

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

FILED

NOV 20 2017

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

Terrence Butchallati Blackman,)
)
Plaintiff,)
)
v.)
)
Allen *et al.*,)
)
Defendants.)
)

Civil Action No. 17-1963 (UNA)

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 has sued the Social Security Administration and a case worker for conduct unknown. The complaint consists mostly of scribble and cryptic statements, and a complaint “that is . . . 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). To the extent that plaintiff is seeking review of action taken by the Social Security Administration, he has failed either to identify a “final decision of the Commissioner of Social Security,” 42 U.S.C. § 405(g), or to allege sufficient facts from which the Commissioner may reasonably identify the decision being challenged. Hence, this case will be dismissed without prejudice. A separate order accompanies this Memorandum Opinion.

Date: November 6th, 2017


United States District Judge