

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Curtis Gralin Simmons,)	
)	
Plaintiff,)	
)	Case: 1:16-cv-02123
v.)	Assigned To : Unassigned
)	Assign. Date : 10/25/2016
Robbert Ryan <i>et al.</i> ,)	Description: Pro Se Gen. Civil (F Deck)
)	
Defendants.)	

MEMORANDUM OPINION


This matter is before the Court on its initial review of plaintiff's *pro se* complaint and application for leave to proceed *in forma pauperis*. The Court will grant the *in forma pauperis* application and dismiss the case because the complaint fails to meet the minimal pleading requirements of Rule 8(a) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure.

Pro se litigants 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 complaints to contain "(1) a short and plain statement of the grounds for the court's jurisdiction [and] (2) a short and plain statement of the claim showing that the pleader is entitled to relief." Fed. R. Civ. P. 8(a); *see Ashcroft v. Iqbal*, 556 U.S. 662, 678-79 (2009); *Ciralsky v. CIA*, 355 F.3d 661, 668-71 (D.C. Cir. 2004). The Rule 8 standard ensures that defendants receive fair notice of the claim being asserted so that they can prepare a responsive answer and an adequate defense and determine whether the doctrine of *res judicata* applies. *Brown v. Califano*, 75 F.R.D. 497, 498 (D.D.C. 1977).

Plaintiff is an Arizona state prisoner incarcerated in Eloy, Arizona. The complaint is largely incomprehensible and thus fails to provide any notice of a claim. To the extent that

plaintiff is seeking review of his conviction or the decisions of judges in state or federal courts, *see generally* Compl. and attachments, this Court has no authority to entertain such a claim. *See United States v. Choi*, 818 F. Supp. 2d 79, 85 (D.D.C. 2011) (district courts “generally lack[] appellate jurisdiction over other judicial bodies, and cannot exercise appellate mandamus over other courts.”) (citing *Lewis v. Green*, 629 F. Supp. 546, 553 (D.D.C.1986)); *Fleming v. United States*, 847 F. Supp. 170, 172 (D.D.C. 1994), *cert. denied* 513 U.S. 1150 (1995) (noting that “[b]y filing a complaint in this Court against federal judges who have done nothing more than their duty . . . Fleming has instituted a meritless action”) (applying *District of Columbia Court of Appeals v. Feldman*, 460 U.S. 462, 482 (1983); *Rooker v. Fidelity Trust Co.*, 263 U.S. 413, 415, 416 (1923)). A separate order of dismissal accompanies this Memorandum Opinion.

Date: October 20, 2016


United States District Judge