

FILED

JUN 19 2017

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

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

JOHN WASHINGTON,

Plaintiff,

v.

ST. LOUIS METROPOLITAN POLICE
DEPARTMENT, *et al.*,

Defendants.

Civil Action No. 17-1020 (UNA)

MEMORANDUM OPINION

This matter comes before the court on review of plaintiff's application to proceed *in forma pauperis* and *pro se* civil complaint. The Court will grant the application, and dismiss the complaint.

In what appears to be a case of mistaken identity, the crimes of plaintiff's twin brother (including rape and sodomy) are attributed to plaintiff. Compl. at 6 (page numbers designated by ECF). As a result, plaintiff believes that he is "targeted by those who are into sodomy and those who sympathize with them." *Id.* He alleges that he has been harassed, and his movements have been tracked. *See id.* at 8.


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, 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). It does not set forth a statement of a cognizable claim or demand any particular form of relief. The Court therefore will dismiss the complaint without prejudice. An Order consistent with this Memorandum Opinion is issued separately.

DATE:

6/15/2017


United States District Judge