

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

FILED

OCT 25 2016

Clerk, U.S. District & Bankruptcy
Courts for the District of Columbia

JEROME L. GRIMES,

Plaintiff,

v.

ARROW SERVICE & TOWING, *et al.*,

Defendants.

Case: 1:16-cv-02132

Assigned To : Unassigned

Assign. Date : 10/25/2016

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).

The Court has reviewed the complaint and finds it incomprehensible. The Court identifies neither a viable legal claim nor a statement regarding jurisdiction. Therefore, the

complaint will be dismissed. An Order consistent with this Memorandum Opinion is issued separately.

DATE: 10/24 /2016


United States District Judge