FILED
SEP 19 2016
Clerk, U.S. District & Bankruptcy
Courts for the District of Columbia

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

JEAN PAUL GAMARRA,	)	
	)	
Plaintiff,	)	
	)	**Case: 1:16-cv-01867**
v.	)	**Assigned To : Unassigned**
	)	**Assign. Date : 9/19/2016**
NORMAN MANASA,	)	**Description: Pro Se Gen. Civil (F Deck)**
	)	
Defendant.	)	

MEMORANDUM OPINION

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 finds that the complaint is incomprehensible. It does not appear to state the grounds upon which this court's jurisdiction depends, or a statement of a cognizable claim showing plaintiff's entitlement to relief, or a demand for relief. As drafted, the complaint fails to

comply with Rule 8(a) and therefore it will be dismissed. An Order consistent with this Memorandum Opinion is issued separately.

DATE: 9/15/12

United States District Judge

J. Boasberg