UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

·	
BRUD ROSSMAN,	JAN - 4 2018
Plaintiff,	Clerk, U.S. District & Bankruptcy Courts for the District of Columbia
v.) Civil Action No. 17-2370 (UNA)
BRIAN McVEIGH, et al.,))
Defendants.)))

MEMORANDUM OPINION

This matter is before the Court on the plaintiff's application to proceed *in forma pauperis* and his *pro se* civil complaint.

Complaints 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). The purpose of the minimum standard of Rule 8 is to give fair notice to the defendants of the claim being asserted, sufficient to prepare a responsive answer, to prepare an adequate defense and to determine whether the doctrine of *res judicata* applies. *Brown v. Califano*, 75 F.R.D. 497, 498 (D.D.C. 1977).

According to plaintiff, defendants prevent him from leaving the United States, have caused his false imprisonment, and accused of him of making terrorist threats. Defendants' actions somehow are premised upon an outstanding Alabama warrant, notice of which has spread via computer virus to the computer systems of the Social Security Administration and the Department of Homeland Security. The Court has reviewed the complaint and its exhibits (including unintelligible handwritten notes and mail receipts), and concludes that the complaint does not comply with the minimal pleading standard set forth in Rule 8(a). Therefore, the Court will dismiss the complaint without prejudice. An Order accompanies this Memorandum Opinion.

DATE: December , 2013

James 2, 2018

United States District Judge