

**FILED**

**AUG 11 2017**

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

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

|                               |   |                   |               |
|-------------------------------|---|-------------------|---------------|
| L. Ruther,                    | ) |                   |               |
|                               | ) |                   |               |
| Plaintiff,                    | ) |                   |               |
|                               | ) |                   |               |
| v.                            | ) | Civil Action Nos. | 17-1379 (UNA) |
|                               | ) |                   | 17-1386 (UNA) |
|                               | ) |                   |               |
| Sequential Brands Group Inc., | ) |                   |               |
|                               | ) |                   |               |
| Defendant.                    | ) |                   |               |

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 resides in Manassas, Virginia. He has filed a purported complaint against what appears to be a private business. The complaint is incomprehensible and thus fails to provide any notice of a claim and the basis of federal court jurisdiction. A separate order of dismissal accompanies this Memorandum Opinion.

Date: August 10, 2017

  
United States District Judge