

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

**FILED**

NOV - 5 2018

Clerk, U.S. District and  
Bankruptcy Courts

JOHN KEITH HEBERT.,

Plaintiff,

v.

Civil Action No. 18-2331 (UNA)

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, *et al.*,

Defendants.


**MEMORANDUM OPINION**

This matter comes before the court on review of plaintiff's application to proceed *in forma pauperis* and *pro se* civil complaint. The Court will grant the application and dismiss the complaint without prejudice.

The Court is mindful that complaints filed by *pro se* litigants are held to less stringent standards than are applied to formal pleadings drafted by lawyers. *See Haines v. Kerner*, 404 U.S. 519, 520 (1972). However, even *pro se* litigants must comply with the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure. *See 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); *See Ashcroft v. Iqbal*, 556 U.S. 662, 678-79 (2009). 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).

The Court has reviewed plaintiff's "International War Complaint" and concludes that it fails to meet the minimal pleading standard set forth in Rule 8(a). Notwithstanding plaintiff's claimed personal and mental injuries and financial damage, his complaint provides no factual support for his demand of \$111,100,000,000. Nor does the complaint allege sufficient facts to put defendants on notice of the claims against them. Therefore, the Court dismisses the complaint. An Order consistent with this Memorandum Opinion is issued separately.

DATE: October 23, 2018

  
United States District Judge