FILED

MAY 2 8 2014

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

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

| DEMETRIUS PROCTOR, |) |
|--------------------|-------------------------|
| |) |
| Plaintiff, |) |
| |) |
| ν. | Civil Action No. 14-906 |
| TRAVIS McCOY, |) |
| |) |
| Defendant. |) |

MEMORANDUM OPINION

This matter comes before the court on review of plaintiff's application to proceed *in* forma pauperis and pro se civil complaint. The Court will grant the application, and dismiss the complaint.

The Court has reviewed plaintiff's complaint, keeping in mind that complaints filed by pro se litigants are held to less stringent standards than those applied to formal pleadings drafted by lawyers. See Haines v. Kerner, 404 U.S. 519, 520 (1972). Even pro se litigants, however, 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 that a complaint contain a short and plain statement of the grounds upon which the Court's jurisdiction depends, a short and plain statement of the claim showing that the pleader is entitled to relief, and a demand for judgment for the relief the pleader seeks. Fed. R. Civ. P. 8(a). The purpose of the minimum standard of Rule 8 is to give fair notice to the defendants of the claim being asserted, sufficient to prepare a responsive answer, to prepare an adequate defense and to determine whether the doctrine of res judicata applies. Brown v. Califano, 75 F.R.D. 497, 498 (D.D.C. 1977).

Plaintiff alleges that defendant copied plaintiff's cassette tapes to compact discs with the exception of certain songs, and sues defendant for \$2,000,000,000. Compl. at 1. Plaintiff neither states a basis for the Court's jurisdiction nor includes a statement showing plaintiff's entitlement to the damages he demands. As drafted, the complaint does not comply with Rule 8(a), and it therefore will be dismissed.

An Order consistent with this Memorandum Opinion is issued separately.

United States District Judge

DATE: 5/4/2014