## UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

ROMAN TIFFER,

Plaintiff,

Case: 1:16-cv-01117 (F Deck)

Assigned To: Unassigned Assign. Date: 6/15/2016

Description: Pro Se Gen. Civil

GOVERNMENT OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA,

v.

:

Defendant.

## **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.

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 Court has reviewed the complaint and finds that it fails to meet the standard set forth in Rule 8(a). Plaintiff purports to bring this action against the District of Columbia and demands civil damages for its unauthorized collection actions. *See* Compl. at 1. Attached to the

Complaint is a Statement of Account indicating that the plaintiff's tax liability to the District of Columbia remains unpaid. *See id.*, App. A. The complaint neither articulates a claim against the District of Columbia nor demands any particular relief. For these reasons, the Court will dismiss the complaint without prejudice because it fails to meet Rule 8(a) standards.

An Order accompanies this Memorandum Opinion.

DATE: 6/13/16

United States District Judge