

FILED

JUN 23 2017

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

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

FRANK BRETT,

Plaintiff,

v.

DAVID SAMSON, *et al.*,

Defendants.

Civil Action No. 17-1054 (UNA)

MEMORANDUM OPINION

The Court construes the plaintiff's *pro se* "Summary Judgment Motion" as a civil complaint. While reviewing the complaint, the Court keeps in mind that pleadings 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); *see Ashcroft v. Iqbal*, 556 U.S. 662, 678-79 (2009). 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).

As drafted, the complaint fails to comply with Rule 8(a). It does not appear to state the grounds upon which this court's jurisdiction depends, a statement of a cognizable claim showing

plaintiff's entitlement to relief, or any support for the plaintiff's demand for \$ 3 million. The Court grant the plaintiff's application to proceed *in forma pauperis*, deny his motion for injunctive relief, and dismiss this civil action without prejudice. An Order is issued separately.

DATE: June 15, 2017


United States District Judge