

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Christopher John Villanueva, )  
 )  
 Plaintiff, )  
 )  
 v. )  
 )  
 United States of America, )  
 )  
 Defendant. )  
\_\_\_\_\_ )

Case: 1:17-cv-00938  
Assigned To : Unassigned  
Assign. Date : 5/19/2017  
Description: Pro Se Gen. Civ. (F-DECK)

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). “[A] complaint that is excessively long, rambling, disjointed,

incoherent, or full of irrelevant and confusing material does not meet [Rule 8's] liberal pleading requirement." *T.M. v. D.C.*, 961 F. Supp. 2d 169, 174 (D.D.C. 2013).

Plaintiff, a resident of Las Vegas, Nevada, has submitted a complaint against the United States of America that consists mostly of assorted attachments. Plaintiff begins: "No informed consent to services provided Donald Trump is not my president because of TREASON." Compl. at 1. That cryptic statement fails to provide any notice of a claim and a basis of federal court jurisdiction. Consequently, this case will be dismissed. A separate Order accompanies this Memorandum Opinion.

Date: May 10, 2017

  
United States District Judge