

**FILED**

JUL 29 2015

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIAClark, U.S. District & Bankruptcy  
Courts for the District of Columbia

AROR ARK O'DIAH,

Plaintiff,

v.

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, *et al*,

Defendants.

Case: 1:15-cv-01224

Assigned To : Unassigned

Assign. Date : 7/29/2015

Description: Pro Se Gen. Civil (F)

MEMORANDUM OPINION

This matter is before the Court on the plaintiff's application to proceed *in forma pauperis* and *pro se* civil 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 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).

The complaint is rambling and disorganized, and it often sets forth fanciful accounts of incidents, some of which arose as far back as 1989 and others of which apparently have been litigated in earlier lawsuits. As drafted, the complaint does not comply with Rule 8(a) and it will be dismissed without prejudice. An Order accompanies this Memorandum Opinion.

DATE:

7/22/2015

  
United States District Judge