FILED

## UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

JUN - 9 2015

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

D'RAYFIELD SHIPMAN,	)
Plaintiff,	)
v.	) Case: 1:15-cv-00871 Jury Demand ) Assigned To : Unassigned
DISABLED AMERICAN VETERANS,	<ul><li>) Assign. Date: 6/9/2015</li><li>) Description: Pro Se Gen. Civil (F Deck)</li></ul>
Defendant.	)

## MEMORANDUM OPINION

This matter is before the Court on 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 as frivolous.

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, who states that he has "been represented by [defendant] for the past 20+ years," Compl. at 1 (page numbers designated by the Court), alleges that defendant has "grossly discriminated against" him, *id.* at 2, by "fail[ing] to acknowledge [his] complaints," *id.* He neither describes his "complaints," nor explains the alleged discrimination against him, nor states the basis for this Court's jurisdiction. 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.

DATE: June 5, 2015

United States District Judge