

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

FILED

MAR 20 2014

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

Eric Brosten,

Plaintiff,

v.

Library of Congress,

Defendant.

Civil Action No. **14-449**

MEMORANDUM OPINION


This matter is before the Court on its initial review of the plaintiff's *pro se* Complaint and 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

Plaintiff is a District of Columbia resident suing the Library of Congress for allegedly limiting his access presumably to the building. *See* Compl. at 2. He seeks \$50 million in damages and equitable relief. *Id.* at 3. The complaint begins with incoherent statements and accusations of a “criminal conspiracy [sic]” between the Library of Congress police force and “Hillary Clinton.” *Id.* at 1. Plaintiff then mentions “unlawful discriminatory practice” but does not provide any discernible facts supporting a basis for federal court jurisdiction. Hence, this case will be dismissed. A separate Order accompanies this Memorandum Opinion.


United States District Judge

Date: February 26, 2014