

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA**

DONETTA MICHELLE BYRD, )

Plaintiff, )

v. )

METRO, )

Defendant. )

Case: 1:17-cv-00210  
Assigned To : Unassigned  
Assign. Date : 1/31/2017  
Description: Pro Se Gen. Civ. (F-DECK)

**MEMORANDUM OPINION**

This matter is before the Court on plaintiff's application to proceed *in forma pauperis* and her *pro se* civil complaint. The application will be granted, and the complaint will be dismissed.

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 claim 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 that it fails to meet the standard set forth in Rule 8(a). The plaintiff alleges that she slipped while riding a bus and sustained injuries to her back, neck and knees. She demands a judgment in her favor and an award of \$999,999,999,999,999,999. Missing from the complaint are any facts describing the date, location, or the circumstances of the incident. As drafted, the complaint does not give the defendant fair notice of the claim against that it, so that it may prepare a proper answer or an adequate defense.

An Order consistent with this Memorandum Opinion is issued separately.

DATE: January 27, 2017

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
BERYL A. HOWELL  
Chief Judge