

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

LAWRENCE V. WILDER,

Plaintiff,

v.

LORETTA LYNCH, *et al.*,

Defendants.

Case: 1:16-cv-00829

Assigned To : Unassigned

Assign. Date : 5/3/2016

Description: Pro Se Gen. Civ.

**MEMORANDUM OPINION**

This matter comes before the court on review of plaintiff's application to proceed *in forma pauperis* and *pro se* civil complaint. The Court will grant the application, and dismiss the complaint.

Plaintiff's wide-ranging complaint touches on federal employment he has lost, racial profiling he has experienced, educational opportunities he has been denied, assaults he has sustained, and presidential pardons he has been promised. Among other relief, plaintiff demands unspecified compensatory and punitive damages.


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 claims 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).

The Court has reviewed the complaint and finds that it fails to meet the standard set forth in Rule 8(a). It does not set forth a statement of a cognizable claim showing plaintiff's entitlement to relief and, therefore, the complaint will be dismissed. An Order consistent with this Memorandum Opinion is issued separately.

DATE:

4/26/2016

  
United States District Judge