

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

**FILED**

**MAY 18 2018**

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

TATYANA ISHUTKINA, *et al.*,

Plaintiffs,

v.

FANNIE MAE,

Defendant.

Civil Action No. 18-1021 (UNA)

**MEMORANDUM OPINION**

This matter is before the Court on consideration of the plaintiff's application to proceed *in forma pauperis* and their *pro se* complaint. The Court has reviewed the 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). *Pro se* litigants still 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).

There are two named plaintiffs, yet the complaint sets forth no factual allegations or claims pertaining to Nikolay Synkov. Rather, particularly if the Court were to focus on certain

demands for relief, such as reinstatement and compensation for lost income, it might conclude that this action pertains to plaintiff Tatyana Ishutkina's former employment with General Dynamics. However, plaintiffs' ultimate goal appears to be securing "financial support [for] the non-profit organization Fermata Arts Foundation," *id.* at 9, the interests of which neither *pro se* plaintiff may represent, *see Ishutkina v. Fannie Mae*, No. 17-cv-1949, 2017 WL 6886312 (D.D.C. Oct. 5, 2017) (citing *180 East Broad Partners LLC v. Ohio Dep't of Taxation*, 193 F. Supp. 3d 1, 2 (D.D.C. 2014)), *aff'd*, No. 17-7156 (D.C. Cir. Feb. 14, 2018). Missing, too, are any factual allegations pertaining to the named defendant, Fannie Mae.

As drafted, plaintiffs' complaint fails to comply with the pleading standard set forth in Rule 8(a). It does not include a short and plain statement of plaintiffs' claims against the named defendant, such that defendant reasonably cannot be expected to prepare a responsive answer or prepare an adequate defense. The Court will grant plaintiffs' applications to proceed *in forma pauperis* and dismiss the complaint and this civil action without prejudice. An Order is issued separately.

  
United States District Judge

DATE: May 18, 2018