

FILED

FEB 28 2018

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

Defendant.

Civil Action No. 18-0350 (UNA)

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).

The Court has reviewed the complaint, and finds that it utterly fails to comply with Rule 8(a). The pleading is unintelligible as are its attachments. Therefore, the Court grant the plaintiff's application to proceed *in forma pauperis* and will dismiss the complaint without prejudice. An Order accompanies this Memorandum Opinion.

DATE:

2/28/18


United States District Judge