## DEC 3 1 2018

## UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

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

EDWARD THOMAS KENNEDY,	)
Plaintiff,	)
v.	) Civil Action No. 18-2699 (UNA)
DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY, et al.,	)
Defendants.	)

## **MEMORANDUM OPINION**

This matter is before the Court on review of the plaintiff's application to proceed *in forma* pauperis and his pro se complaint. Plaintiff alleges that defendants have kept him in "constructive financial imprisonment," Compl ¶ 8, and have "acted in such a way, or failed to act in such a way, that [he] is deprived of his liberty," id. ¶ 9. However, Plaintiff has failed to allege any plausible facts to support his claims that Defendants committed "trespass" or acted in "bad faith" aside from his bald assertion that they denied him credit on two occasions. Compl. ¶¶ 29, 36. That, alone, is insufficient to state a claim for relief.

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) 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). Because the instant complaint fails to meet this standard, the Court grants plaintiff's application to proceed in forma pauperis and dismisses the complaint. An Order consistent with this Memorandum Opinion is issued separately.

DATE: December  $\overline{2}$ , 2018

United States District Judge