## FILED

## APR 2 7 2016

## UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

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

| Lawrence v. Wilder Sr., | )   |  |
|-------------------------|---|--|
| Plaintiff,              | )<br>Case: 1:16-cv-00801                          |  |
| v.                      | Assigned To : Unassigned Assign. Date : 4/27/2016 |  |
| Choice Hotels et al.,   | Description: Pro Se Gen. Civil                    |  |
| Defendants.             | )   |  |

## 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, 556 U.S. 662, 678-79 (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 Wilmington, North Carolina. He purports to bring claims against several hotels under the umbrella of Choice Hotels. Plaintiff alleges that when he stayed at the Cambria Convention Suites in the District of Columbia, he was served "a heart and rotten spinach" and his "salad was laced with chemicals." Compl. at 3 (page number supplied). He does not allege an injury. Plaintiff also alleges that when he stayed at a Quality Inn in Hilton Head, South Carolina, the "Defendants assaulted me multiple times when I used the business center and racially harassed me," and that "Defendants conspired with interstate intrastate criminal stalkers to illegally enter my hotel room to sexually assault, assault, and commit theft in Raleigh, NC, and in Virginia Beach VA." *Id.* Finally, plaintiff claims that "Defendants refused to investigate discrimination and refund me expenses," and that he "was also racial profiled." *Id.* Plaintiff demands \$10 million in damages.

Plaintiff does not state when any of the alleged events occurred and by whom. At the end of the case caption, plaintiff writes: "Every stay in Choice Hotels from 2013-2015" and "Unknown Federal and State agents." Notwithstanding the frivolous nature of the factual allegations, the Court finds that the complaint is simply too cryptic to provide adequate notice of a claim under Rule 8. Hence, dismissal will be without prejudice. A separate order accompanies this Memorandum Opinion.

Date: April  $\overline{\lambda}$ , 2016

United States District Judge