FILED

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

MAY 2 1 2014

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

Eric Houston,)
Plaintiff,)
ν.) Civil Action No. 14-0641 (UNA)
Mary D. Andrea et al.,)
Defendants.)

MEMORANDUM OPINION

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



Plaintiff is a prisoner at the United States Penitentiary in Lewisburg, Pennsylvania. He sues two individuals who may work at a federal court in Williamsport, Pennyslvania. See Compl. Caption (listing defendants' address as "US Courthouse Suites"). Plaintiff demands damages exceeding \$ 1.1 million, see Compl. at 5, but the complaint consists of incoherent statements that do not implicate the named defendants in any wrongdoing. Hence, this case will be dismissed. A separate Order accompanies this Memorandum Opinion.

Date: May $19^{1/2}$, 2014

United States District Judge