

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

FILED

OCT 20 2014

Clerk, U.S. District and
Bankruptcy Courts

LUTHER DARNELL STAPLETON, JR.,)

Plaintiff,)

v.)

THE PEOPLE OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA,)

Defendant.)

Civil Action No.

14-1748 (una)

MEMORANDUM OPINION

This matter is before the Court on the plaintiff's application to proceed *in forma pauperis* and his *pro se* civil complaint. The application will be granted, and the complaint will be dismissed.

The Court has reviewed the plaintiff's complaint and exhibits, keeping in mind that a complaint filed by a *pro se* litigant is held to a less stringent standard than that applied to a formal pleading drafted by a lawyer. *See Haines v. Kerner*, 404 U.S. 519, 520 (1972). Even a *pro se* litigant, 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).

This complaint utterly fails to meet even the minimal pleading set forth in Rule 8(a). It is illogical, incoherent, and filled with the sort of "fantastic or delusional scenarios," *Neitzke v. Williams*, 490 U.S. 319, 328 (1989), warranting dismissal under 28 U.S.C. §§ 1915(e)(2)(B)(i),

(n)

3

Williams, 490 U.S. 319, 328 (1989), warranting dismissal under 28 U.S.C. §§ 1915(e)(2)(B)(i), 1915A(b)(1). Furthermore, it “is patently insubstantial, presenting no federal question suitable for decision.” *Caldwell v. Kagan*, 777 F. Supp. 2d 177, 178 (D.D.C. 2011) (quoting *Tooley v. Napolitano*, 586 F.3d 1006, 1009 (D.C. Cir. 2009)), *aff’d per curiam*, 455 F. App’x 1 (D.C. Cir. 2011), *cert. denied*, 133 S. Ct. 279 (2012). No defendant should “be forced to spend time and energy in attempting to decipher plaintiff’s utterly confusing and lengthy pleading.” *Hamrick v. United States*, No. 08-1698, 2009 WL 8747880, at *1 (D.D.C. Jan. 30, 2009) (footnote omitted).

The Court will dismiss the complaint and this civil action as frivolous. An Order consistent with this Memorandum Opinion is issued separately.

DATE:

10/15/2014

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Amy S.', written over a horizontal line.

United States District Judge