

FILED

NOV 17 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 No. 17-2060 (UNA)
)	
)	
State of Michigan <i>et al.</i> ,)	
)	
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).

Plaintiff resides in Manassas, Virginia. He has filed a purported complaint against the State of Michigan and an individual. But the cryptic document simply 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: November 6th, 2017



United States District Judge