintiff is a resident of Washington, D.C. who has named Eric Holder as the defendant to this action. The plaintiff lists this courthouse as the defendant's address. The one-



page complaint consists of a demand for a jury trial and for relief in the form of "Impeachment & replacement[,] Canidate(s) [sic] Octavia Wells and/or Barack Obama." In addition, the complaint contains the following inexplicable statement: "Supplying Mexican Drug Cartel & distribution of illegal drugs keep my people off illegal drugs," and the plaintiff's offer to "accept his Salary & Commissions as pay ASAP!" The complaint fails to provide any notice of a claim or basis for federal court jurisdiction. Hence, this case will be dismissed. ¹

United States Distr

Date: January <u>15</u>, 2014

¹ A separate Order accompanies this Memorandum Opinion.