

FILED

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

Defendant.

Civil Action No. 18-228(UNA)

The Court has reviewed plaintiff's complaint, keeping in mind that 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 claims 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).

This complaint does not appear to allege facts to support a viable legal claim. Rather, it consists of incomprehensible ramblings regarding the interception of oral and electronic communications, wire fraud, and patents, and demands for millions of dollars. The complaint fails to set forth a short and plain statement showing plaintiff's entitlement to relief. Therefore, as drafted, the complaint does not meet the minimal pleading requirements set forth in Rule 8(a). The Court will dismiss the complaint without prejudice and deny plaintiff's motions as moot.

An Order is issued separately.

DATE: 2/28/18

Frank J. Chaudler
United States District Judge