

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

DR. ROBERT G. MODRALL,

Plaintiff,

v.

JOHNS HOPKINS UNIVERSITY, *et al.*,

Defendants.

:
:
:
:
:
:
:
:
:
:

Case: 1:16-cv-01566
Assigned To : Unassigned
Assign. Date : 8/2/2016
Description: Pro Se Gen. Civil (F Deck)

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).

Plaintiff appears to allege that he brought "evidence of misconduct" to the attention of Dean, Provost and President of Johns Hopkins University with regard to financial aid and plaintiff's involuntary leave of absence. Nowhere in the complaint does plaintiff state a basis for this Court's jurisdiction or a statement to show that he is entitled to the injunctive relief he demands.

The complaint will be dismissed without prejudice because it fails to comply with Rule 8(a). An Order consistent with this Memorandum Opinion is issued separately.

DATE:

2/29/16


United States District Judge