## UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

CLARENCE A. BRANCH, III,	)	Case: 1:17-cv-00971 Assigned To : Unassigned	F Deck
Plaintiff,	)	Assign. Date : 5/23/2017 Description: Pro Se Gen. Civil	Jury Demand
$V_{\underline{*}}$	)	Civil Action No.	
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF THE UNITED STATES, et al.,	)		
Defendants.	)		

## **MEMORANDUM OPINION**

This matter is before the Court on plaintiff's application to proceed *in forma pauperis* and his *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 claims being asserted such that they can prepare a responsive answer, prepare 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 has prepared his pleading using a preprinted form titled Third-Party Complaint. While plaintiff lists several defendants, he sets forth no factual allegations. The Court cannot determine what claim plaintiff intends to bring, and no defendant is given fair notice of the claim or claims plaintiff purportedly brings against them. As drafted, the complaint fails to comply with Rule 8(a) and therefore it will be dismissed. An Order consistent with this Memorandum Opinion is issued separately.

DATE: 5 5 17

United States District Judge