UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Brud Rossmann,)	
Plaintiff,) Case: 1:17-cv-01096	
v.	Assigned To : Unassigned Assign. Date : 6/8/2017	
G. Michael Harvey et al.,	Description: Pro Se Gen. (Civil (F Deck)
Defendants.)))	

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 is a District of Columbia resident. He purports to sue a magistrate judge of this court, G. Michael Harvey, and three "John Doe[s]." Compl. Caption. The rambling complaint contains no factual allegations against Magistrate Judge Harvey, and no other defendants are identified in the caption of the complaint. *See* LCvR 11.1 (requiring the "first filing" to include "in the caption the name and full residence address or official address of each party"). Consequently, this case will be dismissed without prejudice. A separate Order accompanies this Memorandum Opinion.

Date: May 30, 2017

United States District Judge