FILED

## UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

NOV 1 7 2014

Clerk, U.S. District and Bankruptcy Courts

Mark S. Ciriello,	)
Plaintiff,	Case: 1:14-cv-01932 Assigned To : Unassigned Assign. Date : 11/17/2014 Description: Pro Se Gen. Civil
v.	
Executive Office of the President,	
Defendant.	)
	,

## MEMORANDUM OPINION

This matter is before the Court on its initial review of plaintiff's *pro se* complaint and application for leave 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, 129 S.Ct. 1937, 1950 (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 resident of Waterbury, Connecticut, who has named the Executive Office of the President as the sole defendant to this action. *See* Compl. Caption. The complaint consists of a narrative about events that have nothing to do with the named defendant. Plaintiff indicates that he is filing here because a judge in the District of Connecticut has "banned" him from filing claims in that court absent his filing of "certain paper work[.]" Compl. at 1. The instant complaint and inexplicable attachments fail to provide any notice of a claim. A separate Order of dismissal accompanies this Memorandum Opinion.

Date: November 1, 2014

United States District Judge