

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

FILED

JUN 26 2017

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

Michael Steven Wilkes,)
)
 Plaintiff,)
)
 v.)
)
 Charles Small *et al.*,)
)
 Defendants.)

Civil Action No. 17-968 (UNA)


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 purports to sue “Charles Small, Mary Small and 163 additional fugitives,” Compl. Caption, but he has provided no further information about the named defendants, and the voluminous complaint consists mostly of random comments and unexplained attachments. *See generally* Compl. (Doc. 1). A complaint, such as here, “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). Consequently, this case will be dismissed. A separate order accompanies this Memorandum Opinion.

Date: June 21, 2017


United States District Judge