

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Surf Moore,)		
)		
Plaintiff,)		
)	Case: 1:17-cv-00899	(F-Deck)
v.)	Assigned To : Unassigned	
)	Assign. Date : 5/12/2017	
U.S. Justice Dep't <i>et al.</i> ,)	Description: Pro Se Gen. Civil	
)		
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).

“Once again, plaintiff, a resident of Jackson, Mississippi, purports to sue the United States Department of Justice and a construction company in Chicago, Illinois.” *Moore v. Justice Dep’t.*, No. 14-1386, 2014 WL 4057158, at *1 (D.D.C. Aug. 12, 2014). He seeks \$100 million in monetary damages. *See* Compl. at 2 (renumbered); *Moore, supra* (noting that plaintiff “seeks money damages exceeding \$50 million”). Although plaintiff adds to his typical “incoherent statements,” *Moore*, 2014 WL 4057158, at * 1, that “this matter is current and request foia of records and have no response,” Compl. at 2, he has not provided any particulars about a request for records under the Freedom of Information Act (FOIA) to provide adequate notice of a claim. Hence this case will be dismissed as well under Rule 8 for insufficient pleading. *See Moore*, 2014 WL 4057158, at * 1 (listing cases finding same).¹ A separate Order accompanies this Memorandum Opinion.

Date: May 11, 2017


United States District Judge

¹ A review of this court’s dockets reveals that since the decision in 2014, all of plaintiff’s complaints (nine excluding the instant complaint), brought against the same defendants as here, have been dismissed for insufficient pleading under Rule 8. *See* Civ. Action Nos. 16-20, 16-21, 16-182, 16-981, 16-1272, 16-1701, 16-2102, 16-2392, 17-324.