

**FILED**

**FEB 26 2014**

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

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Surf Moore, )  
 )  
 Plaintiff, )  
 )  
 v. )  
 )  
 Justice Dept. *et al.*, )  
 )  
 Defendants. )  
 \_\_\_\_\_ )

Civil Action No. *14-313*

MEMORANDUM OPINION

This matter is before the Court on its initial review of plaintiff's *pro se* Complaint 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 resident of Jackson, Mississippi, purports to sue the United States Department of Justice and a construction company based in Chicago, Illinois. Compl. at 2. The Complaint consists wholly of incoherent statements and contains no discernible request for relief. Hence, this case will be dismissed. A separate Order accompanies this Memorandum Opinion.

Date: February 11, 2014

  
United States District Judge