## UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

BARRY HUTCHINS,

v.

Plaintiff, : Case: 1:16-cv-01565
Assigned To: Unassigned

Assign. Date : 8/2/2016

Description: Pro Se Gen. Civil (F Deck)

SOCIAL SECURITY OFFICE OF CIVIL RIGHTS, et al.,

Defendants.

## **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 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).

Among other claims, plaintiff alleges that he has been denied Social Security benefits, administered psychiatric drugs, denied public assistance by the District of Columbia government, and discriminated against for reasons that are not explained. There are so few factual allegations that the Court cannot determine what claim or claims plaintiff brings against each defendant, and none of the defendants can be expected to file a meaningful response to the complaint. The Court finds that the complaint fails to meet the standard set forth in Rule 8(a) and, therefore, the complaint will be dismissed. An Order consistent with this Memorandum Opinion is issued separately.

DATE: 7/29/16

United States District Judge