**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**
**FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA**

JULIUS B. MILLER,

Plaintiff,

v.

INVENT HELP, *et al.*,

Defendants.

Case: 1:15-cv-01029
Assigned To : Unassigned
Assign. Date : 6/30/2015
Description: Pro Se Gen. Civil (F Deck)

**MEMORANDUM OPINION**

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

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).

It appears that plaintiff entered into an agreement with defendants, and he now requests reimbursement for the amount he has paid to date. The complaint contains no short and plain statement showing plaintiff's entitlement to relief, and the Court therefore is unable to determine the legal basis of plaintiff's claim. As drafted, the complaint does not comply with Rule 8(a) and it will be dismissed.

N

4

An Order consistent with this Memorandum Opinion is issued separately.

DATE: 6/30/15

United States District Judge